

We commence this issue with an academically timely paper considering sexual harassment against women and girls on public transport. The location of such harassment is surprisingly under-researched. The authors address the topic by adopting a thorough and very well handled rapid evidence assessment that revealed some rather stark findings; these include estimates of such harassment as high as 95 per cent in some studies and differences across locations. Their reflection on the latter is a particularly helpful one since it captures the concept of public space being male dominated in some cultures and relates it to more structured forms of segregations (e.g. the development of Ghettos). Indeed, this is a helpful aspect of this review since the authors do not aim to simply present the descriptive findings but also highlight why these findings may occur. As with most novel reviews it leaves more unanswered questions than answered and this is a positive element since it can serve only to drive future research. Questions for future research should focus on whether or not men are likely to experience such harassment; whether the aging population are more at risk; and what prevents victims from reporting.

Continuing with victimisation, the edition then moves to domestic violence victims and the belief systems held by them. The contribution of this paper lies in the focus on subjective experiences and in doing so recognises the importance of the victim in this process of abuse. The victim is essentially provided with a voice that allows them to contribute to the process of understanding how such aggression occurs and is maintained, without serving to victim-blame. This is an important area to capture and one that is being recognised more widely in the risk assessment literature where risk assessments are no longer done “to” victims but with them in recognition of what their unique treatment and support needs may be. One particularly interesting belief that emerged from this research was negative attitudes towards police and other agencies and how this often has a basis in early negative experiences as children and adolescents; resolving such attitudes are vital if we want to protect and support victims. Perhaps an interesting next step with such research, and an issue carrying over from the previous paper, is how to capture male victims in this research. The focus in the current paper is on women and we continue to know little about the male victims of such aggression and how best to support them.

Following this contribution is one on the association between crime and economic influence in India, a paper that perhaps serves as a showcase for the wide range of methodologies that *JCRPP* publishes on. Using econometric tools and capturing a database exceeding 30 years, the paper argues for an association between offending and economic affluence in India, most notably for violent crime across the long term. Perhaps the most interesting element of this paper is the value in utilising data sets from such extended periods of time, with the authors able to demonstrate a noted relationship across the long-term but not the short-term. The paper also makes very good use of theory, particularly strain and control theory, to demonstrate not only the existence of an association but also to offer some tentative explanation as to why it occurs. The need to expand the study to other countries is clear, most notably by capturing long term as opposed to short term or mid-term data sets.

The edition then progresses to more discrete topics, with deception the focus of the next paper, specifically the validation of the Paulhus Deception Scales and its association with personality. This is very much an evolving field of study and those familiar with the deception scales will recognise its predecessor to be social desirability. However, social desirability is at a disadvantage as a concept alongside deception as it sounds less interesting. The current study is undoubtedly of value and more as a result of its focus on a general population since there can be a tendency to focus on forensic samples, which are not normally distributed when considering deception. The study also uses advanced analyses (SEM – exploratory) to consider the structure

of the deception scales. It demonstrated a differential relationship with antisocial and narcissistic personality. The paper is also helpful in not presenting a staunch “deviant” or “dissocial” model to understanding concepts such as impression management and instead recognising it along a continuum of functionality. It also argues, quite rightly, for replication of their findings using a more traditional forensic sample.

This is followed by a paper exploring developmental factors and drug use in young offenders, capturing in detail a range of developmentally valuable factors, such as attachment styles, coping styles, and early maladaptive schemas and exploring how these can distinguish between drug users and non-drug users. Using a relatively small sample, the authors were able to demonstrate a preference for drug users to adopt emotional coping styles, more early maladaptive schemas, and those with insecure attachments more early maladaptive schemas. The paper certainly presents a case for arguing the importance of developmental factors in understanding preference towards drug use, but you could also argue that it raises questions over what prevents non-drug users from engaging. Young offenders are, after all, a vulnerable population and they share challenging backgrounds; the question that appears to be most relevant for future studies therefore is one of what factors protect against involvement in drugs (e.g. resilience? social support? early adaptive schemas?), and whether they use other maladaptive behaviours as an alternative to drug use.

This then brings us to the concluding paper of the edition, one on intervention. This is an appropriate paper to end on since we have focussed thus far on understanding challenges but not on intervening. In this paper there is a review of the value of a domestic violence programme for offenders. Adopting a sizeable sample of offenders – over 1,000 in a community based treatment programme and the same number allocated to an untreated control group – the paper demonstrates a reduction in reconviction and time in custody for those completing the domestic abuse programme, with an increase in community orders. At first consideration some readers could note the focus on reconvictions and variations on this form of measurement and criticise it as a rather crude non-specific measure, particularly for those engaging in domestic abuse, which can be starkly under-reported. However, closer consideration of this paper provides evidence of its clear added value beyond its large sample, matched control, and well-handled analysis to consideration of financial costs for running a domestic abuse programme. The authors clearly demonstrate that the programme saves money. It is this outcome that will drive core policy decisions on the implementation of such interventions; reducing victims is clearly a driver for implementation but politically the stronger message is that the intervention saves the taxpayer money. The value of being able to include financial analysis in evaluation thus becomes apparent. If savings in the costs of caring for and supporting victims could also be individually accounted for then you could expect these reported savings to increase yet again.