

Candidate 1 evidence

Modern Studies Advanced Higher Paper

7. Definitions, measurements, and perceptions of crime are not fixed.

There are a number of factors which shape our perceptions of crime – the media, statistics, the law, culture and the time period that we live in. These factors mold and influence are perceptions and our definitions of what crime is and how that is measured so that they are constantly changing and often distorted from reality. This essay will look at definitions, measurements, and perceptions of crime as it relates to the UK and other countries such as the US, China, and middle eastern countries like Saudi-Arabi, Afghanistan, and Iran.

There are many ways in which people can find out about the extent of crime in the UK, one of which being police recorded crime. However, these statistics are a flawed way to measure overall crime considering it only includes the crimes that are reported to the police and subsequently dealt with by the police. Where the police are likely to know about the extent of crimes such as murder, they are unlikely to know the true extent of crimes such as sexual assault which are often misrepresented and underreported. Though it is important to recognize that as time passes the police develop new ways to measure and record crime and that this can change. Indeed, while the police are likely to know about the extent of murder in the modern day, this was not the case even twenty or fifty years ago when it was much more difficult to investigate such crimes.

Measurements of crime are therefore not fixed and there is therefore also a gap between the reality of crime in the UK and what can be perceived by looking at these statistics. It is possible to attempt to bridge this gap through the Scottish Crime and Justice Survey or the Crime Survey for England and Wales. These surveys are anonymous and have been developed so that society has new ways to measure crime, and they ultimately provide a better and more accurate view of crime in the UK than police recorded crime. For instance, in 2021 the SCJS estimates that Scottish police were only aware of 29% of crime. This highlights the major extent to which there are flaws in police data and how surveys such as the SCJS can 'fill in the gaps' in police knowledge and data. There is a similar situation in the US where crime is recorded in part through FBI Crime Uniform Reports and the National Crime Victimization Survey, where just like the UK the surveys provide a better view of crime. For example, in one year the FBI reported a 12% increase in aggravated assault whereas the survey reported a 21% decrease, a major difference. While it would be unreasonable to suggest that these surveys are a completely accurate measure of crime and know about all crime in the UK or the US, they are a more accurate measurement that can better inform our perceptions of crime than police data, and ultimately there is value in having two different but reliable and trustworthy sources to record crime. Overall, the way in which crime is measured is constantly changing and developing so that the public can learn more about crime and our perceptions can be better informed and more accurate, as seen in the introduction of surveys like the SCJS and CSEW. However it is important to note that public engagement with these statistics is low and that most people gain their perceptions of crime through the media. This means that even if measurements of crime were developed to be completely accurate and provide a full view of crime, it would not change perceptions.

The media heavily influences our perceptions of crime. Traditional media puts a big focus on crime reporting, with newspapers devoting roughly 30% of their coverage to crime reporting, and the media therefore fulfils its purpose in informing the public on current events relating to crime. This is unlike countries such as China in which the state controls the media and imposes censorship on crime reporting. For instance, in March of 2024 Chinese police attempted to censor crime reporting on a deadly explosion that occurred. In Britain the media is much more free to report on what it wants and therefore the media arguably distorts and changes perceptions of crime in Britain far less than in countries such as China. However, the British media is not perfect and while

**Modern Studies Advanced
Higher Paper**

it does not go so far as to censor crime reporting it is selective about what it shows to the public. The media skews the facts and tends to highlight the negatives rather than showing any balance. Notably, the media is not falsely reporting on anything, but it is putting an angle on and taking out of context reliable information. For instance, the media cited extreme increases in crime rates in 2021 and 2022, not taking into account the fact that crime had gone down during the COVID-19 pandemic and subsequent lockdown and was only then 'recovering' to the normal rates seen in 2019 and previous years. This is the media setting an agenda based on what is newsworthy and can lead to the overreporting and overrepresentation of certain crimes, making people believe that crimes such as murder are much more common than they actually are. The media therefore plays an important role in developing and informing public perceptions of crime and these perceptions can change and be heavily influenced by whichever narrative the media decides to push at any given time, therefore showing how perceptions are not fixed and can be significantly distorted by the media. However, the media can also accurately inform our perceptions and be a positive influence, shedding light on important issues. An example of this is how media reporting on the increase in knife crime in the past decade put pressure on the government to amend the Criminal Justice Bill, raising the maximum penalty for the possession of an illicit weapon from six months to a year, among other reforms. Equally, the Black Lives Matter movement in the US, which came in the wake of media reporting on the death of George Floyd by a police officer, helped to usher in policy changes to policing such as implicit bias trainings and body worn cameras. This shows how the media can change our perceptions in a good way and how this can have an immensely positive impact. Overall, perceptions of crime are constantly changing and majorly dependent on the media. While the media can be a force for good, in most cases it changes and develops our perceptions for the worse, distorting rather than informing our perceptions of crime. This kind of media reporting can often go to far and create a false reality where crimes like murder are common and the public have to fear all strangers.

The medias distortion of our perceptions can have dangerous consequences when moral panics – overreactions by society to perceived problems – are spread. The media can exaggerate the extent of violence through sensational headlines and often predicts future violence, and even in the instances in which this is untrue it can whip up moral panic and fear among the public. For instance, in the week following the Manchester concert bombings hate crimes rose by 50% compared to the previous year, as the public blamed Muslim and Arab people for the attacks (a narrative pushed by the media) and thus unjustly took their anger out on these people. Similarly, in the year following 9/11 hate crimes against Muslims in the US rose by 1700%, a significant number. This shows how media agendas can change our perceptions of crime and how this can have dangerous consequences, and this is only furthered by the use and role of social media today. Online, misinformation is spread easily by those wanting to gain clicks and views and this is only further encouraged by the lack of accountability on online platforms. A recent example of this is how racial hate was spread online following the Southport stabbings in July of 2024, which then led to violent riots that targeted immigrants. It is evident that social media distorts and changes our perceptions to an even greater extent as it speeds up the transfer of misinformation and reinforces false beliefs through algorithms and echo chambers. However, McRobbie and Thornton argue that moral panics are now so frequent that they have little impact on the audience. They believe that people are now much more sceptical of media interpretations and that it has become much more difficult for the media to define an issue and spread a fixed agenda because of the number and variety of media interpretations and stories out there in social media and traditional media. This highlights how social media and the media in general arguably has less power to significantly develop, change and distort our perceptions than it used to. Moreover, just like traditional media, social media can have a positive influence, as it helps to raise awareness for social issues and helps campaigns to grow more influential. For

Modern Studies Advanced
Higher Paper

instance, the Black Lives Matter movement started on social media before reaching traditional media and helped to raise awareness of police brutality against black people. Overall, the media can have a positive or negative influence on our perceptions, raising awareness while also making it more difficult to separate fact from fiction, leading to moral panics which distort our perceptions even further. Whichever the case, positive or negative, the fact is that the media as a whole can significantly change peoples perceptions of crime, thus proving that perceptions of crime are not a fixed thing.

Perceptions and definitions of crime are significantly reliant upon what culture and time period people live in. There are actions that may have been considered crimes a hundred years ago, but now nobody blinks an eye at or even notices, and even in the modern day across countries people have differing views and perceptions and laws around what behaviour is criminal and deviant – criminal acts are not universal. For example, in many middle eastern countries such as Saudi-Arabi, Afghanistan, and Iran homosexuality is a crime that carries the maximum penalty of the death sentence. This is in stark contrast to the law in the UK and other western countries in which it is not homosexuality which is criminalized but rather discrimination against the LGBT community which is considered a criminal act. This makes clear how definitions of crime and perceptions of what is criminal and not is heavily dependent on the culture and place that a person lives in. Though the UK also used to criminalise homosexuality, as before 1967 it was illegal for two men to sleep together if they were both over the age of 21. It was only forty plus years later in which gay marriage was legalized in the UK. This therefore shows how definitions and perceptions of crime are constantly changing and are reliant on a number of complex factors, including the media, culture, time period, and even the law. While laws don't always denote what is socially acceptable or otherwise they can influence public perceptions of crime by making clear to the public what is right and what is wrong. For example, reports of sexual assault and rape vastly increased after the legal and social definitions of rape were expanded. Equally, after gay marriage was legalized in the UK in 2014 there was an increase in reported hate crimes against gay people, from 4500 in 2013/14 to over 7000 reported in 2015/16. This is likely because, before gay marriage was legalized, people did not take these crimes seriously and they were therefore underreported, but with the legal change peoples view of hate crime as a serious offence was changed. Therefore highlighting the major and notable impact that legislation can have on perceptions and definitions of crime as well as social attitudes and beliefs. Overall, the culture and time period that a person lives in will instill inherent perceptions and biases surrounding crime and this will therefore distort a persons perceptions to some extent, and these biases are constantly changing as culture progresses and time passes.

In conclusion, definitions, measurements, and perceptions of crime are absolutely not fixed, but rather constantly changing and developing. In terms of measurements, there are many ways in which crime can be measured in the UK and elsewhere around the world and while these measurements are not always accurate and cannot provide a complete picture of crime, new ways to measure crime are constantly being developed and these methodologies are constantly being improved. When it comes to perceptions of crime, they can be influenced by culture, time, and even to some small extent statistics, however the media is what plays the most significant role in developing and also distorting perceptions of crime. The media plays on peoples emotions and skews the facts which can make it impossible to understand the true extent of crime in the UK as well as spreading fear by making certain crimes such as murder seem more common than they are. Though the media can also accurately inform and develop our perceptions, as seen in cases like the Black Lives Matter

**Modern Studies Advanced
Higher Paper**

movement, it is more likely to exaggerate and misinform, changing our perceptions for the worse, as seen in cases like the Southport stabbings. Whatever good the media does is countered by the negative influence that it also has. Ultimately it is clear that the media changes and influences perceptions of crime significantly so that they are never fixed but constantly changing depending on the media agenda. Furthermore, certain perceptions of crime and beliefs surrounding crime can be instilled in people depending on where they live and when they were born, but even these inherent beliefs are not fixed as society and culture can progress and peoples beliefs can change. Moreover, definitions of crime are heavily dependent on societal changes and what society you live in and can change, as seen in how the definitions of rape were expanded in recent years. Overall, it is evident that definitions, measurements, and perceptions of crime are not fixed and constantly changing as they are influenced by a number of other factors.

8. Early intervention remains the best strategy to reduce further crime.

Much of the criminal justice system and law enforcement is focused on the aftermath of crime – investigating crime, making arrests, sentencing criminals and more – but crime prevention is incredibly crucial and arguably much more important as it can stop crime from happening in the first place and therefore prevent the immense and negative consequences that crime has on society. There are many different ways to prevent crime, including early intervention, police strategies, and multi-agency approaches. Early intervention is ultimately the best strategy to prevent and reduce future crime as it deals with crime and its causes early on. This essay will focus on crime prevention as it related to the UK and as it compares to other countries such as the US.

There are many long-term sociological causes of crime which could be dealt with early on in order to prevent individuals from offending in the future. Indeed, Lee Freeman Chief Constable of Humberside Police has stated: 'Evidence shows that the best way to prevent crime, reduce harm, and build public confidence, is to prevent problems from arising in the first place'. Scotland has therefore introduced the Whole System Approach which aims to reduce further crime through early and effective intervention, with many organisations focused on aiding young people. This includes preventative services and activities to divert young people away from crime as well as services that provide support and address behaviour. For example, the Midnight and Beyond programme in West Granton provides activities such as paintball, camping, and quad biking for young men susceptible to gang recruitment. An example of early intervention programmes abroad, is the Community Parent Education Programme in Sweden which provides families with group sessions to promote positive child behaviour, conflict avoidance, and boundary setting. These programmes are incredibly important as they aid the wellbeing of young people and provide support which can mitigate the impact of factors such as ACEs which have been proven to lead to offending. Research shows that reducing ACEs can reduce incarceration by up to 50% and therefore if early intervention can prevent ACEs and aid those who have had these adverse experiences then it can be immensely effective at preventing and reducing crime. Indeed, since the introduction of the Whole System Approach in 2008, youth offending has halved and prosecutions for under 18s have reduced by 78%. It is clear that early intervention is significantly effective at preventing and reducing future crime especially in young people. It is likely such an effective approach because it deals with problems early on before a persons brain has developed so that attitudes and behaviours are not

Modern Studies Advanced
Higher Paper

ingrained. For example, the Graham Allen Review highlights how the problem with crime prevention in general was late intervention, as it means that behaviours and beliefs were already deeply entrenched and therefore very difficult to change. Therefore emphasizing how an approach such as early intervention which deals with problems early on is the most effective way to prevent and reduce future crime. Moreover, its effectiveness also comes from preventing people from committing crime in the first place and therefore stopping young people from entering into the prison system and therefore stopping them from entering into a vicious cycle in which they could be in and out of prisons for the rest of their lives – a common occurrence, with prison often being referred to as a revolving door. However, for early intervention to work it has to be able to identify those children who are at risk and in need so that it can provide these services. A national system has therefore been developed in Scotland for officers to record concerns about a child's wellbeing. Equally, in the US in California a questionnaire which parents or the child themselves is expected to fill out has been introduced, this will produce results which can be screened to identify concerns. Early intervention services in the US and the UK are therefore able to intervene where necessary and therefore prevent crime. However, the Whole System Approach is not without its flaws. The main issues of early intervention are in a lack of funding and a lack of availability and how services can vary greatly between localities. This means that services are not available to everyone, and that even those who do gain access, their services can be delayed or terminated early, thus preventing them from being effective. Overall, however, many of the problems with early intervention is in how it is implemented and not with the idea of early intervention itself. Where implemented effectively, early intervention can be incredibly effective and is the best way to reduce further crime as it addresses the root causes that may lead someone to go on and offend.

The police also play an important role in crime prevention. Contrary to popular belief the police are not just involved in law enforcement and making arrests but are also heavily focussed on crime prevention. To do so, they employ a number of policing strategies such as community policing, hot-spot policing, neighbourhood watch, campus policing, and they even utilize crime prediction software in order to prevent and reduce crime. Community policing is a particularly effective pro active approach that aims to reduce crime through direct intervention within communities. Around 75% of officers in Scotland work in local policing and they aim to prevent crime by building relationships within communities so they can more effectively address violence, addiction and drug harm, as well as more effectively dealing with less serious offences such as theft and shoplifting which can be a serious problem in some communities. A similar strategy has been adopted in the US in New York where the Neighbourhood Policing Program has made cops more accessible to residents in an attempt to deepen community relationships and therefore prevent crime. Another policing strategy that aims to prevent and reduce further crime is hot spot policing. This is where the police are directed to patrol in areas with high crime rates and this ensures that the police use their time efficiently and effectively while also acting as a deterrent for anyone who may want to commit crimes in these areas. However, both community policing and hot spot policing can be seen as contributing to the over policing of certain areas, with many communities feeling as though they are being picked on by the police. This therefore reduces the effectiveness of such approaches, especially community policing, as it leads to a general distrust and dislike of the police in these communities. An even more controversial policing strategy, however, is stop and search. The police have the power to stop and search anyone that they have reasonable grounds to believe is in the possession of an illegal item, and of the stop and searches that occurred between June and October of 2024, 26% had a police outcome. While this may seem like a small number it definitively proves that the police have been effective at preventing some crimes such as knife crime, which is a huge problem in the UK. The problem with stop and search, though, is that it involves a lot of profiling and specifically racial profiling. Ethnic minorities are much

Modern Studies Advanced Higher Paper

more likely to be stopped and searched by the police than white people, for instance in 2021 black men were stopped seven times more than white men. Similarly, in the US, black men and women are two times more likely to be subject to a stop and frisk than white people, despite the fact that white men are more likely to carry weapons and are more often the perpetrators of violent crime. This shows how, although stop and search alongside other policing strategies can be marginally effective at preventing and reducing future crime, these strategies can also be significantly problematic and therefore ineffective. Overall, each policing strategy has its advantages and disadvantages, but ultimately the police play a marginal role preventing and reducing future crime. However, the police are much less effective than early intervention and even multi agency approaches and this is because the police's main focus is still on law enforcement and the aftermath of crime and police prevention can therefore only provide short term support and solutions. Ultimately, police prevention cannot address the root causes of offending and therefore cannot aid offenders in the long term. Early intervention and multi-agency approaches are therefore significantly more effective as they both target and aid these underlying causes of crime.

Multi-agency approaches are where organisations such as the police, charities, and community bodies all work together to prevent crime, and this has been described by John Carnochan as a 'coalition of the willing'. Such an approach recognizes that crime is a complex problem, one that will require a complex solution that will provide the necessary and comprehensive services to aid offenders in all aspects of their lives and therefore prevent crime. An example of this approach being put into practice in the UK is the Violence Reduction Unit, based in Glasgow. Based on a similar unit in Chicago, the VRU uses a public health approach to deal with violent crime, treating it like something that can be prevented and cured. The VRU aims to understand the nature of crime and thus how to fix it, and therefore it works with hospitals to try and understand the true nature and extent of violent crime, as well as providing services such as Street and Narrow which provide those with a criminal record or those likely to gain a criminal record with employment opportunities in food trucks so they can gain valuable skills and work experience. An example of a similar multi-agency approach in the US is Everytown Violence Intervention, which also uses a public health approach to deal with gun crime, treating it as a contagious disease that they need to prevent from spreading throughout the country. Everytown programmes are in place in 41 states in the US and have been associated with a significant decline in gun violence and gun crime – specifically, a 37% reduction in gun injuries and a 63% reduction in gun shooting victimisations. The approach has therefore been majorly effective at preventing and reducing gun crime in America. The benefits of such an approach are also seen in the UK, where the Glasgow murder rate fell by 37% between 2007 and 2017, after the introduction of the VRU in 2005. The VRU has been so successful that it is now being implemented in other cities across the country such as Manchester and London. Furthermore, the Scottish government has recently introduced its new Violence Prevention Strategy. This is a multi-agency approach which aims to prevent crime through a coordinated violence prevention framework that is backed by 2 million worth of government funding. It is evident that multi-agency approaches are the way forward and this is because they have proven to be successful and effective at reducing future crime, especially among violent offenders. However, multi-agency approaches also come with flaws. Firstly, many of these approaches fail to identify and support existing local initiatives and this can lead to a lack of local engagement. Moreover, funding is always a huge obstacle in ensuring that approaches like this or even early intervention is effective. In addition to this, multi-agency approaches can be less effective because the different organisations contained within an approach might have a different view on how to prevent and reduce crime and what is the best way to go about preventing crime, which can lead to difficulties in these agencies working together and sharing information. Overall, multi-agency approaches are significantly

Modern Studies Advanced
Higher Paper

effective at reducing future crime, however they are marginally less effective than early intervention because these approaches have many more flaws such as a lack of direction and difficulties in working together.

In conclusion, early intervention is the best strategy to reduce future crime. This is because early intervention deals with problems and directly addresses and targets the root causes of offending early on so that young people can be prevented from committing crime in the first place and therefore they can be prevented from entering into a life of crime. Early intervention can therefore aid a wide range of people and prevent more crime than any other method, and Scotland achieves this through the Whole System Approach (an approach which is in many ways similar to a multi agency approach but focused on early intervention). This is immensely beneficial as it can prevent the immense cost that offending and reoffending has on society as well as preventing the significantly negative social impacts that crime can have. In contrast, multi agency approaches, while effective, are less effective than early intervention at reducing future crime as they mostly deal with violent offenders or adult existing offenders that are much more difficult to work with and rehabilitate. In addition to this, multi-agency approaches have many more flaws than early intervention, and while both address the root causes of crime, early intervention is better at doing so and therefore preventing future crime. Of the three crime prevention methods, policing strategies are the least effective. This is because the main aim of many of these strategies is to prevent and reduce crime through deterrence, which is not effective when it comes to those who have a disregard of the law and law enforcement, as well as those who act in the heat of the moment and are not thinking about the consequences, which is often the case. Furthermore, the police are not trained specialists or experienced psychologists and are not going to be able to deal with the root causes of offending such as ACEs, trauma, mental health issues, and addiction in the way that services designed for this purpose are going to be able to – and it is only through addressing these root causes of crime that offenders can be truly rehabilitated and future crime can be effectively reduced and prevented. Therefore, overall, early intervention remains the best strategy to reduce future crime.

9. You are researching the impact of the presumption against short prison sentences in Scotland. To what extent would focus groups be the best method for investigating this issue?

Investigating the impact of the presumption against short prison sentences (PASS) in Scotland would be important in order to find out its impact on crime and reoffending and whether or not it has been effective and whether or not it could be improved or extended to include sentences that are slightly longer but still classified as short term sentences. There are many different research methods that could be utilised to research the impact of PASS, one being focus groups, which would be beneficial in finding out peoples views of PASS. Though official statistics or even an alternative third method such as postal surveys could also be utilized. Ultimately, focus groups would only be effective to a small extent, and official statistics would be the better research method to use in the scenario.

In assessing the impact of PASS it would be important to gain both qualitative and quantitative data on the subject. Focus groups provide qualitative data as it allows these groups to discuss the impact of PASS and their views on PASS, with the back and forth rapport of a focus group allowing new information about its impact to

Modern Studies Advanced
Higher Paper

come to light. This would be beneficial in seeing why and how PASS has had an either positive or negative influence on crime and reoffending as qualitative data provides reasons and motivations as well as context and in depth explanations. In this case it might aid the research by proving that not sending people to prison for short periods of time is helpful because it allows offenders to stay with their family and not be isolated in prison where they will likely lose their job. Official statistics, on the other hand, provide quantitative data, which would show absolute figures relating to the impact of PASS, for instance whether it reduced overall reoffending rates or increased these rates and what crime rates looked like before and after the introduction of PASS. Official statistics are beneficial for this purpose, seeing the before and after impacts of certain government policy. For instance, statistics from the UK Home Office showed that hate crime increased during and immediately after the Brexit referendum, and that there were generally spikes during significant events such as the EU referendum. However, quantitative information does have the disadvantage in that it does not provide the same context as qualitative information. This means that while official statistics could clearly show the effect that PASS has had on crime, it would not allow a researcher to understand why it has had that effect in the same way that the qualitative information from focus groups would provide. Overall, focus groups would be the better research method to use while researching the impact of PASS in Scotland as it would allow the researcher to truly understand the impact that it has had.

The generalizability of data is also important to discuss when comparing research methods. Official statistics are based on total populations or large sample sizes and therefore produce highly valid results that are representative of Scotland as a whole. In this case it would show the impact that PASS has had on crime and offenders as a whole in Scotland. Whereas focus groups might just show the impact that PASS has had on a certain number of offenders that the participants are aware of. This is because focus groups are small, made up of an average of 7-10 members, and this means that the groups are not necessarily going to be representative of the whole population and the results of the focus group are therefore not necessarily generalizable to the whole population. Moreover, focus groups can have an even smaller number of participants, which will affect the representativeness of the results to an even greater extent. For instance, focus groups were conducted in Sweden to find out about the experience of stress among school aged children in Sweden. These focus groups were audio recorded, transcribed verbatim and analysed using qualitative content analysis. The intention of the study was to have focus groups with 6-8 children each, and while this was the case in 8 of the focus groups, 2 of the groups only had 2-3 children. This will significantly impact the validity of conclusions drawn as a result of the study. Overall, official statistics would in this sense be the better research method as it would allow a researcher to see the full impact of PASS on the entirety of Scotland whereas focus groups are not generalisable.

It is also imperative to highlight the difficulty in conducting each research method. Official statistics are conducted by independent organisations for the government, and the researcher therefore does not have to conduct these studies themselves but can easily gain access to a wealth of data as it is published and made available to the public. This means that it would be cheap, easy, and efficient to use official statistics to assess the impact of PASS in Scotland. Focus groups, on the other hand, are much more difficult to organize and put together. This is because, if a focus group is to be representative, it has to have a wide range of members of society, who will all have varying commitments at varying times and be varying degrees of busy throughout the week. It can be difficult to get a representative group together at one time as certain people will have school

**Modern Studies Advanced
Higher Paper**

commitments and other family commitments etc. It can be especially difficult if the focus group is aiming to get certain people who have expertise or are going to be more familiar with PASS and its impacts, such as people working in law enforcement, or the legal sector, or policy, or even those who have offended or know people who have offended and been in prison on a short sentence. These people are the type of people which would make a focus group much more effective and would allow the researcher to gain the best information on PASS, however it would be difficult to get these people together in a room at the same time. In addition to this, for focus groups to be more generalizable several focus groups would have to be conducted. In this scenario, a telephone focus group could be conducted. They are easier to organize, and people might be more willing to participate and multiple can be conducted in one day. Furthermore, while it may be difficult to start up a conversation and keep the discussion going in a telephone focus group, these focus groups do make it easier for people to discuss sensitive or uncomfortable information. For example, Silverman found that in a telephone focus group doctors were more willing to discuss how they had treated patients incorrectly, cut corners from accepted practice, and where they were uncomfortable with gaps in their knowledge. This could be useful for those who may feel ashamed or embarrassed and might not want to talk about their experience with offending and prison or if they know someone who has offended and had a short term sentence. Overall, it would be easier to utilize official statistics to see the objective impact of PASS than it would be to conduct a focus group, telephone or otherwise, considering that focus groups are much more difficult to conduct and they could include a number of people who do not know much about PASS and its impacts or crime in general and therefore not be able to contribute effectively to the research.

In a focus group the moderator has to have good leadership and interpersonal skills in order to moderate it successfully and effectively. They have to be able to keep the focus group on task and on focus, and promote debate and ask open questions without giving their own opinions and unduly influencing the responses of the focus group. While this can be difficult it does mean that the moderator and researcher has more influence over the general and broad topics of discussion within a focus group and can ask more targeted questions if they want to know specific information about the impact that PASS has had, for instance if they want to know whether alternatives used instead of short term sentences were more effective than short term sentences or not. In contrast, official statistics are not conducted by the researcher themselves, but, as stated previously, they are conducted by reliable and independent organisations on behalf of the government. This means that a researcher may not be able to find out all of the information that they want to know about the impact of PASS from official statistics alone. In this case, focus groups may be the better method to utilize.

Ethical considerations are important to recognize for both focus groups and official statistics. When it comes to focus groups, the biggest ethical concern is related to privacy and confidentiality. In a focus group there is no confirmation of confidentiality and privacy and it is possible that other participants within a focus group could talk about the discussion and any sensitive information brought up by other participants to others outside the focus group. This makes focus groups ethically ambiguous. Official statistics, however, are more ethically sound as they avoid the bias of profit driven research and they are gathered and published according to ethical, professional, and scientific standards. Though it is possible that official statistics could do harm, for instance school league tables put pressure on schools, including teachers and pupils, to focus solely on exams and results rather than creativity and other important skills. However in this case it is unlikely that statistics surrounding the impact of PASS, such as offending and reoffending rates before and after its introduction, are

Modern Studies Advanced
Higher Paper

going to cause harm. Rather these statistics would only show whether or not it has been effective and whether or not it should be continued or abolished. Overall, therefore, official statistics are more ethically sound than focus groups.

An alternative research method such as postal surveys could be considered. Surveys generally provide qualitative information but because of the closed question design of a postal survey, where answers are generally limited to yes or no, the data is more quantitative. This can be a disadvantage when it comes to investigating the impact of PASS in Scotland, just like official statistics, as it means that the data is not detailed and does not have context. However, unlike official statistics, surveys face issues with sample sizes and representativeness. This is because surveys have low response rates, as people may throw mail they deem unimportant in the trash or the length of a survey might put people off from responding. This means that a survey might have a smaller sample size than expected and this will affect the validity of the data. Furthermore, surveys incur a cost and can take a long time, as it can take around a month to receive responses from a postal survey. Ultimately, postal surveys would not be the best research method to use while researching the impact of PASS as it has many disadvantages and would likely not gain representative results that show the true impact of PASS, especially in comparison to official statistics.

In conclusion, official statistics would be the better research method to use while investigating the impact of the presumption against short prison sentences in Scotland, as focus groups would only be effective at investigating this issue to a small extent. This is because official statistics provide reliable, highly valid quantitative data that is generalizable considering it is based on total populations or large sample sizes, while also being cheaper, easier, and more efficient to conduct and less ethically ambiguous. Focus groups, on the other hand, while they can provide valuable qualitative information and can find specific or direct information about the impact of PASS, is not generalizable, with small groups affecting the validity of results, as well as being immensely difficult to conduct and organize. Moreover, many participants within a focus group might not know much about PASS or its impacts and while they could provide their subjective opinion and uninformed view this would not be effective for researching the tangible impact that PASS has had. Equally, postal surveys come with issues of representativeness due to low response rates and those surveys might not be able to provide much accurate information about the impact of PASS, making it an even less effective research method. Therefore, official statistics is the better research method to use while investigating this issue, as they are to a large extent effective.

10. To what extent can Source B be considered trustworthy

Source B is a largely untrustworthy source. This is because Source B utilizes reliable and highly valid methodologies. However this is the only strength of the source as it is adapted and funded, as well as many of the authors being biased or unknown and in need of further research. Moreover, the source includes out of date information, as well as having a lack of presented data and this majorly decreases the reliability of the source. Therefore, Source B is largely untrustworthy and not a hugely reliable source.

Modern Studies Advanced
Higher Paper

Source B was published by the Institute for Government. The source describes this organization as an independent non partisan charity which makes the source more reliable as the author is a non-biased charity that is registered and is likely to put out accurate information. However, this institute is largely unknown and further research would have to be done to check their claims and check the veracity of the source and the data that has been included. There are opportunities for such research, as a link has been provided at the end of the source to see the full article. However, the fact that the source is adapted from the Institute for Government website does decrease the overall reliability of the source. This is because information could have been taken out of context or alternative points of view could have been left out, thus decreasing the trustworthiness of the source. Furthermore, the source states that the charity Institute for Government is funded by the Gatsby Charitable Foundation which is apparently part of the Sainsbury Family Charitable Trusts. This further decreases the reliability of the source because this foundation could have a specific reason or motivation or agenda in funding this research and the institute for government in general and this could create a conflict of interest which affects the trustworthiness of the source to a great extent. Moreover, this Charitable foundation is unknown and further research would have to be conducted into the other things that it is funding and its background in general in order to confirm its reliability and trustworthiness. In addition to this, the source includes an interview with a previous minister and cabinet secretary, Kenny MacAskill, which does make the source more reliable as they will have experience and first hand insight into the subject matter of the source which is the effectiveness of government. However, she is an SNP MSP and could therefore be biased and want to reflect favourably on the SNP and the Scottish government in her interview, which to a significant extent negatively impacts the reliability and trustworthiness of the source. Furthermore, the interviewees, named Tess Kidney Bishop and Akash Paun, are in contrast unknown and further research would have to be conducted to confirm their reliability. Though they are named and therefore it would be relatively easy to conduct research into their background and experience with the subject matter. Overall, there are a number of instances in which further research needs to be conducted in order to confirm the reliability of the authorship as well as the fact that the source is adapted and sponsored and is open to possible bias in a number of ways. Source B is therefore trustworthy to a small and minor extent when it comes to authorship.

Another weakness of Source B is the dates and timings of the source. The actual date in which the source was published on the Government for Institute website is unknown and this majorly decreases the trustworthiness of the source. Furthermore, the interview contained within the source was conducted in 2018, which is around seven years ago and therefore no longer relevant for 2025. Since then, changes to governance and reforms to governance could have been made which this interview and source does not take into account. Furthermore, the interviewee Kenny MacAskill was only an MSP until 2016 and only a Cabinet Secretary for Justice until 2014 and much of the interview included is centered around decisions made in 2011, meaning her experience and insight into the subject is almost a decade old and the subject matter of the interview itself is even older, thus decreasing the trustworthiness of the source and the validity of the interview to a major extent as this data is likely no longer relevant. To improve the source, a recent interview that is relevant for 2025 and the state of government in 2025 could be included. This would majorly increase the reliability of the source as it would mean that the interview could be compared to the previous one to see if there have been any changes in the way in which governments deal with changes and make decisions, among other aspects of the interview. Overall, the dates of the source are unreliable and contribute to the untrustworthiness of the source greatly.

Modern Studies Advanced
Higher Paper

One strength of the source is the methodology included within the source. The source includes an interview, which could be a structured or unstructured interview. This increases the trustworthiness of the source and the reliability and validity of the data as interviews are a reliable way to get in depth and detailed qualitative information about a subject. Though interviews can be expensive and can take a long time to conduct, depending on the type of interview. It is clear that this interview has been audio recorded and transcribed so that it can be put into the source. This takes a long time – it can take up to 150 minutes to transcribe a 15 minutes interview – but allows for the interview to be analysed so that researchers can draw conclusions about the realities of governance and how to be effective in government. The fact that it is only one interview, however, decreases the reliability of this methodology to a marginal extent. For interviews to be effective and their conclusions to be generalizable to government as a whole, multiple interviews would have to be conducted. This is because Kenny MacAskills could be an outlier and have differing views about governance in comparison to other MSPs or other members of the Cabinet. To improve the methodology of the source, multiple interviews could be carried out with member of government who have differing positions in government and are in different parties or another methodology such as a survey or focus group could be introduced. Overall, despite these flaws, the methodology of the source is valid and an advantage of the source, increasing its overall trustworthiness.

In conclusion, Source B is a largely untrustworthy source. This is because there are many issues with the authorship of the source, including the fact that it is adapted and sponsored and that there are many unknown surrounding the Institute for Government and the interviewees mentioned. Though it has reliable contributors, such as insight from an MSP, this does not negate or mitigate the other negative aspects of authorship. Furthermore, the dates and timings included within the source decrease reliability greatly as it means the source is no longer relevant for 2025. While the methodology of the source is an advantage, this can only increase its overall reliability to a small extent. Therefore, Source B is largely untrustworthy.

Candidate 2 evidence

Modern Studies Advanced Higher

Question 7

Definitions, measurements and perceptions of crime are not fixed.

The definition, measurements and perceptions of crime, differ for each individual and for different parts of the world. The definition of crime is constantly changing overtime, with new laws being put in place and old laws being cast aside. The definition of crime can also be different for each individual person because they may have completely different perceptions of crime than one another. If someone has experienced crime firsthand, their definition of crime will probably be different to someone who has only ever seen crime on the TV, in the newspaper or through social media. The perception of crime can differ due to the measurement of crime and the media, and through seeing statistics that may not be one hundred percent accurate. This essay will compare the Scotland, England, the USA and Saudi Arabia.

In Scotland crime is measured by the Scottish Crime and Justice survey (SCJS) and by the Police Recorded Crime Statistics. By using the Police recorded crime statistics, it means that the full extent of crime isn't being shown. This is because in Scotland many incidents of crime go unreported. For example, in Scotland it has been estimated by the SCJS that only around 40%-50% of crime is actually reported to the police. This percentage tends to be much higher for specific types of crime, such as domestic abuse, petty theft and sexual abuse. This is because victims can often feel embarrassed about what has happened to them, and don't want to come forwards. In domestic violence or sexual offence cases, for the victim it can seem as if it could potentially be more damaging to report what has happened, in case nothing is done to protect the victim against the perpetrator. This can be extremely damaging because it means that people may potentially not understand the full extent of crime, because they are seeing statistics that aren't actually completely accurate, this will change their perception of crime. However, the SCJS is a survey that is conducted to ask people about their personal experiences with crime, to figure out if crime is at a larger extent than what police recorded statistics say. This means if people use the SCJS alongside police recorded statistics to find out about the extent of crime they will find a more accurate result. However, the SCJS isn't actually that accurate as a representation for the whole of Scotland, this is because they have a sample size of around 5500-6000 adults. They also only ask people living in private households. This means that compared to Scotland's 5.5 million population, these statistics are quite small, which further distorts our perception of crime. Similarly in the USA, they use the FBI's records to measure crime. This is a mixture of surveys and police records to identify the extent of crime in the USA. However, just like Scotland, many of their crime cases go unreported. For example, around 45% of all violent crime in the USA goes unreported. This is almost half of violent crime, which shows that the USA have a huge issue, just like Scotland of people not reporting what has happened to them. Especially with violence-based crime in the USA, which is primarily due to fear. The fear of nothing being done by the court system to help keep the victim safe. This shows that our perception, definition and measurement are never fixed. This is because of the way that crime has been measured and the statistics society is being shown are not accurate enough. This can be further distorted due to what is being portrayed in the media.

The media plays a pivotal part in informing the public of what is happening in the country and around the world. In the media it is shown that crime is mostly gender based. If a woman is seen to be involved in violent crime, it is so heavily portrayed, mainly if she is a victim or sometimes if she is a perpetrator. An example of this would be Sarah Everard. She was murdered by police officer Wayne Couzens. She was taken into his police car, assaulted and then murdered. The case completely shocked everyone all over the country. This has to be heavily reported on because it was a case showing how someone could be betrayed by a police officer who

Modern Studies Advanced Higher

you are supposed to be able to trust completely. However, women all over the country became panicked and afraid of police officers, when in reality Wayne was in such a minority of officers that would ever dream of doing something like what Wayne committed. This changed women's perception of crime greatly and made women even more cautious walking alone at night. The BBC news and STV news report extensively on gender-based violence towards women, when in reality, the gender and age that face the most recorded crime is young men. This is because so many young men are involved in gang culture in many cities across the UK. This means that societies perception of crime is that young women are the usual targets but actually it is young men. Cases such as Sarah Everard, create such a moral panic in society that it drives fear in many groups of people. When we are constantly being fed stories of violence and extreme criminal behavior as soon as we turn on our televisions or open our phones it can make people feel extremely anxious and nervous, some even avoid going outside alone at certain times of the day and avoid going to certain areas around where they live. For example, in the Scotland around 40% of adults believed that violent crime had increased in their local area in the last year, but only 3.5% of adults had actually experienced violence. Which shows that it is such a minority of people that are actually experiencing crime, but the public think that it is much more common than it is, which means their perception of crime is very unfixed. Similarly in the USA, the media is very harsh and their citizens are constantly being fed violence on their news. In the USA the news is much harsher than in the UK. This is because it is such a large country that there is much more chance of multiple violent crime cases happening in a day, so when they watch the news it seems like crime is happening everywhere. For example, 23% of people in the USA thought that crime had increased in their local area instead of nationally. Which shows that almost one quarter of people are scared that violence is increasing around them, which also shows that peoples perceptions and definitions of crime is changing.

The media in the USA is so harshly portrayed that violence makes up the majority of what is seen on their news alongside political news. However, violent crime in the USA only actually makes up around 5% of their overall crime. Even though the news has a duty to report on crime, it tends to give people very bad anxiety. An example of this is if a terrorist attack happens, of course the news must report it, but it is the way that they report it which makes it seem as if a terrorist attack could very easily happen to you. These reports further drives fear into the public about social situations such as concerts. It can also change peoples definition of crime by putting the blame on certain groups. For example, after the Manchester arena bombing, at an Ariana Grande concert in 2017, hate crime rose around 60% in the week following. This means that people could potentially be targeting certain groups of people as their definition of crime, this is extremely harsh and can be really damaging for the mental health and sometimes even physical health of the individuals. Similarly, after the 9/11 attacks in NYC in the USA hate crime towards Muslims rose around 1700% which is, such a huge amount showing how peoples perception and definition can change so fast towards a group of people. Furthermore, social media is also a huge part of driving fear and hate. This is because social media can tell the public information so quickly that they may not gain the full story and the full picture. It can easily create a moral panic around any violence situation. For example, in the UK in Southport, a man attacked children attending a Taylor Swift themed dance class. It was a devastating event, and two children were murdered, and many had serious injuries. This quickly came to social media, as the suspect was an immigrant. On social media it was portrayed as an immigrant attacked and killed young girls. This was very impactful on society, because it started a huge campaign to ban immigrants from entering the UK as they were believed to be criminals by many people. This started riots in the streets, and left immigrants scared for their lives. This is why social media can be so damaging to society, as it warps our perception of who commits crimes, by placing the blame on minority groups. In the USA, social media had a positive effect after George Floyd was attacked and killed by a police officer. Social media quickly began the Black Lives Matter movement, which aimed to protect black

Modern Studies Advanced Higher

people and stand up for their rights. If social media is used carefully it can be beneficial to spread awareness, but if it is used wrongfully it can be extremely detrimental. Social media is a new form of media, which has had an influence on society's perception, and definition of crime.

Overtime peoples opinions of crime have really started to changed. In the Scotland we used to have corporal punishment and the death penalty. Corporal punishment was banned in 1965 and the death penalty was banned in 1969. Some countries such as Saudi Arabia still has public flogging and public execution. In the UK this was really looked down on by society, especially corporal punishment. Many members of the public in Scotland still believe that the death penalty is the best way to deal with murderers and sexual offenders. However, there is evidence to suggest that that type of punishment doesn't actually work. For example, in the USA many states still have the death penalty in use. In Texas they still have the death penalty, but their murder rate is 8 per 100,000 people whereas in Michigan who don't have the death penalty there's is now 5 per 100,000 people. This suggests that the death penalty doesn't work as well as society thinks. Scotland is aiming to move towards a more rehabilitative approach to dealing with crime, despite society thinking that deterrence is a better approach. An example of public opinion changing over time is for same sex marriages. For example, in Scotland in 2002 around 60% of people thought that same sex marriage was morally wrong whereas in 2014 that had dropped to 18%. This shows that societies opinion does change overtime, along with their perception and definition of crime. In the USA, for many members of the public their opinions of same sex marriage remains unchanged, for example, only 49% of republicans think that same sex marriage is okay. This is a worrying statistic because it shows that over half of republicans think that it is wrong, which means their perception of same sex marriage is fixed and hasn't changed much overtime. The theorist Becker, believed in morally wrong actions being punished for, and he believed that people should follow their morals. Furthermore, crime in places changes overtime. In Scotland historically Glasgow had a huge reputation for murder, they used to be nicknamed the murder capital of Europe. Currently Glasgow is a much safer city and many more people are moving to Glasgow as it is becoming much safer. Similarly in the USA a well-known ghetto city in Baltimore named Harlem, has become much safer in the 2000s than it was in the 80s and prior to the 80s. Which shows that perception also changes in certain areas.

Overall, peoples definition of crime remains unfixed. This is because society's opinion drastically changes overtime. This is because of what is portrayed in the media, what crime is like in their local area and due to their own personal experiences of crime. Societies perception of crime changes the most, and it remains unfixed. This is because societies minds are constantly being changed on how they perceive crime, which can be caused by the measurement of crime and the statistics they are seeing. Currently in Scotland the measurement of crime is a more fixed approach with the SCJS and the police recorded statistics being the main forms of research. Similarly in the USA with the FBI recorded statistics being the most used resource. Laws are constantly being changed which further changes our perception of crime. Societies definition, and perception of crime remain unfixed to a very large extent, because they are consistently changing overtime, whereas the measurement of crime remains fixed to a significant extent.

Modern Studies Advanced
Higher

Question 8

Early intervention is the best strategy to reduce future crime

Early intervention is an excellent way to reduce further crime. This is because many Children are born into difficult living situations, which makes life really difficult to get through especially at the early stage. Early intervention can help children get through difficult parts of their lives without having to suffer the consequences as they get older. Early intervention can be used alongside, the multi-agency approach and policing strategies to combat crime. This essay will compare, Scotland, England, Malawi, New Zealand and the USA

Early intervention is an excellent way to reduce the likelihood of future crime in a Child's life. Researchers say that early intervention is absolutely key to reducing the causes of crime. Some Children are born with neglectful parents, into poverty, and broken homes. This can make early life really difficult for some people. By using early intervention to provide children with opportunities, it means that they will have a better chance in life than what they started off with. In London, around 8 million pounds was invested into Children's Education in the more deprived areas in London. It meant that Children were able to progress much better in School and in later life. By giving Children opportunities in sport and education they are much more likely to live a life free of crime. For example, in Malawi Children are being given the opportunities to help out in animal conservation areas to prevent them from wanting to poach animals in the future. Poaching is a huge issue in their country, so by teaching children early on about how important the Animals are for their ecosystems and for tourism it makes them less likely to commit the crime of poaching. The headteacher of a School in the area of Kuti in Malawi said that it is extremely beneficial for the children to learn as it prevents them from poaching in the future. This shows that in Malawi early intervention is really working which is similar to in Scotland who are giving children more opportunities in education. In the USA they are using the California ACES study, to identify children who have Adverse Childhood Experiences. They do this by surveying children in low income households in California, and then providing support for the children in need. This has been seen to be very beneficial as it helps children early enough to prevent the consequences. Another form of early intervention is providing effective parenting for parents going through difficulties raising their children. This is beneficial because early intervention prevents crime, and it costs around £800 per day to house a prisoner in Scotland, but effective parenting courses will cost around £4000 for multiple parents. Which means in doing so Scotland are benefiting economically as they are much more efficient with their costs. Parents play a pivotal role in a child's early development.

Parents are a child's role model, they are who the child looks to for comfort and for safety, early on in life. Some parents can leave their child for long periods of time which can make them much more likely to commit crime. For example, latch key kids are children who let themselves in after school and are at home for the hours of 5pm-7pm. It means that they are completely unsupervised for long periods of time. This is very damaging because 70% of all youth crime happens when a parent isn't home and kids that feel neglected by their parents are around 60x more likely to commit a crime in the future. This is why parenting courses and strategies can be such beneficial methods of early intervention for some children. Furthermore, Adverse childhood experiences (ACES), are so damaging to a child's early development. Some examples of ACES are, neglect, abuse, parents divorce or having an incarcerated parent. If a child has 4 or more ACES they are 20 times more likely to be incarcerated in their life, 14 times more likely to be a victim of violence and 15x more likely to be a perpetrator of violence. However, if a child has enough protective factors in their lives then they will be able to tackle these statistics and should be less likely to be involved in crime. Some examples of

Modern Studies Advanced Higher

protective factors are, having stable relationships, enjoying school and having a strong parental figure. If early intervention approaches can recognize children with four or more ACES it means that they can then protect the child from suffering the consequences of having ACES and reduce the likelihood of future crime. In Malawi the owner of Charities Clinic, which helps women and young children. She said that the most important thing for a child is having a loving parent. This is because even though many women she works with don't have much money or some without a home but the most important thing for the child is the love that the mother can provide for the child. This shows just how important love and care is for a child and it is the same all over the world. We need to recognize children that are in need of help and help them early enough before it's too late, as they may end up in the prison system. An example of this is David's story. David was from Glasgow, his mum was a drug addict, his dad was absent and he had little to no opportunities in life. He moved from different areas in Scotland all being very difficult areas to live in, and nobody supported him or reached out to help. He ended up stabbing and murdering someone. This shows a child who was practically born into a life of crime, and he had no way of saving himself. We need ways to protect children such as early intervention and the multi-agency approach.

The multi-agency approach is when two or more agencies join together to create something to protect certain groups. They can be really beneficial as many of them are there for people to go to look for support and help. There are many that are based around drug and alcohol addiction. For example there is one in the UK based on helping women out with addiction, many women have been saved by this multi-agency as it is there to provide them with help to combat their addiction. There are two examples based on fixing up bikes in prisons. One in the UK named the Bike station. It aims to get prisoners to help fix up bikes in order to gain qualifications in manufacturing and give them an opportunity once they come out of prison. For example, Graham Allen said that some people must be incarcerated, but it must be the main goal to make sure they leave prison in a better state than when they entered the system. In New Zealand they have a very similar approach which does the same thing, as it gets prisoners to fix up and restore old bikes and then they sell them which gives them the work ethic they need to have when they leave prison. This is a good example of how multi-agency approaches can really be beneficial in preventing future crime. Furthermore, in Glasgow in Scotland, the no Knives better lives initiative was set up to prevent young people from getting involved in knife crime. Since the initiative has started knife crime in Glasgow has reduced by around 60%, which is such a huge achievement for the initiative. They have done it by working closely with young children to provide them with knowledge of the consequences of knife crime and how dangerous it can really be. This shows a case of the multi-agency approach and early intervention working alongside each other for young people, which has clearly had a very positive effect on the young people in Glasgow. However, early intervention is still the more beneficial option for reducing further crime, this is because early intervention prevents crime at the root of the problem, which means that less people will even need to use the facilities multi-agencies provide. Multi-agency is similar to policing strategy because policing strategy can only prevent crime at the time it's taking place.

Policing strategies are necessary for preventing crime. One policing strategy is community policing. Community policing is beneficial as it builds trust and forms relationships with police and the wider community. It means that the community are much more likely to trust the police and tell them if they've seen anything or if anything has happened. For example, in Scotland even schools are each assigned a police officer that can be on hand to help at any time. This makes sure that the relationship with the officer and the school is key. Community policing is often similar to hot spot policing. This is because hot spot policing means that in communities that are deemed to be more 'rough' by society will likely have more police in the area. In reality the police are there because there is more crime that is being recorded by them in those areas, however it could make people living in the area feel targeted and made to feel as if the area that they live in is considered

Modern Studies Advanced
Higher

'dodgy' by others. Hot spot policing can really work if it is done well. This is because the police will get to know the area very well, and are able to figure out places that crimes usually happen and when, so they can be in close proximity to hopefully prevent something bad from happening. In Chicago in the USA they have a very similar approach. Chicago has been known for having bad gun violence for many years, however recently they have discovered a new technique of using AI to calculate exactly where a gunshot has gone off in the city, so that police can be sent straight to the scene of the crime. This shows that this policing strategy is very beneficial and shows that new policing strategies are being adapted across the world. The police also come to large social events such as derby days at football matches, for example policemen are always around at Hibs vs Hearts matches in Edinburgh, just in case something happens. They are there to protect the public as well as to deter the public from committing the crime. Hobbs the theorist argued that society calculated the risk of being punished before committing the crime. So if police are in the areas crime usually happens, they act as a deterrent towards crime. However, similarly to the multi-agency approach, it doesn't actually prevent crime as much as early intervention does.

Overall, if early intervention, multi-agency approach and policing strategies are used together, then crime will be prevented in the best way. This is because early intervention will be able to reduce crime from a young person early on, and then the multi-agency approach can help people further who need extra support later on in life and policing strategies can be used to prevent serious injuries and catch criminals at the scene of the crime. Early intervention supports children as soon as it is recognized that they need extra support, which means that it is the best way of reducing further crime to a large extent. It is because we must recognize the problem early enough before it turns into something much worse that could potentially ruin a person's life. This is why early intervention used alongside the multi-agency approach, policing strategies can be the most beneficial and effective way to combat further crime to a large extent.

Modern Studies Advanced
Higher

Question 9

Impact of presumption against short prison sentences in Scotland

A focus group could be a good research method to use to research the impact of presumption against short prison sentences in Scotland, because of many different reasons.

A focus group can offer in person research, which is very beneficial because in other research methods, such as a telephone survey, an example of a telephone survey is the NHS, use telephone surveys to interview their employees on their perception of workload and an advantage of this is that its cost effective for the NHS to use the phone instead of paying employees to come into work to be interviewed. You cannot fully understand what the person is thinking because you cannot see their body language. Specifically for the topic of short prison sentences, which can be quite a sensitive topic it would be beneficial to see people's facial expressions and body language, for example, to potentially figure out if they feel that short sentences are beneficial to keeping society protected. One example, of some focus groups that were done was at Manchester University, they held focus groups to find out views of undecided voters in the 2019 general election. This allowed them to gain insight on why so many people were undecided in who to vote for. However, telephone surveys are very easy to set up unlike a focus group. Which could be very beneficial for finding out more information on the economic cost of short sentences, as it would be quicker to gain the information from them. This means that telephone survey may be better for some parts of the research on the impact of presumption against short prison sentences, but for the more sensitive discussions around short sentences a focus group would be the better option.

A focus group could be very beneficial as it usually has set questions being asked, but it means that you can gain much more information from people as they will begin spin off discussions that the researcher may not even have thought of. For example, when researching the impact of presumption against short prison sentences in Scotland, the researcher may not have thought about the potential impact on families that short sentences have, which may be brought up within a focus group. Using another research method such as an online survey would not have the same effect. This is because in an online survey only set questions would be asked. An example of an online survey is the UCAS offer acceptor online survey. They use this survey to gain insight into why applicants chose their firm uni choice, as it helps them to inform unis on how they could improve and gain more applicants. An online survey would be much less time consuming to do over a focus group, which means it may be more beneficial for researching other topics, but the for the impact of presumption against short prison sentences in Scotland, it is such a large topic with so many factors influencing the opinion to be against short sentences. Which means a focus group would be able to pick apart details of the topic much easier. For example, a focus group may suggest that shorter sentences actually worsen the chances of an offender reoffending, which would be unlikely to be suggested on an online survey.

A focus group could make sure that they have enough people to be apart of the focus group to discuss the topic, whereas a postal survey will be less likely to have respondents. An example of a postal survey is the NHS survey on the alcohol consumption. They only had around a 20% response rate which is very low meaning they won't be able to get accurate results which is needed to research the impact of presumption against short prison sentences in Scotland, because so many people have different opinions, a large enough sample size must be taken into account to gain an accurate representation of results.

A focus group is sometimes slightly dysfunctional. This is because some people in the group have much larger voices than others in the group. This means that the researcher may get only the opinion of some group

Modern Studies Advanced
Higher

members. The research will then become invalid, which to research the impact of presumption against short prison sentences in Scotland, the researcher will need valid results, for example, two members of the focus group may be heard the most and they may think that short sentences are a good idea because they keep communities protected from criminals for short periods of time. By using a method such as open interviews, the researcher could gain insight from each individual person and the extra information they may think of during the interview, for example if they were asked about their own personal experiences, they may have a family member who has been through a short sentence and ended up worse off. Which would help the researcher gain further insight to individual experiences of the impact of presumption against short prison sentences in Scotland.

Overall a Focus group would be the best way to investigate the impact of presumption against short prison sentences in Scotland to a large extent. This is because a focus group will allow the researcher to develop a deep understanding of the opinions and experiences of a group of people, which will make it easier for the researcher to come to a conclusion of the impact of presumption against short prison sentences in Scotland.

Modern Studies Advanced
Higher

Question 10

To what extent can source B be considered trustworthy

Source B can be considered trustworthy to an extent because of its Author. The institute for Government is a registered charity, which makes them qualified and reliable. Registered charities must be factual and provide honest information and research. It means that source B will be a relatively trustworthy source because of its reputable author. Their main funder is the Gatsby Charitable foundation which is one of Sainsbury's family charitable trust. Sainsbury is a huge company, with a huge customer base. This means that Sainsbury is constantly being looked into by many people, it means that they are more likely to promote positive and reliable companies, which makes source B increasingly trustworthy to a large extent.

The presented data, of source B makes it a more trustworthy source. This is because it has been laid out clearly, with bullet points and clear headings. This makes it easier for the reader to read and makes the information presented more clear which increases validity and in turn increases trust of the source. Furthermore, if the reader wishes to research the institute more they can do that by using the link at the bottom of the source. This means that if they haven't gotten all of the information they want then they can do so by looking further into the institute, this increases the trustworthiness of the source to a high extent. However, the presented data is adapted from their website. This means that the reader may miss key information which could confuse the reader and change the reader's perception of the information given. Furthermore, many sources have graphs as visual aids to help present data. Source B has no graphs to present data efficiently for the reader, which makes it more difficult for readers to pick out key pieces of information in the source, and it makes it much less time efficient. This means that source B is an untrustworthy source.

The Methodologies of the source make it less trustworthy to a large extent. The person being interviewed was former SNP MSP Kenny MacAskill, he is a good person for them to interview because he has knowledge on the roles within parliament so he can provide specialised knowledge in the subject, which makes the source more trustworthy, however Kenny may have not been completely truthful in his answers in the interview, which means that it may not be very trustworthy. In an interview you can never tell if the person is being 100% truthful which is why it decreases the trustworthiness of the source. Furthermore, there is room for bias from the interviewers, Tess Kidney Bishop and Akash Paun, they may try word the questions so that Kenny may feel pressurized to answer in a certain way, which in a question from Akash Paun he said a statement and then at the end used the phrase "wasn't it". This would have made Kenny feel pressured into thinking the same way as the interviewer did. This decreases the trustworthiness to a large extent.

The date of the interview was 5th of December 2018. This means that the information given from the interview is no longer useful to use as current evidence. It could be used as a comparison but it isn't able to be used as current evidence. This is also because it is before Covid-19 which means that roles in parliament will have significantly changed and likely have become more difficult since covid which makes the source untrustworthy. Furthermore, Kenny MacAskill was working in parliament from 1999-2014, which means the evidence he gave in his interview is very out of date information, and the roles in parliament are likely to have changed a lot since 2014. This makes the information less reliable which makes the source very untrustworthy to a very large extent.

Overall, source B is an untrustworthy source but only to a small extent, this is because it has some trustworthy qualities but overall it is adapted information that is out of date so it cannot be used in current research, I recommend to the reader to use the link for further information, and use research that is more up to date if

Modern Studies Advanced
Higher

researching jobs in parliament currently. The source is trustworthy in some aspects such as it is from a reputable charity with funders from Sainsburys which is one of the biggest companies on UK streets, which means that they would be very unlikely to invest in something that is untrue, which makes the source slightly trustworthy, but overall the source is untrustworthy to a large extent.

Candidate 3 evidence

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
⑦	<p>There are many factors which can change public perceptions of crime including media, police recorded crime, crime surveys and the changing of laws. Each factor can be seen to be used around the world in countries like USA, Australia, Canada and Saudi Arabia and all factors have different impacts on perceptions in each country. Whilst all factors are relevant to perceptions not being fixed, this essay will look at how media is the main reason why perceptions of crime aren't fixed.</p>
	<p>The main factor of changing perceptions of crime is media. Newspapers are commonly the main way people obtain ^{their} knowledge on crimes and papers allow 30% of their stories to focus on crime. These stories are often based on violent, sexual crimes which are often exaggerated and cause fear to the public. Canada also reports that sexual crime makes up 20% of news stories but just 2% of actual crime</p>

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>showing how similar it is for the Canada and the UK to over-report on these issues which therefore is misleading to the public and can explain why perceptions are skewed from the more true extent of crime levels. Cohen & Young (1973) said 'news is not discovered but manufactured' as papers will exaggerate stories to gain traction and create fear within the public. This can like to the USA's Yellow Journalism which is stories that often have little to no truth about them. This has been a popular style of journalism since the 1800s and is still is being used in today's society, which is only giving false information to the public and causing perceptions to constantly change. This again is similar to the UK's approach to news stories with stories being extensively exaggerated and misleading so perceptions around the world are all changing and inaccurate to true crime levels. Media can also often be racially bias as reporters will often pick the same kinds of stories to gain more viewers: commonly attacks on</p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>middle-aged white women. Sarah Everard was all over news stories after being raped and murdered while almost identical stories from Sabina Nessa and Blessing Olesegun were hardly looked into. The only difference was that Sarah was white while Sabina and these were Blessing were both women of colour. This shows how selective media is when reporting serious and violent crimes which is only disrupting and skewing public's perceptions of crime. Overall media is so powerful over public's perceptions of crime that one story can instantly change the views at therefore proving that perceptions of crime are not fixed. Other factors can also cause perceptions to change but media remains the main reason why perceptions of crime change so easily.</p>	
	<p>Another factor that changes perceptions is Police Recorded Crime (PRC). PRC is the main way we get information on crime levels and where they are happening. However PRC cannot be truly accurate as not all crimes are reported so there are some</p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>* PRC is also used in Turkey and shows that 42% of women over 15 have experienced sexual violence - higher than the UK. But again almost half of victims won't speak up showing that PRC cannot give accurate representation of true levels of crime, which is very similar to the UK which also had little success.</p> <p>ambiguities. This can often be due to fear, especially with domestic abuse crimes. Most domestic abuse victims are women and nearly half of victims don't tell anyone, let alone report them to the police showing how PRC cannot be accurate on all types of crime. Also, financial/business crimes often go unnoticed due to them being secretive so PRC can't show true levels. Also reports of white collar crimes were increasing by over 20% whilst actual levels of the crimes were decreasing by around 12%, again showing inaccuracy that PRC gives meaning that perceptions will change and be a false representation of the true crime levels.* Whilst PRC is needed to gain valuable information, it does not show enough accuracy and so changes the public's perceptions on levels of crime. Even though PRC is successful at changing perceptions, media still has a wider impact on changing perceptions of the public and also changes their perceptions on levels of crime more drastically.</p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
<p>Another way perceptions are of crime can be changed is crime surveys. The Scottish Crime & Justice Survey (SCJS) is an in-house, face-to-face survey done to get more accurate information on crime levels in Scotland. SCJS gets around 5,500 participants a year and makes people feel more free to talk about their experiences with crime. The SCJS shows more accurate results of crime levels as in 2021 SCJS reported over 622,000 incidents of crime whilst PRC only recorded just over 405,000 showing the vast difference in accuracy of each factor and how easily perceptions of crime can be changed. Similar surveys are also used around the world in the US, Canada and Australia showing its effectiveness both in Scotland and around the world, with similar models. The SCJS is also government verified and so can be a trusted is and reliable resource to gain information on crime. Although the SCJS gives more accurate information on crime, it does not change perceptions at the same level which media does with deeply</p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN

exaggerated stories and fearful violent crimes being common headlines, so overall media still is the main factor as to why perceptions of crime aren't fixed.

A final factor that can change perceptions of crime is the changing of laws. Laws will change over time as society continues to evolve and change beliefs. This then means that things that were once seen to be a crime, become decriminalised and accepted such as gay marriage being legal and smoking laws continuing to change and try to reduce smoking population. This then changes public perceptions of crime & what is wrong in society, ~~so~~ as legislation changes, perceptions of crime also change. This is also common in other countries such as Saudi Arabia where women were allowed to drive in 2018, which was previously a crime, showing how attitudes can easily change. This is very similar to the UK as with the changing of laws, perceptions too change showing the major impact it has on the world's perceptions of

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>crime. Despite legislation change showing that it can be Also, countries like Norway got rid of the death penalty and life sentences which also changes perceptions of what serious crimes should be punished by - again similar to UK with decriminalising behaviours. Despite the legislation change showing how it can change public perceptions, media is still the main and most effective way at the causing perceptions to change and not remain fixed.</p>	
	<p>In conclusion, each factor clearly shows how they can show that perceptions of crime aren't fixed and can be changed however, media remains the sole and strongest cause of changing perceptions of crime caused by over-reporting and over-exaggerated stories which only put fear into the public and cause inaccurate and changing perceptions of crime. Each factor is relevant to unfixed crime perceptions but media is where perceptions will change easily and most often.</p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
8	<p>Many factors are being used to try and deter future crime from occurring including stop & search search, policing - stop & search, early intervention - EEI and multi-agencies - VRU. Each approach hopes to deter future crime whilst trying to change offending behaviour and rehabilitate. Each approach can also relate to other countries including the USA and Denmark. Whilst each approach works to provide a safer society, early intervention remains the best way to reduce future crime and rehabilitate those involved in it.</p>
	<p>Stop and Search is a power given to police to search someone if they are suspected to be carrying illegal drugs/ weapons or stolen property. This is a common strategy used in the UK and can often be effective at protecting society from crime. However Stop & Search can also often be used in a racially biased way as black men under 25 are 5x more likely to be stopped than white men of the same age, showing that stops cannot be deemed as</p>

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
<p>random and are unfair to people of ethnic minorities. Neomi Bennett was also randomly stopped and due to refusal, she spent 18 hours in a cell and was suspended from her job to for a month despite nothing being found, showing the impacts of inaccurate stops. This approach to reducing crime is is retributive and aimed to punish but can also be seen as utilitarian as it aims to deter and prevent crime from happening and keeps society safer. Similarly, New York has a stop & frisk programme which can be aggressive and also racially biased as black men were averaging 38 per 1000 people in stops while white men were just 7 per 1000 & again showing similarities between the UK and US with them both having aggressive and racially biased programmes. Stop & Search can also be shown to be ineffective as the relationship when stop & search rates were decreasing, Scotland's homicide rate also decreased showing that there is no relationship between stop and search and reducing crime levels effectively. Overall, stop & search</p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>doesn't show enough effectiveness to successfully reduce future crime which is why early intervention is the best strategy at deterring future crime & rehabilitating offenders.</p>
	<p>A type of early intervention commonly used is Early & Effective Intervention (EEI). EEI aims to break the cycle of causes of crime and help to rehabilitate those involved in the criminal justice system (CJS). EEI is a Scotland wide framework which uses a multi-agency approach to help get young people aged 5-17 out of the CJS. EEI partners with sectors like education to give better learning support to those obtaining offending behaviour and also healthcare to partner with psychologists and anger management to try and divert offending behaviour and provide support to young people which shows to be working as in Glasgow City Council, GIRFEC is successful in reducing the amount of young people in CJS and gives them opportunities to learn important skills which help them to get jobs and be deterred away</p>

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
<p>from crime. Similarly, the US uses OJDP which aims to 'free all children from the JS'. OJDP works to give a grant to every state to provide resources which can help reduce future offending and remove young people from gang like behaviours. However OJDP can't work to its best ability in every state as laws differ and can stop OJDP being successful in reducing as much future crime as possible. This is similar to the UK as EEI is very resource intensive and not every council can accommodate to young offenders needs which is a pitfall for both the UK and US's Early intervention approaches. Despite this EEI shows the best results for reducing future crime and is working in more areas to be as successful as it is in Glasgow city. However EEI does rely heavily on multi-agency support so without it EEI would not be as successful and with more budget cuts, EEI's success is at risk. Even though EEI has its pitfalls, it still remains the most successful approach at deterring future crime</p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN	
	<p>and helping to work with those with adverse childhood experiences to reduce them committing crimes and work to rehabilitate them in a utilitarian way, so A EEI & Early Intervention remain the best strategy at reducing future crime.</p>	
	<p>Finally multi-agency approaches like the Scottish Violence Reduction Unit (SVRU) is in place to deter future crime and rehabilitate those already involved. The SVRU partners with hospitals & medics against violence to create a Navigator system which works to reduce knife crimes. A navigator will work in hospitals with those involved with knife crime to deter any any future offending behaviours and work to with social workers to keep people away from the CS. Since the SVRU homicides in Scotland have decreased drastically and knife crime has also reduced showing the great relevance and effectiveness of the SVRU. Similarly, the US has the Chicago VRS which aims to reduce gang-like behaviour and divert</p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>those involved away from crime crime & the CJIS. This is also proving to be successful as gang behaviour in the 9 states it works in has reduced by around a quarter and less young people are lead to the CJIS. The UK's & US's violence reduction approaches are similar to each other and are both showing success in where they work but a pitfall is they are not accessible to enough people to see a drastic change in crime levels with with the SVRU only operating in under 10 hospitals. So increased funding & expansion is needed to see a & more significant difference in reducing future crime. So despite the success shown in the SVRU, it is not a wide enough framework to support enough people so early intervention is still the best approach for reducing future crime.</p>
	<p>In conclusion, each approach shows great success in certain areas but stop & search & SVRU do not have enough reach and success in reducing crime to be the best</p>

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION		DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>strategy which is why EEI & Early Intervention remain the most successful and effective way to reduce future crime as its benefits and success outweigh the pitfalls which is the opposite for stop & search.</p>	
⑨	<p>Focus groups would not be the best method for researching the impact of PASS but instead face-to-face surveys would suit better to investigate this issue. An alternative method could also be a longitudinal study which would gain strong info on impacts of PASS.</p>	
	<p>A disadvantage to focus groups could be observer bias as people answering may not be truthful when answering to impress or better themselves to the group or the interviewer. Also ethics are harder to keep anonymous and as many larger groups will be needed to gain valuable and accurate information on impacts of PASS and so is therefore a less successful and appropriate method for this study on PASS.</p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>However focus groups can give multiple opinions out on the impacts of PASS at the one time which is harder to obtain from other methods so it it can still be successful.</p>
	<p>Face-to-face surveys however can allow clarification of questions so participants can answer the questions to their best ability and give accurate data on the impacts of PASS. However, face-to-face surveys can be time-consuming so results will take longer as a larger sample size is needed to show an accurate opinions on the impact of PASS. Despite this face-to-face surveys give both qualitative & quantitative data to show the impacts of pass ^{PASS} & allow comparisons to be made which is why it is the best method for investigating the impacts of PASS.</p>
	<p>An alternative method for investigating this issue is longitudinal studies which give unique insights and information that cannot be obtained from anywhere else. Longitudinal studies also give qualitative data which can be</p>

ENTER
NUMBER
OF
QUESTIONDO NOT
WRITE IN
THIS
MARGIN

compared over time & show differences between impacts of PASS. However, these studies are very time-consuming so it takes a long time to see results over years & people will often drop out making info less accurate & representative of the public's views on PASS. An example of a longitudinal study is the birth cohort study where 19,000 people born between 2000-2002 were studied.

Overall, face-to-face surveys would be the best method for investigating impacts of PASS due to the valuable qualitative data provided, over longitudinal studies which are too time consuming and expensive to conduct and also focus groups due to observer & framing bias as well as lack of confidentiality in ethics. Therefore making face-to-face surveys the best method.

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
10	<p>Source B can be considered trustworthy due to who produced it, provided further research and links to the government, but also it can be considered less trustworthy due to the date and lack of knowledge on the purpose of the article.</p>
	<p>Source B was written by Institute for Government which is government verified and can be a trusting and reliable source. Also the authors of the source are a registered charity so all work done is verified and aims to do good for the government. The IFG also works with all political parties showing there is no bias as to where they stand and solely want to better the gov.</p>
	<p>However Source B's trustworthiness is lessened as the date of the interview was nearly 7 years ago so opinions and information may be out of date and less accurate therefore meaning</p>

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN

Source B is less trustworthy.

However Source B also provides an extra link showing all information and the full interview which allows follow ups and further reading to be done.

So overall Source B is trustworthy as the extra information along with verified authors ~~with~~ with extensive knowledge provide strong accurate & trustworthy info which makes Source B a trustworthy source.

Candidate 4 evidence

ENTER QUESTION NUMBER BELOW	Do not type in this shaded box	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>Question 7- DEFINITIONS, MEASUREMENTS AND PERCEPTIONS OF CRIME ARE NOT FIXED</p> <p>Definitions, measurements and perceptions of crime are not fixed. As the world changes our knowledge of crime does too. Criminologists are constantly finding new ways to measure crime, as well as definitions constantly changing and perceptions being altered. This essay will examine why definitions, measurements and perceptions of crime cannot be fixed by exploring, how we define crime, and police recorded statistics and types of crime.</p> <p>Crime cannot be defined forever. There are many different types of crime and they are evolving and new forms are continuously coming to light. Crime statistics are inaccurate for many reasons. As crime is undefined there is a lack of understanding within our society over what could be considered a crime and what is included within that. This means that when measuring crime from one year to the next it is not going to be an accurate picture as the charges of crime have broadened. For example hate crimes have only properly been defined as a crime since the early 2000s so therefore comparing crime statistics from before then would be an inaccurate picture. This also makes it hard to compare crime rates between countries as in Scotland our legal limit for drink driving is a lot lower than other countries such as England, therefore as we have stricter rules the drunk driving rate is slightly higher. So Scotland's definition of what is a drunk driving crime is different than others and constantly changing. This can make it hard to change people as if there was someone from England driving just over the Scottish border over the Scottish limit but not England it would be difficult to convict them and this therefore shows that the definition of crime is not defined. Overall definitions of crimes are not fixed as they are constantly changing and depend on each offender.</p> <p>Police recorded statistics are not a fixed measurement of crime. Police recorded statistics are a good way to see crime levels however it is important to remember that they are not always an accurate picture of crime as a whole. Police recorded statistics are found through police work, i.e. arrests they make and the legal system. However they do not account for the number of crimes that go unreported and therefore do not paint an accurate picture of</p>	

ENTER QUESTION NUMBER BELOW	Do not type in this shaded box	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>true crime statistics. Around 60% of all crimes go unreported due to many reasons. This is because many people have different perceptions of crime and therefore what someone thinks to be a serious offence another may believe to be not worth reporting. It can also be hard to measure crime and compared it as many countries have different laws and ideas of what is criminal. For example in Scotland it is illegal to physically hurt your child as a form of discipline, however, in some Scandinavian countries it is illegal to do so and therefore this definitely has some contribution to the countries crime level. This makes it hard to compare crime statistics and see where each country stands as there are different ideas of crime from each country and new laws. Overall measurements of crime cannot be fixed as they are not entirely accurate and therefore there are constant new ideas coming to light on how to get a better picture of true crime.</p> <p>The many different types of crime ensure that definitions, measurements and perceptions are not fixed. There are many different categories of crime and within those categories there are even more brackets of crime. The different types of crime all have different levels of accuracy in statistics and more types of crime go unreported than others. Due to the intimate nature, sexual crimes very often go unreported because of shame, guilt or a lack of sufficient evidence or witnesses. As well as this domestic violence also goes largely unreported due to close relationship between the victim and the perpetrator. Business crime is another one that goes largely unreported because employees fear for their jobs and the cooperate ranking within the cooperation often make it hard to charge them. Additionally, often media and government officials will bend and highlight crime statistics to fit their agenda and these are the crimes that are highlighted the most in the media. For example David Cameron highlighted benefit fraud in his 2010 'broken Britain' election campaign. After this benefit fraud reports increased significantly as that was what was in the media at the time and therefore what stayed on most people's minds so they were looking for warning signs. This is similar to the USA, when after mass shootings in places like school there are huge campaigns against gun violence and gun violence related crime reports skyrocket as again that is what is in the media at the time. However these eventually die down once the media does and these crimes go back to being underreported. But this does have a lasting effect and changes people's perceptions of crime as they have learnt a lot about it over the weeks it's been in the media. This proves that perceptions of crime are not fixed. Overall perceptions of crime are not fixed as people's ideas of crime are constantly changing and there are new cases coming to light which alter people's perception.</p> <p>In conclusion, definitions, measurements and perceptions of crime are not fixed as everything in society is constantly changing a new ideas are coming to light. Definitions of crime are hard to give as crime categories are too broad for just one definition. This can cause problems when reporting crime as many may struggle to know what can be classed as a crime and this therefore shows that definitions of crime are not fixed. Measurements are also not fixed as they are not a true representation of crime and therefore the ways in which we measure a constantly changing to try and get it as accurate as possible. And lastly perceptions of crime are constantly changing as the media brings light to crime types and case studies many were oblivious to before changing how they see crime.</p>	

ENTER QUESTION NUMBER BELOW	Do not type in this shaded box	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>QUESTION 8- RESPONSES BY SOCIETY TO CRIME</p> <p>There are many different approaches in the UK to try and respond to and rehabilitate offenders and reduce reoffending. Early intervention strategies are very effective at deterring crime and are seen as a relatively soft response to crime as the aim to deter crime before it happens rather than just dealing with it after. They have proven to be effective in reducing youth offending and stopping reoffending. Harsher methods such as traditional policing and zero tolerance policies focus on punishment rather than tackling the issues that cause criminal behaviour. Many different countries use different responses based on their legal system and what their priorities are. This essay will examine different responses to crime such as zero tolerance policy's, community policing, and multi-agency approaches but will argue that early intervention programmes remain the best strategy to reduce future crime by using international compariosns such as the USA and Scandinavian countries.</p> <p>Community policing is a good strategy to reduce future offending. Community policing is a proactive approach that fosters partnerships between the police and the public to deter crime and build trust in law enforcement. This involves local police, community wardens and volunteers to engage with residents. In Scotland there have been 520 homicides and murders since 2013, only two of these remain unsolved. Many of these cases were solves by strong community cooperation with local police who had built trusting relationships with the residents. Community policing is most effective at stopping low level criminal activity before it escalates. Community policing is based of broken windows theory which suggests that visible signs of disorder encourage further crime. By embedding police within communities it allows for trust to be built which leads to increased intelligence sharing and crime prevention, this means that the approach is most effective in communities where residents are engaged. However, community policing relies heavily on social cohesion as there needs to be active community cooperation. This means that in high crime and economically deprived areas where mistrust in the police is common this strategy is not effective as people are less likely to report crime and cooperate. Additionally, without clear police orders, officers can struggle to find a balance between crime prevention and enforcing law. Overall community policing can be very effective at helping cases to be solved and deter small crimes. However it is mostly effective in already low crime areas and therefore is not making a huge contribution to lowering reoffending rates as it is proving to be ineffective in crime hotspot areas where most offenders are. This shows that early intervention remains the best strategy to reduce future crime as it helps to reduce reoffending and targets young people as potential offenders and gives them the resources to go in a different direction.</p> <p>Zero tolerance policies are a good strategy to reduce further crime. Zero tolerance policies give out strike penalties for even minor crimes in hopes of preventing more serious crimes. It comes from the belief that cracking down on petty crime will deter larger offences from occurring. For example, in 2019, Scotland introduced a zero tolerance policy on drug driving making it illegal for anyone to drive with even trace amounts of controlled substances in their system. This followed a similar trend in the USA where president Biden introduced a zero tolerance policy on rough gun dealing, revoking someone's licence upon their first offence. Zero tolerance policies comes from deterrence theories and suggest that by increasing the severity and consistency of punishments it will deter potential offenders from committing</p>	

ENTER QUESTION NUMBER BELOW	Do not type in this shaded box	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>crimes. This has proven very effective in the short term at decreasing crime rates as many potential offenders have been deterred from the potential threat of punishment. Additionally, the swiftness and severity of punishment has reinforced the social values and cultural norms that crime will not be tolerated. However critics argue that, many crimes are not planned in advanced and when someone is going to drive with drugs in their system they are not in the right headspace at the time to worry about the consequences. This is a limitation to zero tolerance as it shows that although it may be effective for some approaches it is ineffective for others. Overall this shows that zero tolerance policies are a good strategy to reduce future crime as it can deter people because of the threat of punishment, but it is not the best as many offenders do not think about the retribution at the time of the crime being committed. This shows that early intervention remains the best strategy to reduce future crime as it is able to change somebody's mind-set before they get involved in criminal behaviour.</p> <p>Multi agency approaches are a good strategy to reduce future crime. Multi agency approaches are the combination of different services coming together to try and tackle the root cause of crime. This includes police, social work, healthcare, and volunteers agencies working together to solve criminal behaviour. For example in Scandinavian countries there was a combination of tax officials, city authorities and utility providers who came together to dismantle organised drug gangs. This mirrored SACROS efforts in Scotland where many services such as police, social work and health providers came together to reduce young offending. Multi agency approaches rely on help from many different services within society and are therefore very dependent on others. However multi agency approaches can be criticised as they can lead to over policing which can cause racist or socio-economic disparities, which in turn leads to continued cycle of crime and by labelling an area as a crime hotspot can cause people to feel stigmatised rather than rehabilitating the offenders. Overall multi- agency approaches are a good strategy to reduce future crime as they use a combination of everyone's strengths to deal with the problems of crime. However, early intervention approaches are still the best strategy to reduce future crime as the deal with the problem beforehand rather than after the fact.</p> <p>Early intervention programmes are the best strategy to reduce future crime. Early intervention programmes spot key warning signs that contribute to criminal behaviour in young people and provide them with the resources to change. This includes the involvement of welfare programmes, charities and mentors to help guide someone away from crime and towards a different way of life. For example no knives better lives was brought into Scotland to help solve knife crime, and from 2009 to 2020 there was a 44% decrease in knife related injuries. Early intervention programmes are based on prevention learning theory which suggests that by tackling the key factors that cause criminal behaviour such as economic difficulties, lack of education and social struggles, potential offenders are able to be rehabilitated. This therefore is most effective with young people and is lowering youth crime and stopping reoffending. However early intervention programmes rely on funding and government contribution, without access to these resources the approach is ineffective and fails to rehabilitate offenders. As well as this critics will say that there was a slight increase in knife crime rates in the year 2017-2018 which suggests that increased resources and reinforcement must be brought back to tackling this issue. And as there is a police agenda that needs to be</p>	

ENTER QUESTION NUMBER BELOW	Do not type in this shaded box	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>followed it can lead to people feeling as though they do not care about rehabilitation but just want to tick of the boxes. Overall early intervention programmes are the best strategy to reduce future crime as they deal with the warning signs of criminal behaviour and therefore tackle the issue before it becomes a problem and leads to offences.</p> <p>In conclusion early intervention remains the best strategy to reduce future crime as they are the best at looking at the root causes of criminal behaviour and addressing them rather than just waiting to fix the problem after the offence. Community policing is effective at building relationships with law enforcement to gain useful evidence from the public, however is proving ineffective in the areas with the most crime and is therefore not the best strategy. Zero tolerance policies are also effective at deterring crime through fear of punishment, however many offenders are not in the correct head space to think properly about the consequences of the crime and therefore will not be deterred by it. And lastly multi agency approaches are good at combining the strengths of many services in the country to tackle crime however they do not correctly rehabilitate offenders.</p>	

ENTER QUESTION NUMBER BELOW	Do not type in this shaded box	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>QUESTION 9-</p> <p>Focus methods can be an effective method to research the impact of short term prison sentences in Scotland. This is because focus groups allow you as the researcher to hear many different opinions from participants as well as being able to quickly identify common trends in opinions about short term sentences. This is effective as it will allow you to be able to conclude your argument on the impact of PASS. This can also be effective as if there is a more quitter person in the group they will be encouraged by other sharing and share too. Focus groups can also be effective as they allow for you as the interviewer to set the questions. This means you will be able to make the questions specific to your research to allow for the most effective answer, as well as this you can also ask for a participant to expand on their answer to try and get more relevant detail. This is effective when researching the impact of PASS as the interviewee may be reluctant to share their personal opinion but by pressing this you will be able to gather evidence on their thoughts. On this though, there can be ethical implications for focus groups as they will be conducted with more than one interviewee, what has been said in the room should be able to stay in the room and not go outwit the walls. This is important when researching the impact of PASS as participant are likely to be people who have dealt with short term sentences and therefore should be able to talk freely about their sentence and keep it between the group. Overall focus methods can be an effective way to research the impact of PASS as it allows for detailed answers and opinions to be heard as well as a variety of opinions but it does have some ethical implications regarding</p> <p>Online surveys can be an effective alternative method to researching the impact of PASS. Online surveys are good as they allow for participant to remain anonymous. This can be effective when researching the impact of PASS as again the people most involved may be those who have has a short term sentence and therefore they would be able to stay unidentifiable if they did not want to talk freely about it but still be able to contribute. Online surveys may also be an ineffective alternative method when researching the impact of PASS as the questions may be misinterpreted. As they will be filling the survey out with no one there to guide them they may miss interpret a question. This would be ineffective when researching the impact of PASS as the likelihood is that there misinterpreted answer would not be useful towards the research you are conducting causing you to loose participants and therefore reliability for you research. Online surveys may also have ethical implications as to complete it you would need to have access to a device of some sort and internet access. This can restrict your research as many do not have that are don't have the time to head to a library to gain it. This is particularly unethical when researching the impact of PASS as many of the participants in your survey may have a criminal record and therefor will struggle to get a job and afford internet access. Overall, online surveys are an ineffective research method when researching the impact of PASS as it is too restricting especially for the demographic you will be trying to reach.</p> <p>Lastly, a one on one, semi structured interview may be an effective research method when researching the impact of PASS in Scotland. A semi structured interview ineffective as it allows you to not have to put time restraints on each question as you will be able to go with the flow slightly more. This is</p>	

ENTER QUESTION NUMBER BELOW	Do not type in this shaded box	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>particularly effective when researching the impact of PASS in Scotland as it will allow you to be able to hear first-hand experiences in detail without having to rush to move onto another question. One on one interviews are also effective as it allows for privacy to be kept between just the interviewer and the interviewee. This is particularly important when researching the impact of PASS in Scotland as it means the interviewee will be able to open up completely about experiences without fear of it going anywhere. However semi structured interviews may cause you to go off track and talk about other things that are not to do with your research. This is particularly ineffective when researching the impact of PASS in Scotland as this is quite a narrow topic and therefore what else you discuss will be ineffective for the research. Overall semi structured interviews are an effective way to research the impact of PASS</p> <p>Scotland have made short term sentences redundant, although not completely abolished them as some judges still use them, they are held in low regard as they are ineffective at reducing reoffending rates. However some countries such as brazil still have a mass usage of them and therefore have a really high recidivism rate.</p> <p>In conclusion, semi structured, one to one interviews are the best way to research the impact of presumption against short sentences in Scotland. This is because they allow for personal experiences to be told, as well as keeping privacy, although they can cause you to fall of track they are still a very effective method. Focus groups are also effective as they allow for efficient detail in answers as well as being able to have specific questions to your research as you make up the questions, however, the ethical implication of other being able to share what you said decreases its effectiveness.</p>	
	<p>QUESTION 10</p> <p>Source B could be considered trustworthy as he extract was published by the institute for government. This is trustworthy as they government have a duty to publish correct and reliable information for citizens to read. However it can also be considered untrustworthy as the government have a biased to their own party and therefore may highlight themselves in a more positive light and only include what will make themselves look good. This makes it untrustworthy as it is clouding you judgment and not giving you a non biased piece of information to allow you to form your own opinions.</p> <p>Source B could be considered untrustworthy as the interviewee was a former first minister discussing his own leadership and therefore may again be biased towards himself and his leadership. This makes it untrustworthy as he is not informing you of how effective it actually was but just how effective he believed he was. However it may also be considered as trustworthy as they have provided you with a clear mission for the report and therefore you know the aim of the interview and if what he says backs up the mission or not.</p> <p>Source B may also be considered untrustworthy because the interview was done in 2018, and although it may have been trustworthy when conducted it is now 7 years later and there has been a global pandemic since which has caused a lot of change in and out of government which makes it untrustworthy</p>	

ENTER QUESTION NUMBER BELOW	Do not type in this shaded box	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	<p>as the information is outdated. As well as this it doesn't provide us with a date where it was published so I don't know whether to believe it.</p> <p>The extract may also be considered untrustworthy as it has been adapted from the institute of government website which mean that it is not the full interview. This makes it untrustworthy as you do not know what parts are missing and therefore cannot form an opinion on the topic without all the information. However they have provided you with the full link to the interview to allow you to go see it for yourself and check the statistics. This makes it trustworthy as it allows you to look at everything and form your opinion.</p> <p>Overall source B can be considered untrustworthy as parts of the research are out of date and it's not provided a date of publishing. As well as this it's been adapted and therefore you don't know if you can trust it and it has also been conducted by the government who may have biased and therefore it further weakens the trustworthiness. Although it does provided a link to the full version, many people will not see that and just go of the extract. And it does provided a clear mission but because it's not got a date I don't know if the conclusion of the mission is still true. Making source B UNTRUSTWORTHY.</p>	