Round Table Discussion Outcomes

1. **Less serious' violence, e.g., common assault, between young males who know each other appears to have driven the fall in violence since 1995. Does this reflect your own experiences and why might this be?**

   ▪ What has been generally recognised is that violence has reduced in the city of Nottingham and especially when it comes to violence in the night-time economy (NTE).

   Noted changes to explain this included:
   ▪ Increasing disengagement from the night-time economy; people are spending more time with friends than in the night-time economy;
   ▪ Higher volume of females in the night-time economy which changed the night-time economy composition; e.g., an increase of female-focused bars/clubs or restaurants;
   ▪ Changing lifestyles, e.g., nowadays people are expected to stay longer in education possibly making it more likely for them to be living at home;
   ▪ The influence of the European culture; that is, people are drinking less, and if they are drinking, they consume alcohol with food and not necessarily to get drunk;
   ▪ Introduction of video games;
   ▪ Policing, e.g., not allowing young male groups in bars or clubs;
   ▪ More control in the night-time economy, including CCTV in pubs, changing nature of licensed trade and ID scans;
   ▪ Shrinking disposable incomes, especially of young people;
   ▪ Some forms of violent crimes might have gone online;
   ▪ Links to drugs markets and trends:
     – 1990-1995: Amphetamine
     – 1995-2000: Ecstasy
     – 2000-2010: Heroin & Crack
     – 2010-onwards: New Psychoactive Substances (NPS)

2. **Our results show there are now fewer victims of violence compared to 1995. However, the average number of violent incidents per victim has remained stable (i.e. repeat victims are experiencing the same level of violence as they were in 1995). Does this reflect your own experiences and why might this be?**

   ▪ It was noted that domestic violence has similar persisting repeat victimisation trends.
   ▪ It was suggested that current strategies to combat victimisation do not work for repeat victims.
   ▪ It is possible that those who go out are more likely to be repeatedly victimised.
   ▪ People who are repeatedly victimised could possibly possess another associated characteristic which makes them more vulnerable, especially those who go out more than once or twice per week. More specifically, repeat victims might have a distinctive lifestyle that exposes them to repeat victimisation.
   ▪ The need to further explore repeat victimisation was highlighted.

3. **How do you explain findings that suggest that divorced/separated individuals experience high frequency of both stranger and acquaintance violence in recent years?**

    ▪ It was noted that a relationship could serve as 'guardianship' against these types of violence. Losing a relationship may therefore make one more vulnerable for experiencing violence.
    ▪ People who have become single after a long-term relationship possibly encounter difficulties in re-connecting with the changing night-time economy scene, including changing values/behaviour, drinking habits and dating scene.
    ▪ Moreover, the introduction of online dating might have resulted in greater exposure to potential offenders, including inviting them to the victim's home.

4. **How do you explain findings that suggest that social renters have experienced more violence by people they know both before (1991-1995) and after the crime drop (2010/11-2013/14)?**

    ▪ It was noted that social renting might be related to poverty. Areas with high numbers of social renters may have more poverty and/or fewer protective factors.
    ▪ Large council estates are relatively isolated communities and possibly they have not underwent the general societal changes that brought about the national violence falls.

5. **How do you explain findings suggesting that cannabis use - commonly considered non-aggressive substance - is a persistent risk factor before and after the crime drop?**

    ▪ Cannabis use is a risky behaviour that might be closely connected to exposure to other risky behaviour or situations.
    ▪ Noted is the need to distinguish frequent from occasional users.

6. **How do you explain findings suggesting that heroin users experienced fewer incidents of stranger violence twenty years ago, from 1991 to 1995?**

    Several explanations included:
    ▪ The ageing population of heroin users;
    ▪ Perhaps the small sample size makes it significant;
    ▪ *Occasional* heroin use could have led to fewer incidents. Therefore, a distinction in frequency of heroin use may be worthwhile: e,g., habitual or frequent use versus recreational or occasional drug use.

7. **We found that heroin and cocaine users experience high frequency of acquaintance violence in recent years. What can be done to protect drug users from experiencing violence?**

    Several explanations included:
    ▪ Heroin/cocaine users might have debts to dealers, which may escalate at some point to resorting to violence as a mean to resolve debt issues;

- There are a lot of of vulnerable young people that are being exploited, for example, to be a drug runner.
- Possibly, drug users may be more likely to be in multiple occupancy houses.

Noted ways to protect drug users included:
- Building effective partnerships;
- Better national data sharing to identify vulnerable people;
- Stringent licensing, e.g. , conducting regular toilet checks regarding ('powder') cocaine use in the night-time economy;
- It has been noted that it may be worthwhile to further explore the frequency of substance use (e.g., recreational or chronic use).

8. How could we implement these findings in practice?

- A national protocol to encourage authorities dealing with vulnerable groups to achieve (a) better data sharing, (b) effective partnerships and (c) better communication to help identify vulnerable groups, especially vulnerable children and young adults. This could be facilitated by better legislation to protect vulnerable people. As an example, the 'Shape' protocol is noted as an example of good practice of sharing data on problematic children.
- Giving more responsibilities to the night-time economy such as via licensing and conducting toilet checks.
- Ensure perpetrators are more aware of the consequences of their actions.
- Encourage a more mixed night-time economy.

9 & 10. What should be our focus going forward / What additional research should be carried out?

- There is a need to examine repeat victims more closely. More specifically, who are the repeat victims and what are their needs? Also suggested is to look more closely at offenders: Is repeat victimisation being perpetrated by the same offender? If so, what can be done about it? If not, is the person being repeatedly victimised vulnerable in some other way?
- Also recommended is to further explore the similarities and differences between repeat and single (non-repeat) victims.
- Focus more on why wounding has not fallen.
- Look at the types of clubs frequent club-goers tend to attend.
- Examine whether licensing laws around closing times change how violence occurred.
- Further research on frequency of substance use, e.g., recreational versus habitual use.

Also, further examination of:
- The location where drug users were victimised (in or outside the night-time economy).
- How serious the violence is perceived by the victim. Thus, include victims' views of the incident.
- How many offenders were involved, especially among youngsters as they may operate in gangs and may use illegal substances as well.