

## **Introduction**

The issue of victimization of young people has increased in research visibility (Finkelhor, 2008; Radford et al., 2013) remaining, however, largely overlooked with regard to young foreigners<sup>1</sup>. Although some pioneering victim survey work, for example by Anderson et al.'s (1994) in the UK<sup>2</sup>, had contributed to shifting the research focus, by establishing that criminal acts against young people are committed with alarming frequency, little is known about the experience of victimization amongst young foreigners. At international comparative level, a series of victimization surveys (Enzmann et al., 2010), has begun to bring aspects of foreign youth victimization to the fore, both academically and politically, but it generally remains the case that the attribution of offender is more readily applied than that of the victim (Andreescu, 2013).

In Italy, the study of the criminalization and imprisonment of young foreigners (Melossi and Giovannetti, 2002) as well as the varied interventions towards unaccompanied minors (Petti, 2004) or the actions of "preventive repression" carried out by the police against young foreigners (Andall, 2003), all highlight some aspects of the institutional processes of discrimination as experienced by young foreign nationals residing in the country. Resting on a feeble equilibrium between paths of exclusion and paths of integration, the power of the "labeling" processes which inexorably equate foreigner to criminal (Guia et al., 2011) results in young foreigners living in Italy facing victimization, struggling to find and create inclusive forms of belonging and citizenship. Wrongly accounted as the human surplus requiring a "zero tolerance" approach, foreigners, and young foreigners in particular, encompass what Simon et al. (2008) dub the "crime deal" which reflects a society that excludes social recovery and social justice, for the less powerful. This approach seems to almost justify racism, with police forces often adopting racial profiling as an instrument of repression and control (Rypi, Burcar and Åkerström, 2018).

This paper draws on Intersectionality (Crenshaw et al., 1995; Ladson-Billings 1998; Delgado and Stefancic 2012) and Critical Race Theory (CRT), which views racism as a reality deeply engrained in the fabric of our societies, to explain how differences are perceived and reproduced. CRT incorporates the notion that racism is a natural feature of everyday life rather than an aberration, thus advocating an open discussion to enhance solutions that tackle it from the victims' perspectives. One of the critical tenets of CRT is that the white privileged majority silences minority communities and that this silencing affords the white population power (Delgado and Stefancic, 2012; Gillborn, 2014). Critical Race theorists have engaged with intersectional theory (Crenshaw, 1989), resulting in greater attention being paid to how other social dimensions such as age, geographic location, class and gender, among other social constrainers, intersect with race and ethnicity to cause disadvantage. Through the literature review we found that the lack of attention paid to young people, race and ethnicity seems to be symptomatic of a broader problem: young people's agency and the denial of experiences of discrimination and victimization. Indeed, most works on race and ethnicity have focussed on adults' perspectives, omitting accounts of young people's experiences, with a few exceptions. For example, Chakraborti and Garland (2004) who, however, overlook the intersection of age with race and place. Hopkins (2010), by contrast, introduces the ways in which young people's experiences are challenged on a daily basis by social factors, such as race, geography, social class and identity. He uses an intersectional approach but does not focus explicitly on race. Finally, Nayak's work (2016), although broadly focusing on young foreign nationals and their experiences, examines how these experiences occur in urban settlements, neglecting on the other hand the experiences of young people in rural settings.

According to the Italian National Institute for Statistics (ISTAT, 2017), as of 31<sup>st</sup> December 2017 Italy had 60.483.973 inhabitants, more than 5 million of which had

foreign citizenship: 8.5% at national level (10.7 % in Central-northern regions, 4.2% in the South and Islands area). Data processing from ISTAT (2017) highlight that on 1<sup>st</sup> January 2017 there were 1.038.046 (53.783 male and 49.9171 female) young foreign nationals residing in Italy. Looking at statistical data from 2002 until 2017 we have that in 2002 there were 288.950 foreign minors officially listed as resident in Italy. The pick has been reached in 2014 with 1.087.016 young foreigners living in Italy. Subsequent years, show a slow decline in the number of young foreigners officially registered.

Nonetheless, within the Italian national context, more and more defined by multiculturalism<sup>3</sup> (Allievi, 2010), discussing the experience of victimization of foreign nationals remains a priority, specifically when it comes to assessing the level of inclusion of foreigners in the national social fabric (Prato, 2016). It is not fortuitous, then, that the criminological thought traditionally identified, in the study of deviance and victimization, a fertile ground for the analysis of any event linked to the experience of being "a foreigner" (Correra and Martucci, 2013). Unlike the experience of previous generations, diversity and multiculturalism are engrained in the lives of today's urban youth (Harris, 2013) in Italy. Within their culturally diverse, and often conflicting, urban environments, young people from different ethnic backgrounds routinely negotiate and contest ways of living together and sharing civic space. Their strategies for producing, disrupting and living well with the experience of being "a foreigner", define and produce conflict as well as community and citizenship.

It is well documented that, in countries of established immigration (Palidda, 2016), criminalization increasingly takes on racist features, striking the children of immigrants first (Policek, 2016) and, almost to a lesser degree, new immigrants (Castles and Davidson, 2000). In Italy, the combination of an almost complete impossibility of regular immigration and of maintaining regularity and the repressive clampdown targeting immigrants, has as an outcome on one hand the re-production of the irregular

and on the other the easy designation of the foreigner as the enemy. National collective imagery on who is a "foreigner" is always traced back, first, to the size of the problematic nature of deviance management that generates – hostilities for the appropriation of job opportunities, merger with delinquent subcultures, strengthening of black and grey economy and growing of disputes related to the maintenance of public order (Maira, 2009) – and, secondly, to the difficulties in the management of inter-ethnic coexistence (Calvanese, 2001). The data discussed here frame some of the difficulties young foreign nationals living in Italy are experiencing: their victimization being even more accentuated by the political will to disregard young people's voices (Finkelhor, 2008). To simplify the reading of the data, we created two sub groups who were selected by **P** = pre-adolescents (11 – 12 – 13 years) and **A** = adolescents (over 14 years). Regarding the absolute values, it is worth noting that in the entire sample group of young people there are also 8 young adults (Regoliosi, 1994), aged between 18 and 20 years.

### **Data Sources**

Originally inspired by Klein (1989), the International Self-Report Delinquency Study 3 (ISRD-3) from which we extrapolated data which frame this contribution, has continually developed since 1989 when, in its initial stage (ISRD-1), the research conducted in 1989-1990 on young people aged from 12 to 18 years, saw the participation of 13 countries<sup>4</sup>, six of which – amongst them, Italy, who had then a representative sample of three city schools, different in size and geographical locations: Genoa, Siena, Messina – used a sample of students, while the remaining seven employed a representative sample selected within the wider population of youth.

The second wave of the project (ISRD-2) was finalised in 2006. In addition to providing some key methodological improvements (in particular, a more rigorous and

accurate standardization), the study saw significant international expansion, with the participation of 31 countries<sup>5</sup>. Even in Italy, the survey was extended, with the participation of 15 cities, of different sizes and from different geographical locations, in this way representing a much wider national state of affairs. The questionnaires were administered in schools, to young people aged between 12 and 16 years. The main objectives were to detect the spread of anti-social behaviour of young people (either by admitting having committed crimes, or by confirming that they have been victims of unlawful acts), to verify the most familiar criminological theories, to analyse the (formal and informal) social reaction to juvenile delinquency, and finally, to understand the differences between the dissimilar national contexts.

The third replication of the research (ISRD-3), began in 2012, involving 35<sup>6</sup> countries. ISRD-3 is primarily a city-based survey with a minimum of two large cities (with a population of at least 500,000 residents) in each country. The standard sampling unit is a school class. In each country, the aim was to recruit 900 pupils per city, 300 from each grade. The baseline questionnaire was supplemented by questions aimed at assessing Situational Action Theory (Wikström, 2010), Institutional Anomie Theory (Messner and Rosenfeld, 1994), Procedural Justice Theory (Tyler, 2003; Hough et al, 2010), Social bonding (or control) theory (Hirschi, 1969), Self-control theory (Gottfredson and Hirschi, 1990) and Routine activities theory (Cohen and Felson, 1979).

In Italy, eight cities took part in the study<sup>7</sup>, and the sampling, as in the previous editions, has been structured so that the selected school grades represented the school population of the cities included in the sample. Only in Milan it was possible to use an electronic questionnaire, while in the other seven cities the traditional means of paper questionnaires were employed. The use of two different detection methods made it possible to concretely evaluate the advantages and disadvantages of the two methods of

data collection. At the outset of the project, it was envisaged that all schools would complete the survey online. However, it became clear that a paper version of the survey should be available for schools with limited computer facilities or with high demands on those facilities, and also in the event that technical difficulties would arise.

The ISRD-3 questionnaire aimed at school children consisted of a core set of questions employed by all countries, as well as some optional sections which could be used by interested countries, and a country-specific module, containing questions chosen by individual countries. The core questionnaire was made up of ten sections covering pupil's personal information such as age, ethnicity, religion, living circumstances, their relationship with their parents, their school life, experiences of victimisation, leisure activities, attitude to offending and risk-taking, any participating in offending, substance use, perception of other people's attitudes to crime, and views on the police (for children in grade 9). Primary outcome variables were contained in the sections on victimisation and offending.

Before delving into the cross-analysis of the data pertaining to victimization extrapolated from the ISRD-3 in Italy (Gualco et al., 2017), it seems appropriate to emphasize that the entire sample of 3.508 respondents, has been divided into three groups: respectively, group **I** (both Italian parents), group **F** (one foreign parent), and **Ff** (both foreign parents).

### **Victimization, gender and group membership**

The first variables analysed are those relating to gender difference in absolute terms and linked to group **I**, **F** and **Ff** where we see significant cases of victimization for robbery,

assault, theft and cyberbullying. The data linked to hate crimes, corporal punishment and abuse are instead not meaningful (Table 1).

Table 1 about here

Regarding the most significant assumptions, in the first three cases the percentages unfolding the most pervasive experience of victimization are attributable to the group of males (robbery: **m** = 6.7%, **f** = 2.9%; assault: **m** = 7.1%, **f** = 4.8%; robberies: **m** = 30.3%, **f** = 22.4%) while in the case of cyberbullying the results are reversed, accounting for a greater female victimization (**m** = 15%, **f** = 23.5%) compared to male. Papatraianou et al. (2014) have already highlighted gender differences in victimization with reference to cyberbullying<sup>8</sup>, noting that gender would be an issue worth examining. Our data support the wealth of literature which discusses the various forms of gender and sexual harassment to which girls and women are particularly vulnerable online: cyberbullying is but one such category of the risks faced by women and girls online.

Adding to the variable gender the one summarising groups' membership (that is group **F**, group **Ff** and group **I**), we have that the victimizing conducts that are of significant value are reduced to three: robbery, theft, assault and cyberbullying (Table 2). In the instances of theft, those to be more victimized are males belonging to group **I** and to group **Ff**. Assault is significant only for males belonging to group **I**. The most victimized gender is reversed, in the case of cyberbullying: the most affected are the females in group **I**, **F** and group **Ff**. Being female and belonging to group **F** or group **Ff**, therefore, seems to increase the risk of victimization related to cyberbullying as already noted in other studies by Marcum and colleagues (2012), for example.

Table 2 about here

With regard to victimization and gender, taking a cue from Anderson (1994), we acknowledge, that for some young males, their "foreign" status – both in terms of self-perception and legal status – can sometimes function as symbolic capital. With Sandberg (2008) we see that stereotypes can at times be used strategically: symbolic signs associated with the category "young foreign male" can be conceptualized as a form of embodied street capital. In other words, to reproduce and act as the stereotypical "dangerous young foreigner" can be an alternative to being powerless (Sandberg, 2008). According to hegemonic masculinity values, it may be essential to establish a masculine self-image. It may, for instance, be important to show off physical strength or to achieve a reputation of strength and power (Anderson 1994; Messerschmidt 2004; Zdun 2008). To act a stereotype, does not of course, diminish or lessen the emotional and social impact of being a foreigner but rather this is one of the contrasting ways in which young foreigners negotiate the exclusions they experience. Thus, it is important to see these young people as active agents who deploy a range of resources to cope with and sometimes to rebel against their isolation and exclusion in their communities (Räthzel, 2010).

### **Victimization, age and group membership**

The study of the intersections between the experience of victimization, age and belonging to one of the groups **I**, **F** and **Ff**, allows us few observations, in line with previous studies (Martucci and Corsa, 2005).

The simple two-variable analysis (victimization and age groups **P**– pre-adolescent: 11, 12, 13 years – and **A** – adolescents, over 14 years, respectively) has given an account of a consistently higher victimization level for members of group **A**



than those in group **P** (Table 3). The only non-significant result (n.s.) is attributable to the item dealing with punishment.

Although the data presented earlier are in line with the criminological findings that have established that crimes committed in the age bracket of criminal responsibility are confined mainly in the age group 15-18 years (Martucci and Corsa, 2005), not the same can be said with regard to victimization: Antonopoulos et al. (2013), for example, as a result of a survey conducted among a group of English students, warn of the calculated risk to attempt to link the incidents of victimization directly with age. Much more helpful is to combine data on victimization with those relating to gender and ethnicity (Fisher and May, 2009).

Table 3 about here

With reference to the whole sample, by adding the variable relating to membership to one of the three groups **I**, **F**, or **Ff** (Table 4), the significance of the available data is considerably reduced – the data about robbery, assault, hate crimes, punishments and abuse in the family are not substantial. Only for theft and cyberbullying, the age variable seems to negatively affect all three groups, reporting an increase of victimization for group **A**. With reference to cyberbullying, the vast existing academic literature supports our findings (see e.g. Rivituso, 2014; Togunaga, 2010; Hinduja and Patchin, 2008).

Table 4 about here

### **Victimization and membership to groups **I**, **Ff** and **F**.**

Although previous research findings suggest that an increasing foreign population is not associated with an increase in community violence and crime (Martinez et al., 2004;

Nielsen et al., 2005; Sampson et al., 2005), we suggest that it is worthwhile to investigate, as well as the differences closely related to membership to a group, namely **I**, **Ff** and **F**, (Table 5), some intersections between the variables in the questionnaire, with the aim to reconstruct some possible relationships between crimes suffered and events that may increase the risk of victimization such as, for example, being out in the evening. Before ascertaining the impact of these variables, however, it is helpful to assess the degree of victimization pertaining to the events presented in the survey as per question 4.1<sup>9</sup>, relating to each of the three groups mentioned above.

The analysis of all data collected for question 4.1 proves to be carrying great weight. Furthermore, for almost all the items, we have provided a double reading: the first reading relates to the distribution of robberies suffered by the total sample (**I** + **Ff** + **F**) amongst **I**, **Ff** and **F**, and the second reading shows the percentage of victimization within the three subgroups. And if the victimization of group **F** often appears less consistent than group **I** within the victimized group, the situation is inverted when looking at the sub-groups, considering an almost always greater level of victimization suffered by those in group **F** than in group **I** and group **Ff**, respectively.

Specific analysis of individual elements considered in item 4.1 allows us to see that, within the total number of robberies (4.1.a)<sup>10</sup> suffered by the whole sample, young people with both Italian parents turn out to be those most victimized, reaching the percentage of 71.2 (**I**)<sup>11</sup>. It is worth pointing out that the victimization of the entire sample, with reference to the robbery suffered is very low, settling at 4.9% in line with similar findings in the literature (Finkelhor, 2008).

The same observations can be made for the next question (4.1.b)<sup>12</sup>, dealing with the assaults suffered: the total number of individuals victimized in group **I** is represented by 69.4%, in group **Ff** by 8.6% and in group **F** by 22%. Radford et al.

(2013) in the UK context, have highlighted similar findings, stressing how local youths have experienced assault more often than foreign youths. Worth of notice are the data relating to theft (4.1.c)<sup>13</sup>: the observation of the percentages referring to the totality of theft does not permit us to detect significant differences compared with the two cases previously considered (**I** = 73.2%; **Ff** = 6.7%, **F** = 22%)<sup>14</sup>. It should also be noted that, compared to robbery and assault, theft constitutes an occurrence that tends to victimize much more evidently members of group **F**, as the percentage of reference differs from that pertaining to group **I**, of well over 15 percentile points. Some useful references can be found in Finkelhor's (2008), discussing young people's experiences of victimization by theft.

Crimes encompassed under "Hate Crime" (4.1.d)<sup>15</sup> were suffered by 48.9% of young people from group **I**, by 7.6% from those from group **Ff** and by 43.5% of those in group **F**. The total percentage of victimization for the specific offense considered is again low, settling at 5.3%. Nuances exist between different types of hate crime that will inevitably see certain independent variables as being causal to one type of hate crime but irrelevant to others (Craig, 2002; Green et al., 2001). However, in exploring the interconnectivities between such differences, we uncover the highly complex aetiological determinants of many incidents of hate: CRT (Delgado and Stefancic, 2012) is relevant here but yet unable to fully explain hate motivated offences against young migrants (Perry 2009). More useful here is Kirkwood et al.'s (2013) contribution reporting on the experiences of violence suffered by asylum seekers and refugees in a Scottish city. The interviewees were hesitant to use racism as an explanation, and such explanations were used tentatively and reluctantly. We claim that racism is not always the sole root cause of hate crime. Research (Walters, 2011) has fully demonstrated that perpetrators of hate crime are not always motivated by a single type of prejudice or hatred, but they can be influenced by a combination of different factors.

Cyberbullying (4.1.e)<sup>16</sup> has been experienced by 75.8% of young people in group **I**, by 7.3% in group **Ff** and by 16.9% in group **F**. When subsequently asked about the experience of punishment (4.1.f)<sup>17</sup>, with regard to the entire group of victims, 78.2% were in group **I**, 5.6% in group **Ff** and 16.1% belonged to group **F**. The last question concerns mistreatment suffered (4.1.g)<sup>18</sup>. Apart from the occurrence of hate crimes, also for this variable we observed a higher percentage relating to group **F**, comparatively to the total of those who have been victimized – 27.7% against the average values usually at around 20%. This has obviously lead to a decrease in group **I** (64.9%), however not a significant percentage in group **Ff** (7.4% against values normally around 7%)<sup>19</sup>. Nonetheless, the total victimization remains in line with the values below 10% (9.4%). It appears that young foreigners, especially males, seem, at times, able to manage conflict by themselves. Researchers have already shown that the tendency to manage conflicts ‘on one’s own’ instead of involving the police may promote hegemonic masculine violence in solving disputes (Messerschmidt 2004). Contacting the police may be viewed as being contrary to a tough and street-wise identity and as being associated with a loss of control and with being weak or defenceless (Anderson 1994; Zdun 2008).

Table 5 about here

### **Victimization – being part of a group of friends – membership to groups **I**, **Ff** and **F**.**

Being part of a group of friends was intersected with the question on victimization (items 4.1 and subsequent) and with groups **I**, **Ff** and **F**, respectively, with the aim of verifying whether there are significant correlations between the variables.

Furthermore, where possible, according to the significance of the available data and to remedy the frequent unfeasibility of comparing the variable "membership to a

group of friends" with that of "not belonging to a group of friends" (because of the inadequate significance of the latter in most of the cases considered), the total victimization values were also taken into account, in order to better understand the relevance of the variable "membership to a group of friends" on the level of victimization. Some interesting observations have emerged. With regard to victimization for robbery, we have a total value of 4.8% of the sample considered (young people who associate with a group of friends)<sup>20</sup>. Victimization due to assault affects 5.9% of the sample considered (young people who associate with a group of friends)<sup>21</sup>. Theft is the most widespread victimizing occurrence in the sample considered (young people who associate with a group of friends) and indeed the percentage recorded was 26.6%<sup>22</sup>.

Hate crimes, which differ from the crimes committed without pecuniary damage because they cause a much deep wound (Iganski, 2001), have elements of differentiation with the circumstances previously analysed because, considering the sample of respondents victimized by this type of crime, and belonging to a group, we have found different percentages in all three groups. In fact, if in the instances already mentioned, the distribution did appear essentially identical, with group **I** between 69.6% and 74.1%; group **Ff** between 6.2% and 8.8% and group **F** between 19.3% and 22%, we have that group **Ff** is in line with the above-mentioned data (= 6.5%)<sup>23</sup>. Cyberbullying has affected 19% of the sample considered (young people who associate with a group of friends), with most victimization seen in group **F** (24.6%), followed by group **Ff** (22.6%) and then group **I** (17.9%). The distribution percentages for groups within the sample of those being victimized remains in line with the percentages reported for robbery, theft and assault. Percentages, and similar considerations apply to the total of victimizations within the total of the sample interviewed. Punishment constitutes by far the form of victimization experienced by the majority of young people associated with a

group of friends: 35.3% of young people has in fact stated that they had been a victim<sup>24</sup>. With regard to abuse, including the negative hypothesis, when abuse did not occur, we are in the presence of significant values allowing us to ascertain that 12.4% of those who have suffered abuse did not belong to a group of friends, and even in this case as in the previous ones, the most victimized group appears to be group **F** (24.3%), followed by group **Ff** (10%) and then by group **I** (9.4%). Comparing the percentages of victimization with those pertaining to young people, usually associating themselves with a group of friends, we have that the latter variable appears to have a definite influence on the chances of being victimized, thus reducing the risk of victimization. In fact, the total victimization remains stabilized at 9%<sup>25</sup>. Therefore, the total victimization experienced against the entire sample of respondents for the cases envisaged stands at 9.4%, thus confirming the provisions of the percentages in the three groups.

Table 6 about here

### **Going out in the evening**

For young foreigners, placing their experiences of victimization in the context of a shared space such as the city (Castles, 1999) remains a particular significant issue. Mead (1934) has already authoritatively pointed out that we all have numerous selves that rest on the various social relationships and situations we are engaged in, however, we are also involved in self-presentation i.e. how we handle this multiplicity in our encounters with others (Goffman, 1959). The manifestation of the underlying negotiation of identities (Scott and Lyman, 1968) appears more evident when we analyse data relating to young foreigners' victimization when going out in the evening.

As can be seen from Table 7 below, 28.3% of the young people in our sample goes out once a week in the evening. Within the whole sample, we have 80.9% in group **I**, 12.3% in group **F** and 6.8% in group **Ff**. Considering the three groups, we see the highest percentages for group **Ff** (30.8%), followed by group **I** (28.6%) and group **F** (25.4%). Our data reveal that 24.9% of young people goes out on average two evenings a week<sup>26</sup>. Amongst the young people interviewed, those who never go out represent 17.9% of the whole sample. Amongst each group, those belonging to group **F** declare to go out less than other groups (24.7%)<sup>27</sup>.

Table 7 about here

Group **F** is always the one that suffers the most victimization, even if we have encountered strong negative peaks for group **Ff** (6 evenings = 37.5%). The total victimization experienced by those who go out in the evening is equal to 9.4% of the whole sample interviewed. Cross-analysis of victimization with the number of evening out has not allowed us to establish reliable correlations (except, perhaps, only for the case provided by **F**). What we have, once again, is the appearance of increased victimization, when we cross-analyse the type of deviant behaviours already considered, for those in group **F**, represented by increasingly higher percentages, followed by those in group **Ff** and then group **I** – the percentages are inverted just once, in relation to item 4.1.f. To have one or two foreign parents, therefore, seems to be an element that affects, by way of increasing it, the risk of victimization.

## Conclusions

The analysis of the data presented here offers the opportunity to contend that, for the sample investigated, being out in the evening does not affect significantly the level of

victimization suffered – irrespectively of group’s membership. The variable females/males, however, significantly highlights discrepancies between the two genders, with females suffering victimization considerably more than their male counterpart. Again, this is not new in the literature (Batchelor et al., 2001). Membership to a group is not to the detriment of females, only in the case of cyberbullying (Faucher et al., 2014). Regarding group **Ff** (both foreign parents) and group **F** (one foreign parent), we do not seem to witness major changes to the distribution of victimization rates. Belonging to a group does not affect the level of victimization, while having one or two foreign parents, can often be translated in a highly critical experience of victimization, as contemplated by item 4.1. As for the data relating to individual cases pertaining to the item in question, the results for group **Ff** and group **F** give an account of the fact that victimization is higher for the foreign group when we look at cases of corporal punishment, followed by theft and cyberbullying. Precisely for these three victimizing events, we have recorded the highest percentages of membership to a group of friends. What followed, in regression, are the events related to abuse in the family, hate crimes, assault and robbery.

This study set out to examine whether being a young foreigner in Italy is a relevant factor in experiencing victimization. Although we have found that the role of foreign generational status is linked to their victimization, these relationships are quite complex as they force us to reconceptualise the parameters of common living in an age of difference (Castles and Davidson, 2000: 223). This research thus contributes to the necessity to account for the diversification of such identities and the everyday negotiations, within which young foreigners become visible, and able to produce community and nation. Segmented assimilation is particularly relevant to this study’s findings by providing insight on the importance of young foreign nationals’ victimization. Indeed, segmented assimilation theorists argue that because economic



and social mobility are directly linked to the social, economic, historic, and political context, the assimilation process for some foreign nationals will result in improved life chances for upward mobility, whereas some others will experience downward social and economic mobility (Alba and Nee, 2009; Portes and Zhou, 1993).

The victimization of young foreigners is a significant social problem in Italy (Prato, 2016), a country where the rhetoric of dangerousness is too often associated with the status of being a foreigner. As a result, policy makers should act accordingly toward addressing the needs, safety, and care for this vulnerable population. Future research can address, and build from, the limitations associated with this particular study. First, examining the longitudinal effects of victimization for foreign young people is essential. Second, researching the roles of the family and community characteristics toward understanding the factors linked to the victimization of foreign youth should be addressed in future work. To best understand the role of young foreigners, the social, political, and economic environment of migration, as well as family factors, should be considered (Glick and White, 2003; Sampson et al., 2005). This study raises important suggestions for the types of policies and programs that promote safe environments so that young foreigners in Italy can attain economic stability and success during adulthood. When young people are victimized because of their ethnicity and or their nationality, it is a clear reflection of society's inability to provide a healthy environment that facilitates educational and economic progress and success. This rings especially true for an already marginalized population. Establishing and fostering safe and healthy environments for all youth, particularly for foreign nationals, should remain a priority in any democratic society.

### **Abbreviations:**

**I** = Both Italian parents

**F** = One foreign parent

**Ff** = Both foreign parents

**m** = Men

**f** = Females

**P** = Pre-adolescents (11 – 12 – 13 years)

**A** = Adolescents (over 14 years).

## Tables

**Table 1.** Victimization and gender – whole sample.

Victimization	Gender	Percentage
Robbery	<b>m</b>	6.7
	<b>f</b>	2.9
Assault	<b>m</b>	7.1
	<b>f</b>	4.8
Theft	<b>m</b>	30.3
	<b>f</b>	22.4
Hate Crimes	<b>m</b>	n.s.
	<b>f</b>	n.s.
Cyberbullying	<b>m</b>	15
	<b>f</b>	23.5
Corporal punishment	<b>m</b>	n.s.
	<b>f</b>	n.s.
Abuse in the family	<b>m</b>	n.s.
	<b>f</b>	n.s.

## Notes

---

<sup>1</sup> Young foreigners are individuals who are not native to Italy or have an immigrant family background but are born in Italy. In both instances they are lawfully residing in Italy. In the context of this study, young foreigners are individuals between the age of 11 and 20 years.

<sup>2</sup> See also McAra and McVie (2010).

<sup>3</sup> There exists a wealth of academic literature on multiculturalism and the notion of integration (Back, 1996; Back, et al., 2008; Cahill, 2000; Castles, 1999; Castles, and Davidson, 2000). Within the interdisciplinary field of multicultural youth studies (Harris, 2013), often what is shelved is the broader question of how young people of different backgrounds, ‘go on’ in Giddens’s (1984) term, in a culturally diverse society. We intend multiculturalism as a dynamic, lived field of action within which social actors both construct and deconstruct ideas of cultural difference, national belonging and place making. Such a perspective moves beyond the focus on ‘ethnic’ groups or individuals and their capacity to adapt, as well as more conventional politics of recognition that tend to assume fixed ethnic identities. Instead it addresses practices which produce cultural subjectification through mix, encounter, conflict and negotiation, always in relation to other kinds of social positionings.

<sup>4</sup> The ISRD-1 Countries are the following: Belgium; Finland; Germany; Greece; Italy; New Zealand; Portugal; Spain; Switzerland; The Netherlands; England & Wales, Northern Ireland and USA.

<sup>5</sup> The ISRD-2 Countries are the following: Armenia; Austria; Belgium; Bosnia-Herzegovina; Canada; China; Cyprus; Czech Republic; Denmark; Estonia; Finland; France; Germany; Hungary; Iceland; Ireland; Italy; Lithuania; Norway; Poland; Portugal; Russia; Slovenia; Spain; Suriname; Sweden; Switzerland; The Netherlands; The Netherlands Antilles and Aruba; USA and Venezuela.

<sup>6</sup> The ISRD-3 Countries are the following: Armenia; Austria; Belgium; Bosnia-Herzegovina; Brazil; Cape Verde; Chile; China; Croatia; Czech Republic; Denmark; Estonia; Finland; France; Germany; Greece;

---

India; Indonesia; Italy; Kosovo; Lithuania; Macedonia; Portugal; Romania; Serbia; Slovakia; South Korea; Spain; Sweden; Switzerland; The Netherlands; Ukraine; United Kingdom; USA; Venezuela.

<sup>7</sup> The cities in question are: Milano, Brescia, Genova, Siena, Firenze, Lecce, Napoli and Messina.

Map 1 about here

<sup>8</sup> See also Faucher et al. (2014).

<sup>9</sup> Question 4.1 reads: “Try to remember: have you ever experienced one of the following events? If so, did you or someone else report it to the police (Police, Carabinieri, etc.)?”.

<sup>10</sup> Question 4.1.a) reads: “Has anyone ever demanded from your money or anything else (watch, shoes, cell phone, etc.) or threatened you when you refused to do so?”.

<sup>11</sup> Such data should be compared with 7.1 for those who have at least one foreign parent (**F**) and 21.8 of those who have two foreign parents (**Ff**). This is not the case with regard to reference groups because, amongst group **I** only 4.3% claimed they had experienced robberies, compared with 5.5% of group **Ff** and 7.8% of group **F**.

<sup>12</sup> Question 4.1.b) reads: “Has anyone ever hit you with violence or wounded you, to the point that you had to go to a doctor?”. Regarding the groups considered, we have a reversal of the percentages which are indeed higher for group **F** (9.7%), then we have group **Ff** (8.3%) and then group **I** (5.2%), with a total value of victimization linked to aggression which equals 6% of the sample considered.

<sup>13</sup> Question 4.1.c) reads: “Did someone ever steal something from you (books, money, cell phones, sports equipment, bicycles, etc.)?”.

<sup>14</sup> However, an analysis of the three groups reveals a higher level of victimization for this offense, for all individuals belonging to the groups - with prevalence still for group **F** - (**I** = 24.2%; **Ff** = 28.4%; **F** = 39.4%), which is identified with a percentage of total victimization 6 and 5 times higher of the two cases previously considered (26.6%).

<sup>15</sup> Question 4.1.d) reads: “Did anyone ever threaten you with violence, or did they ever commit violent acts against you because of your religion, your language, the colour of your skin, your social or ethnic origins or other similar reasons?”. With reference to the individual groups, in this instance it is possible to underline how group **F** is the one most victimized (16.9%) in comparison to group **I** (3.2%) and group **Ff** (6.4%). Young people with two foreign parents are victims of hate crime almost 7 times more than those with both Italian parents.

<sup>16</sup> Question 4.1.e) reads: “Has anyone ever made fun of you or harassed you or offended you by email, instant messaging systems (Facebook, Messenger, etc.), in chat, on a website or via SMS?”. Here, we have an increase in the percentage within each group, with group **I** (18%) and group **Ff** (22%)

---

previously represented by much lower percentages (except in the case of theft). Nevertheless, the highest value still needs to be attributed to group **F** with 23.5%. It follows that the total victimization for this type of crime is more significant than previously, settling at 19%.

<sup>17</sup> Question 4.1.f) reads: “Your mother or father (or your stepmother or your stepfather) have ever beaten you, slapped or pushed you? (Include also instances where you have been punished for something you have done)”. With reference to individual groups, we have that 34.5% of the members of group **I** claim to have suffered some sort of punishment at one point. A similar experience is shared by 31.8 % of young people who belong to group **Ff** and by 42.1% from group **F**. Consequently, the total victimization of the sample is the highest at 35.3%.

<sup>18</sup> Question 4.1.g) reads: “Did your mother or father (or your stepmother or stepfather) ever hit you with an object, punched or kicked you, or were you ever violently beaten? (Include also instances where you have been punished for something you have done)”.

<sup>19</sup> For an interesting assessment of the longer-term consequences of punishment and mistreatment at a young age, see the thought-provoking study by Herczog et al. (2004).

<sup>20</sup> With reference to the groups, we found that the level of victimization is higher for group **F** (8.1%) and almost halved for the other two groups (**I** = 4.2%; **Ff** = 4.8%). Again, 4.8% is the value of the total victimization of young people based on the total sample interviewed.

<sup>21</sup> This figure is a little lower than that of the total victimization (6%) with regard to the same conduct. Considering the breakdown by groups, group **F** remains in first place (9.7%), followed by group **Ff** (7.6%) and finally we have group **I** (5.2%). The total victimization against the entire sample of respondents remains at 6%.

<sup>22</sup> Again, being members of the group **F** coincides with the level of increased victimization (41.3%), followed by group **Ff** (28.6%) and group **I** (24.2%). The total victimization for this offense is 26.4%.

<sup>23</sup> However, data for group **I** and group **F** are very similar, to the detriment of the victimization of the members of group **F** (**I** = 49.4%; **F** = 44.2%). Furthermore, even the hypothesis of victimization of subjects not belonging to a group of friends, presents interesting features: in this occasion, against a total victimization equal to 7% (against that of 5.1% of the total victimized subjects, belonging to a group of friends), the group whose members are most victimized is group **Ff** (13.8%), followed by group **F** (12.9%) and group **I** (4.7%). Finally, regarding the totality of the sample interviewed, those who have experienced victimization constitute 5.3% of the whole sample, despite the fact that group **F** has again reported an increase in the number of individuals experiencing victimization (17.1%).

<sup>24</sup> The differences regarding each group, tend to fade, presenting more smoothed values for each of the 3 groups: **I** = 34.5%; **Ff** = 31.5%; **F** = 41.9%. Notwithstanding this, we can still report a prevalence of victimization in group **F**. Similarly, victimization percentages behave the same way as the total victimization compared to the total sample of respondents, in relation to the event in question (the value of victimization total, in fact, settles at 35.4%).

---

<sup>25</sup> There is no indication, however, of any ameliorative hypothesis for group **F**, which remains the most victimized group (**F** = 18.6%; **Ff** = 11.2%; **I** = 7.6%).

<sup>26</sup> Sample divided as 84.1% for group **I**, 10% for group **F** and 5.8% for group **Ff**.

<sup>27</sup> With reference to the higher frequencies of evening outings (six nights a week and every night), although these are very low percentages of young people who enjoy such freedom (6 nights = 1.5%; every night = 5.6%), we found interesting increases in group **F** and group **Ff**, with respect to group **I** (group **F** went from 1.7% for "six nights" to 7% for "every night", group **Ff** increased from 3.7% for "six nights" to 6.1% for "every night", while group **I** went from 1.2% for "six nights" to 5.4% for "every night"), but also within the same group, thus demonstrating that the tendency to take advantage of greater freedom means that there is an almost direct transition from four nights out (5.5% of the sample) to daily evening outings (5.6% of the entire sample).

## References

- Alba R and Nee V (2009) *Remaking the American mainstream: Assimilation and contemporary immigration*. Harvard: Harvard University Press.
- Allievi S (2010) Multiculturalism in Italy: the missing model. In Silj A. (ed) *European Multiculturalism Revisited*. London-New York: Zed Books.
- Andall J (ed) (2003) *Gender and Ethnicity in Contemporary Europe*. Oxford: Berg.
- Anderson E (1994) *Code of the Streets*. London: Atlantic.
- Anderson S, Kinsey R, Loader I and Smith C (1994) *Cautionary tales: Young people, crime and policing in Edinburgh*. Aldershot: Avebury.
- Andreescu V (2013) Fear of Violent Victimization among Foreign-Born. *Journal of Identity and Migration Studies*.7 (1): 69–93.
- Antonopoulos GA, Papanicolaou G, Tupling C and Wattis L (2013) Perspectives on punitivity, victimisation and fear of crime: A student case study in the United

- 
- Kingdom. In Kury K and Winterdyck J. (eds) *Fear of crime and punitivity: Results from international student surveys*. Vol. 9 Bochum: Universitaetsverlag Brockmeyer, 39-80.
- Back L (1996) *New Ethnicities and Urban Culture: Racisms and Multiculture in Young Lives*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Back L, Cohen P and Keith M (2008) Between Home and Belonging: Critical Ethnographies of Race, Place and Identity. In Räthzel N. (ed) *Finding the Way Home: Young People's Stories of Gender, Ethnicity, Class and Places in Hamburg and London* Göttingen: V&R Unipress, 197–224.
- Batchelor S, Burman M and Brown J (2001) Discussing violence: let's hear it from the girls. *Probation Journal* 48(2): 125-34.
- Cahill C (2000) Street Literacy: Urban Teenagers' Strategies for Negotiating their Neighbourhood. *Journal of Youth Studies*. 3(3): 251–277.
- Calvanese E (2001) *Media e immigrazione tra stereotipi e pregiudizi. La rappresentazione dello straniero nel racconto giornalistico*. Milano: Franco Angeli.
- Castles S (1999) Immigration and Social Cohesion. *Growth*. 47:35–46.
- Castles S and Davidson A (2000) *Citizenship and Migration: Globalization and the Politics of Belonging*. New York: Routledge.
- Chakraborti N and Garland J (2004) *Rural Racism*. London: Routledge.
- Cohen LE and Felson M (1979) Social change and crime rate trends: a routine activity approach. *American Sociological Review* 44: 588-608.
- Correra MM and Martucci P (2013) *Elementi di Criminologia*. Padova: Cedam.
- Craig KM (2002) Examining hate-motivated aggression: A review of the social psychological literature on hate crimes as a distinct form of aggression. *Aggression and Violent Behaviour* 7: 85–101.

- 
- Crenshaw K (1989) Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics. *The University of Chicago Legal Forum* 140: 139-167.
- Crenshaw K, Gotanda N, Peller G and Thomas K. (Eds.) (1995) *Critical race theory: The key writings that formed the movement*. New York: New Press.
- Delgado R and Stefansic J (2012) *Critical Race Theory: An Introduction*. New York: New York University Press.
- Enzmann D, Marshall IH, Killias M, Junger-Tas J, Steketee M and Gruszczynska B (eds) (2010) *Juvenile Delinquency in Europe and Beyond: Results of the Second International Self-Report Delinquency Study*. New York: Springer.
- Faucher C, Jackson M and Cassidy W (2014) Cyberbullying among University Students: Gendered Experiences, Impacts, and Perspectives. *Education Research International* 1: 1-11.
- Finkelhor D (2008) *Childhood victimization: Violence, crime, and abuse in the lives of young people*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fisher BS and May D (2009) College Students' Crime-Related Fears on Campus Are Fear-Provoking Cues Gendered? *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* 25(3): 300-321.
- Gillborn D (2014) *Multicultural Education*. London: Routledge.
- Giddens A (1984) *The Construction of Society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Glick JE and White MJ (2003) Academic trajectories of immigrant youths: Analysis within and across cohorts. *Demography* 40(4): 759-783.
- Goffman E (1959) *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Doubleday.
- Gottfredson MR and Hirschi T (1990) *A general theory of crime*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.



- 
- Green DP, McFalls LH and Smith JK (2001) HATE CRIME: An emergent research agenda. *Annual Review of Sociology* 27: 479–504.
- Gualco B, Rensi R and Fossa G (2017) Violenza assistita e comportamenti devianti dei giovani in Italia: i risultati dell'International Self-report Delinquency Study- 3 *Rassegna Italiana di Criminologia* (2): 104-114.
- Guia MJ, van der Woude M and Van der Leun J (2011) *Social control and justice: crimmigration in the age of fear*. The Hague: Eleven International Publishing.
- Harris A (2013) *Young People and Everyday Multiculturalism*. London: Routledge.
- Herczog M, Browne K, Hamilton-Giachritsis C, Johnson R, Agathanos-Georgopoulou H and Anaut M (2004) Mapping the number and characteristics of children under 3 in institutions across Europe at risk of harm. Report prepared by Centre for Forensic and Family Psychology at University of Birmingham.
- Hinduja S and Patchin JW (2008) Cyberbullying: an exploratory analysis of factors related to offending and victimization. *Deviant Behavior* 29: 129-156.
- Hirschi T (1969) *Causes of Delinquency*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hopkins P (2010) *Young people, place and identity*. London: Routledge.
- Hough M, Jackson J, Bradford B, Myhill A and Quinton P (2010) Procedural justice, trust, and institutional legitimacy. *Policing* 4 (3): 203-210.
- Iganski P (2001) Hate crimes hurt more. *American Behavioral Scientist* 45(4): 626-638.
- ISTAT (2017) Archivio Migrazioni. URL: <https://www.istat.it/it/archivio/migrazioni>
- Klein M (1989) *Cross-National Research in Self-Reported Crime and Delinquency*. New York: Springer.
- Kirkwood S, McKinlay A and Mcvittie C (2013) The Mutually Constitutive Relationship between Place and Identity: The Role of Place-Identity in Discourse on Asylum Seekers and Refugees. *Journal of community & applied social psychology* 1-23.

- 
- Ladson-Billings G (1998) Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a nice field like education? *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 11: 7-24.
- Maira S (2009) *Missing: Youth, Citizenship and Empire after 9/11*. Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press.
- Marcum CD, Higgins GE, Freiburger TL and Ricketts ML (2012) Battle of the sexes: An examination of male and female cyber bullying. *International Journal of Cyber Criminology* 6 (1): 904-911.
- Martinez R, Lee MT, and Nielsen AL (2004) Segmented assimilation, local context and determinants of drug violence in Miami and San Diego: Does ethnicity and immigration matter? *International Migration Review* 38(1): 131-157.
- Martucci P and Corsa R (2005) Fanciulli e devianza penale tra allarmismo e realtà. Fattori psicosociali e ruolo delle appartenenze etniche nei reati degli infraquattordicenni. *MINORIGIUSTIZIA* (4): 161-184.
- May D and Fisher BS (2009) College Students' Crime-Related Fears on Campus: Are Fear-Provoking Cues Gendered? *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* 25 (3): 300-321.
- McAra L and McVie S (2010) Youth Crime and Justice: Key Messages from the Edinburgh Study of Youth Transitions and Crime. *Criminology and Criminal Justice* 10(2):179-209.
- Mead GH (1934) *Mind, Self, and Society from the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Melossi D and Giovannetti M (2002) *I Nuovi Sciuscià: Minori Stranieri in Italia*. Roma: Donzelli.
- Messner SF and Rosenfeld R (1994) *Crime and the American dream*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Messerschmidt J (2004) *Flesh and Blood*. Lanham MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

- 
- Nayak A (2016) Young people, race and ethnicity. In Furlong A. (2016). *Routledge Handbook of Youth and Young Adulthood*. London: Taylor and Francis: 58-66.
- Nielsen AL, Lee MT and Martinez R (2005) Integrating race, place and motive in social disorganization theory: Lessons from a comparison of black and Latino homicide types in two immigrant destination cities. *Criminology* 43(3): 837-872.
- Palidda S (ed) (2016) *Racial Criminalization of Migrants in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. London: Routledge.
- Papatraianou LH, Levine D and West D (2014) Resilience in the face of cyberbullying: an ecological perspective on young people's experiences of online adversity. *Pastoral Care in Education* 32(4): 264-283.
- Perry B (ed) (2009) *Hate crimes*. London: Praeger.
- Petti G (2004) *Il Male Minore: La tutela dei minori stranieri come esclusione*. Verona: Ombre Corte.
- Policek N (2016) Turning the Invisible into the Visible: Stateless Children in Italy. In Ensor MO and Gozdzia EM (eds). *Children and Forced Migration: Durable Solutions during Transient Years Studies in Childhood and Youth Series*, London: Palgrave Macmillan. 79-102.
- Portes A and Zhou M (1993) The new second generation: Segmented assimilation and its variants. *The annals of the American academy of political and social science* 530(1): 74-96.
- Prato GB (ed) (2016) *Beyond multiculturalism: views from anthropology*. London: Routledge.
- Radford L, Corral S, Bradley C and Fisher HL (2013) The prevalence and impact of child maltreatment and other types of victimization in the UK: Findings from a population survey of caregivers, children and young people and young adults. *Child abuse & neglect* 37(10): 801-813.

- 
- Räthzel N (2010) The Injuries of the Margins and the Restorative Power of the Political: How Young People with Migrant Backgrounds Create Their Capacity to Act. *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 31(5): 541–555.
- Regoliosi L (1994) *La prevenzione del disagio giovanile*. Roma: La Nuova Italia Scientifica.
- Rivituso J (2014) Cyberbullying Victimization among College Students: An Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis. *Journal of Information Systems Education* 25(1):71-75.
- Rypi A, Burcar V and Åkerström M (2018). Refraining from reporting crimes: accounts from young male crime victims with an immigrant background, *Nordic Social Work* 8(2):2-16.
- Sampson RJ, Morenoff JD and Raudenbush S (2005) Social anatomy of racial and ethnic disparities in violence. *American Journal of Public Health* 95(2): 224-232.
- Sandberg S (2008) Street Capital. Ethnicity and Violence on the Streets of Oslo. *Theoretical Criminology* 12 (2): 153–171.
- Scott MB and Lyman SM (1968) Accounts. *American Sociological Review* 33 (1): 46–62.
- Simon J, Frampton ML and Lòpez IH (eds) (2008) *After the War on Crime*. New York: New York University Press.
- Togunaga RS (2010) Following you home from school: A critical review and synthesis of research on cyberbullying victimization. *Computers in Human Behavior* 26(3): 277-287.
- Tyler TR (2003) Procedural justice, legitimacy, and the effective rule of law. *Crime and Justice* 30: 283-357.
- Walters, MA (2011) A general theories of hate crime: Strain, doing difference and self-control. *Critical Criminology* 19 (4): 313–30.

- 
- Wikström POH (2010) Explaining crime as moral actions. In Hitlin S and Vaisey S (eds) *Handbook of the Sociology of Morality*. New York: Springer. 211-239.
- Zdun S (2008) Violence in Street Culture. In Heitmeyer W and Huppig W (eds) (2008) *Youth, Violence, and Social Disintegration*. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass, Wiley. 39–54.