



Community safety practice briefing

Tackling anti-social behaviour

what really works

Nacro's community safety mailing and work

This briefing is part of Nacro's free mailing for community safety practitioners. If you do not already receive this mailing and would like to add your name to our mailing list, please write to Crime and Social Policy Mailing at the address below.

The mailing is just one part of our work on community safety. Nacro works with local people, practitioners and inter-agency partnerships to reduce crime levels, lessen the fear of crime and regenerate communities.

Our research, our work with Government and our experience of delivering services at a local level give us an excellent national perspective on what works in community safety and how to adapt and apply this at a local level. Community safety practitioners from a range of community safety partnerships use this expertise at every stage of partnership development. More information is available from the address below.

Nacro
Crime and Social Policy Section
237 Queenstown Road
London SW8 3NP
tel: 020 7501 0555
fax: 020 7501 0556
www.nacro.org.uk

© Nacro 2002

Nacro is a registered charity.
Registration no. 226171
Registered office
169 Clapham Road London SW9 0PU

Rachel Armitage

Tackling anti-social behaviour is high on the agenda of both national government and local agencies. Local partnerships, together with local communities, have been encouraged to identify local problems, develop strategies and action plans, and evaluate their interventions to inform future practice. This briefing highlights examples of work carried out by agencies from across the country that have been successful in tackling anti-social behaviour.

Contents

2	<i>Introduction</i>
3	<i>Defining anti-social behaviour</i>
4	<i>Measuring anti-social behaviour</i>
4	<i>Why does anti-social behaviour matter?</i>
5	<i>Legal measures before Anti-Social Behaviour Orders (ASBOs)</i>
5	<i>Tackling anti-social behaviour through enforcement: Anti-Social Behaviour Orders (ASBOs)</i>
8	<i>Other interventions that use enforcement to address anti-social behaviour</i>
8	<i>Tackling anti-social behaviour through prevention</i>
10	<i>Tackling anti-social behaviour through education</i>
10	<i>Conclusions</i>
10	<i>Bibliography</i>
11	<i>Footnotes</i>

A large print version of this briefing is available on request. Please phone 020 7501 0555.

£5.00 where sold
(£4.00 each for orders of 10 or more copies)

- Findings from the British Crime Survey (BCS) 2000 revealed that nine per cent of adults had experienced disorderly and anti-social behaviour in the last year. The most commonly cited anti-social behaviour was young people being rude or abusive (cited by a fifth of respondents).¹
- Young people and students were particularly likely to state that they had experienced anti-social behaviour.²
- Between April 1999 and March 2002, a total of 583 Anti-Social Behaviour Orders (ASBOs) were granted.³
- Of the 466 ASBOs granted between April 1999 and September 2001, 84 per cent were on men, and 74 per cent were on those aged 21 years and under.⁴
- A Home Office Review of ASBOs⁵ found that 36 per cent of the orders were breached within nine months of being granted (some up to five times).
- The average ASBO costs more than £5,000 and takes over three months to obtain.⁶
- In 2000, over half of those sentenced in court for a breach of an ASBO received a custodial sentence.⁷
- Between April 1999 and September 2001, 141 parliamentary questions were asked about anti-social behaviour.⁸
- 55 per cent of local authorities stated that they currently had an anti-social behaviour policy, a further 16 per cent stated that they were currently developing one. Metropolitan authorities were most likely to have a policy or be in the process of developing one (84 per cent) with county councils least likely.⁹
- 29 per cent of local authorities¹⁰ had a dedicated officer dealing with anti-social behaviour. 26 per cent had a team dealing with this work. A third of local authorities had no officer or team.

Introduction

Tackling anti-social behaviour is high on the agenda of both national government and local agencies. Local partnerships, together with local communities, have been encouraged to identify local problems, develop strategies and action plans, and evaluate their interventions to inform future practice.

This briefing highlights examples of work carried out by local authorities that are considered to have been successful in tackling anti-social behaviour. Three types of intervention are considered:

- enforcement
- prevention
- education

Evaluations of what works in reducing anti-social behaviour are scarce. Where they do exist, they are carried out locally with very little standardisation in methodology. For this reason, it is difficult to make informed judgements about what works and what does

not work to reduce anti-social behaviour. Despite this, however, it is clear that a focus upon one element of intervention at the expense of others can only result in a quick fix at the expense of any long-term solutions. Partners need to address anti-social behaviour using an holistic approach that includes enforcement, prevention and education.

A new phenomenon?

The term 'anti-social behaviour' may have only emerged in the last few years but the behaviour it describes – from 'young people hanging around' to 'noise and nuisance' – have been in existence for many years.

Not only has the term become a catch all, but the interventions described as solutions to this problem often simply form a mix of initiatives already identified as successful in reducing such crime and disorder as vandalism, youth crime or noise nuisance.¹¹

There is some evidence to suggest that the problem of anti-social behaviour is increasing:

- In the period 1996–1998 the number of ‘notices of seeking possession’, and possession summons issued on the grounds of anti-social behaviour more than doubled.¹²
- 80 per cent of social landlords stated that legal action was used more frequently in cases of anti-social behaviour now than five years ago.¹³
- With the exception of noisy neighbours and litter, the percentage of people perceiving various disorders to be a big problem increased between 1992 and 2000. The proportion who considered drug misuse to be a problem more than doubled.¹⁴

On the other hand, the following data suggest that the picture may not be so clear:

- Between 1997/98 and 1999/00, local perceptions of problems such as vandalism, hooliganism, graffiti and crime declined amongst survey respondents.¹⁵
- The British Crime Survey 2001 reported a nine per cent reduction in vandalism between 1999 and 2000. Police recorded crime figures showed a one per cent reduction in vandalism over the same period.¹⁶

Many of these problems in measurement arise from the lack of clarity regarding definition: it is difficult to say whether or not anti-social behaviour is increasing when there is no clear agreement on what it actually is. Unless anti-social behaviour is clearly, measurement, and consequently patterns and trends, will vary.

Defining anti-social behaviour

The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 defines anti-social behaviour, in relation to obtaining an ASBO, as acting: ‘in a manner that caused or was likely to cause harassment, alarm or distress to one or more persons not of the same household’.¹⁷

This definition describes the consequences of certain behaviour (such as harm or distress) as opposed to the behaviour itself (such as begging); as such, it is open to different forms of interpretation.

The following list describes the behaviours for which ASBOs were awarded against offenders within the areas covered by a recent Home Office review:¹⁸

- harassment
- threats
- verbal abuse
- intimidation
- graffiti and criminal damage
- assault
- noise
- public disturbance
- arson
- racial harassment or abuse
- criminal behaviour
- drunk and disorderly
- prostitution
- shoplifting
- throwing missiles
- trespass
- harassing a specific person

There are operational definitions of arson, shoplifting and prostitution. It is also clear who these behaviours should be reported to and where data relating to patterns and trends can be found. But what is ‘noise’? What are ‘threats’? What is ‘throwing missiles’? Because of the degree to which these behaviours vary in terms of definition and responsibility, data relating to the levels of anti-social behaviour are limited and geographical and temporal comparisons are complex. For example, what is considered to be excessive noise within a rural neighbourhood with an older population may go unnoticed within an urban area.

The lack of clarity regarding the precise definition of anti-social behaviour has resulted in many Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRPs) adopting their own definition in consultation with the local community as well as partnership agencies. The benefits of a locally defined definition are threefold:

- 1 The terminology can be tailored to the local context allowing definition that is relevant as opposed to one which is largely generic and all encompassing.
- 2 Those who helped to define the problem have enhanced ownership of resulting responses.

- 3 A standard definition utilised by all partner agencies can help to minimise confusion and enhance standardisation of monitoring practices.

CDRPs that have agreed their own shared operational definition of anti-social behaviour include the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames and Wakefield Metropolitan District Council.¹⁹

Measuring anti-social behaviour

As well as the problems of definition, there are also difficulties in measuring anti-social behaviour. Data relating to anti-social behaviour are collected by a variety of agencies, including the police, environmental health, housing departments and the fire service. Other types of anti-social behaviour are 'grey areas', where responsibility for data collection remains unclear. For example, the findings from the BCS revealed that the most commonly experienced anti-social behaviour was 'young people being rude or abusive';²⁰ but being rude and abusive is difficult to define and no agency is responsible for collecting data on it.

Why does anti-social behaviour matter?

Anti-social behaviour acts as a catalyst for more serious crime and disorder

Several studies have suggested that if anti-social behaviour is not addressed, it can act as a catalyst for more serious crimes. Skogan (1990) refers to this as the 'contagion theory', suggesting that the 'presence of vandalism stimulates more vandalism'.²¹ This is supported by many studies which found that the presence of anti-social behaviour such as vandalism, rubbish or criminal damage leads directly to more anti-social behaviour.²² Wilson and Kelling²³ refer to this contagious effect as the 'broken windows theory'. This suggests that an area with existing deterioration such as graffiti and vandalism conveys the impression that:

- Nobody cares so apprehension is less likely.
- The area is already untidy so one more act will go unnoticed.

Because of its existing deterioration the area is not only an easy target, it is also 'fair game':

'If a window in a building is broken and left unrepaired, all the rest of the windows will soon be broken ... One unrepaired broken window is a signal that no one cares, so breaking more windows costs nothing ... Untended property becomes fair game.'²⁴

This link between disorder and crime is supported by the results revealed in the 2000 British Crime Survey, which suggests that areas in which respondents perceived disorder to be highest also had the highest levels of actual crime.²⁵

Anti-social behaviour inhibits communities

Research suggests that anti-social behaviour can have a debilitating effect upon communities by increasing fear²⁶ and social withdrawal and undermining residents' ability or desire to exercise control of the situation.²⁷ This can be seen through a reluctance to take part in crime prevention activity, be it formal (property marking) or informal (asking neighbours to watch your property whilst you are on holiday), as well as a reluctance to get involved in community activities.

Anti-social behaviour is costly

Anti-social behaviour can also be costly for communities. Anti-social behaviour can undermine stability and confidence in an area's housing market.²⁸ It can also affect the success of local businesses and can be costly (in terms of human and financial resources) to repair. Data relating to the costs of anti-social behaviour are limited, but several estimates have been made which relate to individual elements of anti-social behaviour such as criminal damage,²⁹ vandalism³⁰ and neighbour nuisance.³¹ Aggregate costs suggest that anti-social behaviour can cost local authorities anything up to £5 million per year.³²

Anti-social behaviour can result in social exclusion

Finally, anti-social behaviour can also affect the lives of the perpetrators and their families. Negative effects include exclusion from school, eviction from their homes,³³ losing contact with service providers, homelessness and becoming involved in the criminal justice system.

Legal measures before Anti-Social Behaviour Orders (ASBOs)

Although the term 'anti-social behaviour' has become increasingly familiar since the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, provision did exist prior to the Act in which behaviour, now referred to as anti-social, could be dealt with. These include:

- The **Housing Act 1996** introduced a number of measures to help local authorities address anti-social behaviour. Firstly, the act requires local authorities to set up local housing registers and offer permanent housing only to applicants on the register. The Act permits local authorities to seek injunctions to prevent anti-social behaviour, both by and against their tenants, where violence has occurred or is threatened. The Act also allows local authorities to use introductory tenancies which enable tenancies to be ended within the first 12 months without having to prove grounds for possession. The Housing Act also provides social landlords with more powers against anti-social behaviour through strengthening the grounds for possession to include behaviour likely to cause nuisance, anti-social behaviour in the locality of a tenant's property, the anti-social behaviour of visitors and a conviction for an arrestable offence within the vicinity of the property.
- Registered social landlords (RSLs) can also use '**starter tenancies**' which, as with introductory tenancies, allow the RSL to terminate the tenancy after a one year period if the tenancy has not been deemed to be satisfactory.
- Under the **Environmental Protection Act 1990**, local authorities have a duty to investigate a complaint of noise or other nuisance from premises

(land and buildings³⁴). If the noise or nuisance is considered to amount to a statutory nuisance then the authority must serve an abatement notice on the person responsible or the owner of the property. The notice may require that the nuisance be stopped altogether or limited to certain periods of the day or night. A failure to comply with the abatement notice can result in fines.

- The **Noise Act 1996** introduced a Night Noise offence for excessive neighbour noise occurring between the hours of 2300 and 0700.
- Other legislation which can be used to address anti-social behaviour includes the **Protection from Harassment Act 1997**, the **Public Order Act 1986** and **criminal offences** such as criminal damage or breach of the peace.

Despite these measures, there were still sectors of the population who were immune to enforcement. These were predominantly:

- Those living in the private rented or privately owned accommodation.
- Juveniles. Much of the legislation could not be used against juveniles.
- Repetitive, persistent acts of anti-social behaviour. When considered in isolation (as they would be if taken to court), these are often seen as trivial.

'Anti-social behaviour orders, therefore, were designed as a solution for such persistent behaviour, regardless of the kind of housing in which perpetrators lived.'³⁵

Tackling anti-social behaviour through enforcement: Anti-Social Behaviour Orders (ASBOs)

ASBOs were introduced under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998. They can be used by local authorities and the police³⁶ against anyone, aged 10 or over, who has acted in an anti-social manner. Any application for an ASBO must be made within six months of the behaviour taking place.

ASBOs are civil orders and only become criminal when they have been breached. For this reason, the standard of proof and rules of evidence that relate to ASBO

proceedings are also civil (on the balance of probabilities), as opposed to criminal (beyond reasonable doubt).

A recent Home Office review of ASBOs³⁷ makes clear recommendations as to how the implementation of ASBOs can be improved. These fall largely into the categories covered in the following sections.

Multi-agency partnerships

Section 1 (2) of the Crime and Disorder Act states that each of the relevant authorities (ie local authorities and the police) cannot apply for an ASBO without consulting the other. In order to ensure that this takes place without unnecessary delay, as well as helping to spread the cost of the ASBO and ensuring that all options for action have been exhausted, anti-social behaviour should be addressed through some form of partnership working. Although at present only local authorities and police can apply for ASBOs, any partnership set up to deal with anti-social behaviour should include a wider range of agencies such as registered social landlords (RSLs) and Social Services.

For example, the London Borough of Islington's anti-social behaviour team have recognised that a more joined-up approach is needed to address anti-social behaviour from tenants of RSLs. As a consequence, RSLs have been invited to sign up to the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership's information sharing protocol. This allows agencies to pool information about cases.³⁸

A step-by-step approach

It is suggested that, in order to avoid delays and unnecessary bureaucracy, partnerships should develop clear and simple protocols with step-by-step guidelines for each agency involved.

Manchester City Council has applied for 22 ASBOs. Although the most recent case involved a juvenile and the procedure would be different for an adult, the clear steps that they used are an excellent example of ensuring that the process is clear and easy to replicate:³⁹

- 1 Formal warning to the individual in the presence of their parent.

- 2 Confirmation of the warning in writing to both the individual and the parent.
- 3 Review of all actions that had previously been taken against the individual with consideration of their effects/failure and whether anything else could be done to change the behaviour in question.
- 4 Once the decision to apply for the ASBO has been made, support and advice is provided for witnesses. This comes in the form of regular contact initiated and sustained by a specialist team who are also on hand at court.
- 5 Once the judgement to make an order is given, it is served immediately.
- 6 A report is published in the local press.
- 7 In some cases a leaflet is produced for residents in the affected community.

Problem-solving groups

Problem-solving groups have been used by many partnerships to ensure that ASBOs are a last resort. A recent study of a sample of ASBOs⁴⁰ found that one in eight of those awarded an ASBO had been evicted and many had long criminal histories, including periods in custody. In addition, many had mitigating factors, including drug and alcohol problems and difficulties with education and schooling.⁴¹ To ensure that everything possible has been done by partner agencies to address these mitigating factors before an ASBO is awarded, partners from a variety of agencies must be invited to these groups. The Home Office review suggests that as a means of avoiding further delays in addressing the anti-social behaviour in question, the focus of these groups should always be kept clear.

For example, Calderdale Metropolitan Borough Council's Anti-Social Behaviour Panel⁴² was formed in Autumn 2001. The panel is jointly chaired by the Council's Community Safety Manager and the Police Community Safety Co-ordinator. The panel includes the police, local housing providers, council education welfare team, the local authority environmental services as well as the legal department. The actions of the panel are monitored by West Yorkshire Police Authority, Pennine Housing 2000, the Probation Service and Calderdale Primary Care Trust.

Witnesses

Witness intimidation can be an obstacle in enforcement interventions. Recent research found that around six out of ten landlords stated that on at least one occasion witnesses in neighbourhood nuisance cases had been subject to intimidation. Of these, half had had to withdraw cases because of the lack of evidence.⁴³ To avoid inflating any existing problems, many areas have used witnesses who work, rather than live, within the affected area. Where this is not possible, support measures must be put in place before, during and after court proceedings.

Manchester City Council's work with courts⁴⁴ provides a good example of a witness protection scheme. The Council has negotiated with the courts to allow:

- access to a quiet room for witnesses
- a video link for juvenile witnesses
- a video link for perpetrators (if a journey from prison is deemed either too expensive or too traumatic for the witnesses)
- police presence for appropriate cases

Courts

In 56 per cent of ASBO cases reviewed by the Home Office,⁴⁵ more than three hearings were needed before a decision was made about the order. On average, it takes 13 weeks from the date of application to the date the ASBO is granted. Delays in court proceedings can be a result of issues such as difficulties in securing civil legal aid as well as confusion over the standard of proof required for such civil orders.⁴⁶

Breaches

Of the sample of ASBOs followed in a Home Office review,⁴⁷ 36 per cent of the orders were breached within nine months of being granted (some up to five times). For this reason, partnerships must look beyond the order being granted when planning their interventions.

Once an order is breached, the proceedings become

criminal, this has several implications for partnerships. These include:

- A breach must be proved beyond reasonable doubt as opposed to balance of probabilities. Partnerships must ensure that evidence gathered is of a sufficient standard.
- Once an order is breached and criminal proceedings begin, the order becomes the responsibility of the police. If the original order was the responsibility of the local authority, without involvement from or ownership by the police, it may suffer delays whilst all parties are informed of the past proceedings.

A summary of home office recommendations to improve the implementation of ASBOs

- Partnerships need to develop time-limited strategies to deal with anti-social behaviour.
- Partnerships should ensure that they are able to demonstrate their commitment to anti-social behaviour through strategies and subsequent outcomes.
- Outside agencies should be invited onto problem-solving groups, to ensure that mitigating factors have been addressed.
- Partnerships should have procedures in place to ensure ASBOs are enforced and breaches are prosecuted.
- Registered social landlords and the British Transport Police should be given powers to deal with anti-social behaviour.
- Partnerships and courts need to develop a two-way understanding. This may involve training as well as feedback.
- Delays relating to obtaining civil legal aid should be addressed.
- Partnerships must develop strategies to protect witnesses both before, during and after the order is granted.
- Attention should be given to monitoring the use and effectiveness of ASBOs and other anti-social behaviour initiatives.

Other interventions that use enforcement to address anti-social behaviour

Fixed penalty fines

On-the-spot fines for anti-social behaviour were introduced in three pilot police forces, beginning 12 August 2002. The three police forces – Essex, Croydon and the West Midlands – will be able to use fixed penalty fines of either £40 or £80 for offences such as:

- using threatening words or behaviour likely to cause alarm, harassment or distress, under section 5 of the Public Order Act 1996 (£80 fine)
- disorderly behaviour while drunk in a public place, under section 91 of the Criminal Justice Act 1967 (£40 fine)

The payment of the penalty involves no admission of guilt or a record of a criminal conviction. If, however, the offender opts for a trial or refuses to pay the fine, they risk conviction and the possibility of a fine up to one and a half times that of the original penalty.

As with other offences for which fixed penalty notices are applied (for example parking offences, speeding, littering and dog fouling), the punishment is fixed. No account is taken of the offenders' ability to pay or whether this is the most appropriate course of action.

Introductory and starter tenancies

Following the introduction of the Housing Act in 1996, the Housing Corporation gave permission for two registered social landlords to pilot the use of assured shorthold tenancies as starter tenancies. The results of a subsequent evaluation revealed that levels of anti-social behaviour reduced in both pilot areas and demand for housing increased.⁴⁸

Rapid response measures

The existence of litter, graffiti and vandalism can act as a catalyst for more anti-social behaviour. An environment which shows signs of litter, graffiti and vandalism can become an easy target for more anti-social behaviour. As a means of addressing this contagious effect, many partnerships have introduced initiatives that enhance the speed at which litter, graffiti or vandalism can be removed from an area.

Wakefield Metropolitan District Council's Abandoned Vehicles Initiative provides an example of this. West Yorkshire Police have seconded a police officer to work with Wakefield Metropolitan District Council's Cleansing Department to speed up the time it takes to remove vehicles that are abandoned around the district. Although the council has a statutory duty to dispose of abandoned vehicles, the process faces substantial delays if the police are not involved. Whilst the process of establishing who is the registered owner of the vehicle could take the local authority up to three months, access to the Police National Computer means that the police can trace the owner within seconds. The introduction of this scheme has allowed the process of disposing of abandoned vehicles to be speeded up dramatically.

Tackling anti-social behaviour through prevention

A recent Home Office review of ASBOs⁵⁰ found that in 60 per cent of cases (where information was available), there was some mitigating factor involved in the offender's anti-social behaviour. These included drug and alcohol abuse, learning disabilities and school exclusions; and in one case the subject of the ASBO was profoundly deaf. These findings were also supported by Hunter and Nixon (2002), who found that more than two-thirds of defendants being threatened with eviction from social housing, were described by housing officers as having 'particular vulnerabilities or special needs'.⁵¹ (See also Table 1.)

Bearing in mind that in such a high percentage of orders the recipient has underlying problems that are often causing the behaviour, authorities need to consider whether prohibitive measures, such as ASBOs, are an appropriate form of intervention. The requirements of an

Table 1 **Underlying problems stated in case files**⁵²

Factor	Percentage of cases
Drug abuse	18 per cent
Temporary/permanent school exclusion	17 per cent
Alcohol abuse	17 per cent
Eviction	13 per cent
Learning disabilities	9 per cent

ASBO can only be negative: for example prohibiting the recipient from entering a certain area or from behaving in a certain manner. ASBOs cannot order an individual to take positive steps such as attending a drug treatment programme. If an offender is acting in an anti-social manner due to factors such as drug misuse, learning difficulties or alcohol misuse, it is debatable whether ordering them to stop doing something will ever solve the problem.

Enforcement interventions such as ASBOs or fixed penalty fines are a reactive measure in dealing with anti-social behaviour. Preventative measures of reducing anti-social behaviour involve addressing the 'risk factors' that predict likelihood of involvement in anti-social behaviour, before that behaviour begins. These might include drug or alcohol misuse, exclusion from school, parental criminality, poor parental supervision, unemployment or homelessness.

The rest of this section summarises some examples of preventative measures that have been put in place in local areas to tackle anti-social behaviour.

Acceptable Behaviour Contracts (ABCs), Parental Control Agreements (PCAs) and Agreements in Schools⁵³

The first ever ABCs were introduced by the London Borough of Islington in 1999. ABCs generally apply to young people but they can be adapted for use with adults. The whole family is included in the process of designing the contract, which is then signed in front of the family at the housing office, once four or five

conditions have been agreed.

The borough has signed 140 ABCs in total and has 30 'live' contracts at present.

PCAs are identical to ABCs except they are for cases of anti-social behaviour by children under 10 years old. In this instance, the parents rather than the child sign the agreement.

Islington Council's housing department has targets for each area office of eight live ABCs or PCAs at any one time. These can be for any tenure and encourage partnership working with RSLs. The policing plan for Islington has a target of 40 'live' contracts.

This partnership have shown innovation by seconding an officer from the Community Safety Partnership Unit to the Anti-social Behaviour Team one day a week, as well as through the funding of a research and development officer post to ensure ABCs are monitored and data are updated.

As well as ABCs and PCAs, Islington is also piloting a scheme within one local school to develop Agreements in School. These are developed in much the same way, and apply to the child's, or the parents', behaviour within school. The conditions within this contract can be positive as well as negative. As well as the threat of enforcement, recipients can be encouraged through incentives such as youth activities throughout the school holidays.

Mentoring

The Bridges to Inclusion Programme⁵⁴ was set up by Knowsley Metropolitan Borough Council to reduce offending by vulnerable young people.

The programme links community mentors (recruited from the local community, Knowsley Borough Council and local businesses) with young people who have been referred through the Youth Offending Team, local schools, education welfare team, social services, children's home and the council's Youth First Programme. Goals are set in three key areas. These are habits (eg drugs or violence), education, training and employment and relationships (eg parents, teachers and peers).

Diversions activities

The London Borough of Tower Hamlets Graffiti Project⁵⁵ has been operational since 1997. It involves offering incentives such as abseiling and rock climbing to those who participate in removing graffiti from selected areas. The project employs a full time project co-ordinator who has made links with local agencies to develop sound engineering and video workshops, drama classes and IT training.

Tackling anti-social behaviour through education

Working with excluded children

The Middlesborough Education Network⁵⁶ works with pupils in years 10 and 11 who have either been excluded or who have experienced difficulties within school. The Network offers individually designed courses to suit the needs of individual students. This might involve hairdressing, art or sport. There is a wide range of courses available and most are accredited through nationally recognised awarding bodies.

Informal educational activities

The Lincolnshire County Council Escape Project⁵⁷ aims to involve 11–16 year olds in a range of informal educational opportunities that are both challenging and fun. The programme promotes personal, social and skill development through a range of activities such as music workshops, literacy development, song, poetry, sport, dance, cooking, art and health and environmental awareness.

More than 1,500 young people took part in the scheme in the year 2000. Of those who attended the scheme, 72 per cent expressed the opinion that the course had 'kept them out of trouble'. Crime statistics supported this finding, showing a 62 per cent fall in crime committed by young persons throughout the period in which the scheme took place.

Conclusions

Although the lack of independent evaluation of schemes to reduce anti-social behaviour prevent any conclusions being made as to what exactly works, it is clear that a focus upon one element of intervention at the expense of others can only result in a quick fix at the expense of any long-term solutions. Partners need to address anti-social behaviour using an holistic approach that includes enforcement, prevention and education.

Bibliography

- Aldbourn Associates (1993) *The Management of Neighbourhood Complaints in Social Housing*, Aldbourn Associates
- Allen, C and Sprigings, N (1999) *Managing Risk Together*, Salford Housing and Urban Studies Unit, University of Salford
- Brand, S and Price, R (2000) *The Economic and Social Costs of Crime (Home Office Research Study 217)*, Home Office
- Budd, T and Sims, L (2001) *Anti-social behaviour and disorder: findings from the 2000 British Crime Survey (Home Office Research Findings 145)*, Home Office
- Campbell, S (2002a) *Implementing Anti-social Behaviour Orders: messages for practitioners (Home Office Research Findings 160)*, Home Office
- Campbell, S (2002b) *A Review of Anti-social Behaviour Orders (Home Office Research Study 236)*, Home Office
- DETR (2000) *Survey of English housing: preliminary results (Housing Statistics No. 7, 1999/00)*, DETR
- Finnie, W (1973) 'Field experiments in Litter Control', *Environment and Behaviour* 5, pp. 123–144
- Hope, T and Hough, M (1988) 'Area, crime, and incivility: a profile from the British Crime Survey', in Hope and Shaw (eds.) *Communities and Crime Reduction*, HMSO, pp 30–47
- Hough, M (1995) *Anxiety about crime: findings from the 1994 British Crime Survey (Home Office Research Study 147)*, Home Office.

Housing Corporation (1999) Starter and Introductory Tenancies: an evaluation (Housing Corporation Research Report 36), Housing Corporation

Hunter, C and Nixon, J (2002) 'Anti-social behaviour and housing', Safer Society Spring 2002

Kershaw, C et al. (2001) The 2001 British Crime Survey, Home Office

Local Government Association (2002) Tackling Anti-Social Behaviour – Information and Case Studies about Local Authority Work (LGA Research Briefing 16), LGA Publications

Nixon, J, Hunter, C and Shayer, S (1999) The Use of Legal Remedies by Social Landlords to Deal with Neighbour Nuisance, Sheffield Hallam University

Skogan, W (1990) Disorder and Decline – Crime and the Spiral of Decay in American Neighbourhoods, University of California Press

Social Exclusion Unit (2000) National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal – Report of Policy Action Team 8: Anti-Social Behaviour, SEU

Wilson, JQ and Kelling, G (1982) 'Broken Windows', The Atlantic Monthly, February, pp. 46–52

Zimbardo, P (1970) 'The Human Choice: individuation, reason and order versus deindividuation, impulse and chaos', in Arnold and Levine (eds.) Nebraska Symposium on Motivation 1969, University of Nebraska Press, pp. 237–307

Footnotes

- 1 Budd and Sims (2001)
- 2 Budd and Sims (2001)
- 3 www.crimereduction.gov.uk ASBO Statistics to March 2002
- 4 Campbell (2002a)
- 5 Campbell (2002b). A sample of 40 ASBOs was followed up in more detail.
- 6 Campbell (2002b)
- 7 Campbell (2002a)

8 Campbell (2002b)

9 LGA (2002)

10 LGA (2002)

11 For example, a recent LGA publication lists case studies of work being carried out by local authorities to address anti-social behaviour. Many examples simply list interventions such as CCTV, proof of age cards and summer schemes without identifying how they address anti-social behaviour, and whether or not they actually work.

12 Hunter and Nixon (2002)

13 Nixon et al. (1999)

14 Budd and Sims (2001)

15 DETR (2000)

16 Kershaw et al. (2001)

17 Crime and Disorder Act 1998, Section 1 (1) (a)

18 Campbell (2002b)

19 Wakefield Metropolitan District Council created an Anti-Social Behaviour Task Group whose initial task was to create a shared locally defined definition of anti-social behaviour.

20 Budd and Sims (2001)

21 Skogan (1990) p.39

22 Zimbardo (1970) purposely abandoned similar cars in New York City. One car was deliberately vandalised before being abandoned, the other was not. The car which was already vandalised was rapidly destroyed by vandals, whilst the destruction of the unspoiled car took much longer. Finnie (1973) found that, controlling for other factors, the presence of debris in an area seems to stimulate further 'trashing'.

23 Wilson and Kelling (1982)

24 Wilson and Kelling (1982)

25 Budd and Sims (2001)

26 Skogan (1990) found that where disorder was high, people were less likely to feel safe. Hough (1995) found that respondent's perceptions of disorder were predictive of concern about crime in general, independent of other factors (including actual experience of crime).

- 27 Skogan (1990) found that in areas where disorder was highest, fewer people reported engaging in co-operative informal crime prevention (such as asking a neighbour to watch the house whilst they were away). Skogan also found that in areas of high disorder, residents were more likely to perceive their neighbourhood as a place where 'people go their own way' as opposed to 'people help one other'. As well as influencing solidarity and informal surveillance, areas with high levels of disorder also had the lowest levels of crime prevention activity.
- 28 Skogan (1990) found that in areas with high levels of disorder, residents were less satisfied with or committed to, the area in which they lived. Hope and Hough (1988) found that disorder was related to dissatisfaction and plans to move.
- 29 Brand and Price (2000) estimate the cost of an individual incident of criminal damage to be £510. Criminal Damage against the commercial or public sector is estimated at £890 per incident.
- 30 SEU (2000). Bradford Local Authority estimate that vandalism to local authority owned property in 1998-99 cost £895,593.
- 31 Aldbourne Associates (1993) found that 20 per cent of social landlords' housing management time was spent on dealing with complaints about neighbours' behaviour.
- 32 Allen and Sprigings (1999). Leeds Local Authority estimated the costs of anti-social behaviour to be between £3 million and £5million a year.
- 33 Nixon et al. (1999) found that around half of social landlords exclude people from their waiting lists on the grounds of their previous involvement with neighbour nuisance.
- 34 As well as vehicles, machinery or equipment in the street.
- 35 Campbell (2002b) p.2
- 36 The Police Reform Bill, which received Royal Assent on 25 July 2002, will allow RSLs and the British Transport Police to apply for ASBOs (although they will have to consult with the police and local authority before doing so). It will also extend the geographical area that an ASBO can cover, as well as introducing Interim ASBOs. The provisions of the Act will be brought in in stages, commencing in Autumn 2002. At this stage, there is no indication as to when the changes related to ASBOs will be introduced.
- 37 Campbell (2002b)
- 38 LGA (2002)
- 39 LGA (2002)
- 40 Campbell (2002a)
- 41 Campbell (2002a)
- 42 LGA (2002)
- 43 Nixon et al. (1999)
- 44 LGA (2002)
- 45 Campbell (2002b)
- 46 In civil cases, evidence is not required to the standard of criminal cases.
- 47 Campbell (2002b)
- 48 Housing Corporation (1999)
- 49 Taken from West Yorkshire Police Website: www.westyorkshire.police.uk
- 50 Campbell (2002b)
- 51 Hunter and Nixon (2002)
- 52 Campbell (2002b) p.18
- 53 LGA (2002)
- 54 LGA (2002)
- 55 LGA (2002)
- 56 LGA (2002)
- 57 LGA (2002)