

Anti-Social Behaviour

Partnerships are now required to include a strategy for tackling ASB as part of their overall strategy and will therefore need to include an audit of the extent of local problems and how they intend dealing with them. Issues of local environmental quality should be included as part of this process.

Collecting data on ASB is not straightforward. Data relating to ASB are collected by a variety of agencies including the police, environmental health, housing departments and the fire service so partnerships will need to contact various organisations.

Defining anti-social behaviour

The Anti-Social Behaviour Research Team in the Home Office Research Development and Statistics Directorate (RDS) has developed a typology of anti-social behaviours. This was used to categorise behaviours recorded in the ASBU one-day count of reports of anti-social behaviour. Details of the one-day count are available at www.homeoffice.gov.uk/crimpol/antisocialbehaviour/daycount/index.html. The research team is now conducting a study exploring how Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRPs) and local services define and measure anti-social behaviour, in particular street drinking and begging.

Prior to publication of an RDS report drawing on this research, information is presented below on definitions and measurement of anti-social behaviour.

– Definitions of anti-social behaviour

The subjective nature of the concept makes it difficult to identify a single definition of anti-social behaviour. A range of approaches to defining anti-social behaviour are set out below.

As part of the anti-social behaviour elements of audits and strategies, CDRPs should address issues of local environmental quality like graffiti, litter, flytipping, and abandoned cars, as appropriate in each local content.

– The Crime and Disorder Act definition (1998)

A widely used definition of anti-social behaviour is the definition contained in the Crime & Disorder Act (1998):

‘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 as (the defendant).’

The definition is broad and allows for a range of activities to be included within it. This is appropriate given that people’s understanding of anti-social is based on individual perception and can therefore encompass a range of behaviours.

– **Local partnership definitions**

It may be useful to adapt or extend the Crime and Disorder Act definition to reflect the local approach to tackling anti-social behaviour. For instance it may be helpful to identify a list of behaviours that are a particular problem within a local area, as anti-social behaviour problems can be highly localised. RDS have developed a typology of behaviours that practitioners can draw from.

– **RDS typology of anti-social behaviour**

Table 1 below sets out a typology of anti-social behaviour. The purpose of this is to provide a practical framework and guide to the range of behaviours that are widely accepted to be anti-social. The list of behaviours are divided into four core categories according to whether they occur in a public space, whether they have a direct or indirect victim and whether the behaviour impacts on the environment.

Table 1 RDS typology of anti-social behaviour

Misuse of public space	Disregard for community / personal wellbeing	Acts directed at people	Environmental damage
Drug / substance misuse & dealing <i>Taking drugs</i> <i>Sniffing volatile substances</i> <i>Discarding needles paraphernalia</i> <i>Crack houses</i> <i>Presence of dealers or users</i> Street drinking Begging Prostitution <i>Soliciting</i> <i>Cards in phone boxes</i> <i>Discarded condoms</i> Kerb crawling <i>Loitering</i> <i>Pestering residents</i> Sexual acts <i>Inappropriate sexual conduct</i> <i>Indecent exposure</i> Abandoned cars Vehicle related nuisance & inappropriate vehicle use <i>Inconvenient / illegal</i>	Noise <i>Noisy neighbours</i> <i>Noisy cars / motorbikes</i> <i>Loud music</i> <i>Alarms (persistent ringing / malfunction)</i> <i>Noise from pubs / clubs</i> <i>Noise from business / industry</i> Rowdy behaviour <i>Shouting & swearing</i> <i>Fighting</i> <i>Drunken behaviour</i> <i>Hooliganism / loutish behaviour</i> Nuisance behaviour <i>Urinating in public</i> <i>Setting fires (not directed at specific persons or property)</i> <i>Inappropriate use of fireworks</i> <i>Throwing missiles</i> <i>Climbing on buildings</i> <i>Impeding access to communal areas</i> <i>Games in restricted / inappropriate areas</i> <i>Misuse of air guns</i> <i>Letting down tyres</i> Hoax calls False calls to	Intimidation / harassment <i>Groups or individuals making threats</i> <i>Verbal abuse</i> <i>Bullying</i> <i>Following people</i> <i>Pestering people</i> <i>Voyeurism</i> <i>Sending nasty / offensive letters</i> <i>Obscene / nuisance phone calls</i> <i>Menacing gestures</i> Can be on the grounds of: <i>Race</i> <i>Sexual orientation</i> <i>Gender</i> <i>Religion</i> <i>Disability</i> <i>Age</i>	Criminal damage / vandalism <i>Graffiti</i> <i>Damage to bus shelters</i> <i>Damage to phone kiosks</i> <i>Damage to street furniture</i> <i>Damage to buildings</i> <i>Damage to trees / plants / hedges</i> Litter / rubbish <i>Dropping litter</i> <i>Dumping rubbish</i> <i>Fly-tipping</i> <i>Fly-posting</i>

Misuse of public space	Disregard for community / personal wellbeing	Acts directed at people	Environmental damage
<i>parking</i> <i>Car repairs on the street / in gardens</i> <i>Setting vehicles alight</i> <i>Joyriding</i> <i>Racing cars</i> <i>Off road motorcycling</i> <i>Cycling / skateboarding in pedestrian areas / footpaths</i>	emergency services Animal related problems <i>Uncontrolled animals</i>		

Source: Research Development and Statistics Directorate

– **Using the typology**

The typology of anti-social behaviour is not intended to be a definite list of all anti-social behaviour. People’s perception of anti-social behaviour is subjective and influenced by local context (Nixon et al 2003). As a result there will always be certain behaviours that are considered anti-social by some and not others. In recognition of this the typology should only be used as a guide to help anti-social behaviour reduction practitioners decide which behaviours to focus upon and tackle locally.

Measuring anti-social behaviour

– **Collecting data on reports of anti-social behaviour**

A key and often readily available source of data on local anti-social behaviour problems is reports of anti-social behaviour received from the public by local service providers and businesses. The Home Office Anti-Social Behaviour Unit conducted a count of all reports of anti-social behaviour in England and Wales recorded on one day. Details of this count and the data collected are provided in Box 1 below. This exercise has been useful in that it has provided a snap shot of reported anti-social behaviour nationally. It has also provided information on the type of report data collected by local services.

Box 1 THE ONE DAY COUNT OF REPORTED ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIOUR

Objectives and Methodology

The aim of the one-day count was to obtain a snapshot of reported anti-social behaviour in order to understand better how anti-social behaviour impacts on members of the public and on key service providers. Organisations that receive direct, first hand reports of anti-social behaviour were asked to count the number of reports that they received between 00.01 and 24.00 on Wednesday 10th September and record them in one of 13 categories of anti-social behaviour. To guide them, participants were provided with a one-page summary of the count and the typology of anti-social behaviour.

The key organisations asked to participate in the exercise were public services and local authorities. Agencies representing the Police, Fire Service and local authorities were asked to distribute information about the count to their members. Additionally, the Crime and Disorder Partnerships (CDRPs) were approached and asked to encourage appropriate organisations in their area to take part.

Results

In total 66,107 reports of anti-social behaviour were made to participating organisations on the day of the count¹. More than 1,500 organisations took part and information was received from every Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership area in England and Wales.

Behaviours reported within the one-day count of anti-social behaviour

• Drug/substance misuse and drug dealing	2920
• Street drinking and begging	3239
• Prostitution, kerb crawling and other sexual acts	1011
• Vehicle related nuisance and inappropriate vehicle use	7782
• Intimidation and harassment	5415
• Noise	5374
• Rowdy behaviour	5339
• Nuisance behaviour	7660
• Hoax calls	1286
• Animal related problems	2546
• Abandoned vehicles	4994
• Criminal damage/vandalism	7855
• Litter/rubbish	10686
• TOTAL	66107

How the information can and can't be used

The results of the one-day count provide a useful snapshot of the problem anti-social behaviour represents daily for individuals, communities and businesses and the impact anti-social behaviour has on service providers. However, the number and source of returns was not consistent across CDRPs and the data should not be used to make comparisons between areas. In some areas a high number of organisations participated in the exercise while in other areas only a handful of organisations took part. Also, the likelihood of anti-social behaviour being reported in some areas may be higher than in others.

¹ 66,107 reports were reported to the Home Office before the specified deadline. A further 5,973 reports were received after this cut-off date, to bring the final total to 72,080. However, because the figure of 66,107 was used at the launch of the Anti-Social Behaviour Unit's Action Plan on 14th October 2004, and 'costed' using the methodology designed by the London School of Economics, it is this figure that is used for ease and consistency.

The cost of anti-social behaviour

The results of the count were used to estimate the cost to agencies of dealing with reports of anti-social behaviour. The numbers of reports of each type of anti-social behaviour counted were multiplied by estimates of unit cost of a report. These unit costs were generated, where possible, from the existing literature. Where they did not exist, a framework created by the London School of Economics (LSE) provided an estimate of reasonable cost, based on their literature review and advice from practitioners. To arrive at an annual amount, the figures were multiplied by 250 (the number of working days in a year). Anti-social behaviour recorded on the day of the count cost agencies in England and Wales at least £13,500 m; this equates to around £3.375bn a year. CDRPs may wish to use this approach to approximate the cost of anti-social behaviour within their area. It should be borne in mind that the unit costs were calculated on the basis of limited evidence and do not include the 'social' costs of anti-social behaviour suffered by victims and communities.

Table 2 Day count responses by organisation

Reports of Anti-Social Behaviour Recorded in England and Wales on 10th September 2003

Reporting agency	Type of ASB													Total reports
	Drugs etc	Street drinking etc	Prostituti on etc	Vehicle nuisance	Abandoned vehicles	Noise	Rowdy behaviour	Nuisance behaviour	Hoax calls	Animal problems	Intimida tion etc	Criminal damage	Litter	
National Government	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	4	10
CDRP	57	23	17	109	100	95	66	131	25	63	80	77	239	1082
Police	714	600	248	2321	1500	1301	1901	2675	889	465	2183	2327	716	17840
Fire	14	58	14	93	44	59	35	163	85	0	17	109	113	802
Health	80	40	20	85	20	89	58	55	13	22	77	59	155	773
Local Authority: Environmental Health	87	179	42	132	299	272	47	119	2	231	110	512	1190	3222
Local Authority: Social Services	60	45	4	100	37	97	110	73	9	25	100	100	121	887
Local Authority: Education	42	68	8	238	65	89	327	340	6	72	356	244	824	2679
Local Authority: Housing	274	181	77	412	227	449	298	619	12	207	359	492	708	4319
Housing Association	288	118	76	362	321	543	272	705	17	200	411	391	553	4257
Voluntary Organisation	59	224	34	113	29	125	88	118	16	25	108	134	184	1257
Business	65	191	37	304	65	88	107	186	3	71	94	393	440	2042
Local Authority: Advice	5	1	0	51	2	13	12	9	1	2	6	5	15	122
Wardens	150	328	103	527	146	176	184	253	24	136	160	577	656	3420
Local Authority: General	1014	1153	326	2921	2132	1969	1797	2177	178	1023	1328	2394	4763	23179
British Transport Police	8	29	5	9	6	4	32	35	6	1	17	39	2	193
National Probation Service	3	1	0	1	1	5	5	2	0	1	9	2	3	33
Total reports	2920	3239	1011	7782	4994	5374	5339	7660	1286	2546	5415	7855	10686	66107

The one day count has been useful in that it has enabled the identification of the types of services that record reports of anti-social behaviour. Table 2 sets out the reports received by behaviour and service provider, giving an indication of potential sources of report data at the local level.

Limitations of anti-social behaviour report data

There are a number of issues associated with the data collated through a one-off or regular collection of report data collected by local services. These include:

- A count of reports cannot identify the number of anti-social behaviour incidents occurring in an area.
- The exercise can only provide information on anti-social behaviour that is reported. It may therefore be skewed towards behaviour that is witnessed or experienced by people who would choose to make a report. It is recognised that a large proportion of anti-social behaviour goes unreported due to apathy, tolerance of anti-social behaviour or fear of revenge amongst members of the public, or because people do not know where to report anti-social behaviour.
- The data may contain false reports either made intentionally against an individual or due to a misinterpretation of behaviour.
- It may be difficult to get information on specific types of behaviour, such as verbal abuse and menacing gestures, as they are often part of broader behaviours, e.g. harassment, which are the acts more likely to be recorded.
- The same report may be recorded by more than one service leading to the problem of double counting. A noise nuisance complaint by a tenant could, for example, be logged by a Housing Department and then be passed for action to the Environmental Protection Team, who may also record the report. There is also a possibility that any one incident could be reported more than once.

These limitations do not mean that the data is not useful or invalid, just that these issues need to be considered when using and interpreting the data.

Community surveys and audits

An audit or survey within the community can provide information on what anti-social behaviour is occurring and identify which behaviours are of specific concern to residents. There are a number of on-going surveys, which provide information on people's understanding and perception of anti-social behaviour in their local area.

Examples

British Crime Survey

- The British Crime Survey (BCS) is a face to face continuous survey of around 40,000 adults living in private households, which asks respondents about their experience of victimisation in the previous 12 months.

- As well as the main crime counting element, a number of other crime-related issues, including respondents' perception of anti-social behaviour, are covered.
- The survey examines public perception of seven anti-social behaviours: noisy neighbours or loud parties; teenagers hanging around on the streets; rubbish, or litter lying around; vandalism, graffiti, and other deliberate damage to property; people being attacked or harassed because of the colour of their skin, ethnic origin or religion; people dealing drugs; people being drunk or rowdy in public places.
- Questions have been introduced on people's experience of anti-social behaviour. However, these questions are only asked in a sample of interviews and, due to the size of the sample, the results will only be available at a national level.
- The size of the sample used in the BCS means that data are only reliable down to Police Force Area level, and cannot provide evidence at CDRP level. However, partnerships may want to replicate the BCS questions in a local survey for comparison purposes.
- The 2001/02 BCS questionnaire and data can be found at the UK Data Archive (www.data-archive.ac.uk).

Local Government User Satisfaction Survey

- The Local Government User Satisfaction Survey (LGUSS) is another public attitude survey conducted every three years by Local Authorities.
- Respondents to the survey are randomly selected and asked to complete a questionnaire by post. It includes questions that are comparable with the BCS questions on perception of anti-social behaviour.
- Respondents to the 2003 survey were asked how much of a problem they think the following behaviours are in their local area:
 - Noisy neighbours or loud parties
 - Teenagers hanging around in the streets
 - Vandalism, graffiti and other deliberate damage to property or vehicles
 - People being attacked because of their skin colour, ethnic origin or religion
 - People using or dealing drugs
 - People being drunk or rowdy in public places
 - People sleeping rough on the streets or in other public places
 - Rubbish and litter lying around
 - Abandoned or burnt out cars
- Further information on the LGUSS can be obtained from the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (<http://www.odpm.gov.uk>).
- The limitations of this survey are that it is only carried out every three years and is a postal survey. Postal surveys tend to have lower response rates than interview based questionnaires. The response rate to the 2000/01 LGUSS, for example, was 56% compared to a 74% response rate for the 2002/03 BCS. The results are therefore skewed towards the experiences of those who choose to respond.

– Conducting local surveys

Local areas may wish to consider conducting their own local surveys or community audits of perceptions and experience of anti-social behaviour.

– **Community Audits**

- Businesses and residents within an area can be asked to record the number of anti-social acts they witness in the locality each week or month.
- The limitations of this approach are that the likelihood of securing a representative sample to participate in the audit is limited. The data will therefore be skewed towards acts, which are witnessed or experienced by individuals who choose to take part and which are perceived by participants to be anti-social acts.
- The success of the approach is also dependent on participants remembering to record events on an ongoing basis

– **Considerations for conducting local community surveys**

- Postal surveys are cheaper than those conducted face to face or by telephone, however, they tend to have a lower response rate, which means the data obtained is less reliable.
- When choosing what type of survey to conduct the cost of the exercise needs to be considered against the relative merits of the methods employed.
- Consideration needs to be given to where a survey is conducted depending on the type of information required. For example, if information is required on perceptions of street activities such as street drinking and begging it may be sensible to conduct a survey in areas where these activities are known to occur e.g. the city centre.
- It is also useful to consider whether a survey should only involve residents or whether the perceptions of visitors, workers and other users of the area should also be obtained as this may influence the type of survey used.
- Surveys can ask questions about perceptions of anti-social problems or experience. The relationship between perceptions and experience of or incidence of anti-social behaviour is not fully understood. There is likely to be a time lag between any change in incidence of anti-social behaviour and the public perceptions of it. There are also likely to be other factors that influence changes in perceptions such as crime levels and media reporting

The following publication provides useful guidance on survey methods.

- Lynn P. and Thomas R. (1995) *A Guide to Designing, Commissioning and Analysing Surveys* London: National Audit Office

Specific advice on carrying out community surveys and audits covering issues of environmental asb can be found in: [DN: Gail – I can get you some references early next week]

– **Police recorded crime figures**

- Recorded crime figures provide information on offences recorded by the police and can be used to measure low-level crimes, which are also classed as anti-social behaviour.

- The advantage of recorded crime data is that they are easily available and can provide information at local level.
- The disadvantages of this approach are that recorded crime figures only relate to acts which have been reported or witnessed by the police and which have resulted in a caution or conviction.
- Further it only measures a subset of anti-social behaviour, which is biased towards 'upper end' anti-social activity and the figures only relate to incidents. It therefore provides an under-estimate of anti-social behaviour.

– **CCTV**

- CCTV can be used to monitor the level and type of anti-social behaviour or the activities of specific individuals in areas where anti-social behaviour is known to occur.
- CCTV footage can be used to support ASBO applications or alternative action against individuals.
- The limitations of CCTV are that it can only record anti-social behaviour where the system is operational and where anti-social behaviour occurs in sight of a camera. Anecdotal evidence suggests that some perpetrators of anti-social behaviour engage in anti-social behaviour out of sight of CCTV to prevent their actions being monitored

– **Street audits**

- Street audits are useful for measuring specific types of behaviour such as begging and street drinking.
- They can be used to count either the number of people engaging in these activities or the number of incidents witnessed in an area at a particular time.
- In addition to determining the extent of a problem they can be used to collect information on individuals engaging in anti-social behaviour.
- A key thing to consider when conducting a street audit is when to undertake the exercise as the levels of anti-social behaviour in an area are likely to differ at different times of the day and week.
- Thought should be given to the route followed during the audit to ensure it incorporates the main areas where anti-social behaviour occurs.
- It is also necessary to consider what data should be collected. Is only the number of street drinkers and beggars needed or is additional information about these individuals required?
- Street audits can be resource intensive.
- It is also possible to miss people who should be counted if for example they move while the exercise is taking place or are located in a place where they are not easily visible to those conducting the count.
- Street audits can only measure the number of beggars or street drinkers in a defined area. It is more difficult to determine whether a problem has moved, or been displaced, to an area falling outside the geographical boundaries of the count.

– **Visual audits**

- Visual audits can be used to identify observable signs of anti-social behaviour within an area.

- The benefits of visual audits are that they record incidents rather than reports of anti-social behaviour and are more objective than measures based on public perception. They are, however, resource intensive and are probably best suited to the measurement of physical disorder e.g. graffiti, abandoned vehicles and rubbish than alternative types of anti-social behaviour.
- Further, training is likely to be necessary to ensure that all observers engaged in the audit define and record incidents in the same way.

- **Further Information**

Visit the ASB website, [Anti- Social Behaviour](#).

The GOWM/NYA publication [Best Behaviour: Shared Learning from the West Midlands on Anti-Social Behaviour and Young People](#) contains information on shared learning regarding ASB and young people in the region.

NACRO have produced relevant guidance on ASB [Tackling Anti-Social Behaviour: what really works?](#)

Nixon, J., Blandy, S., Hunter, C., Jones, A. and Reeve, K. (2003) [Developing Good Practice in Tackling Anti-Social Behaviour in Mixed Tenure Areas](#). Sheffield: Sheffield Hallam University.

Alcohol related crime and disorder data

The Government's Alcohol Harm Reduction Strategy (AHRS) for England for tackling the harms and costs of alcohol misuse was published on 15 March 2004. Alongside the AHRS the Home Office published a report Alcohol audits, strategies and initiatives: lessons from Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships which explores how local concern about alcohol-related crime and disorder is implemented in practice by examining how it is identified, prioritised and tackled at a local level. The report presents information on how some local areas are tackling some of the negative aspects of the night-time economy (NTE).

One of the commitments in the AHRS was to identify and spread good practice in local strategies and tactics which tackle alcohol-related violence. On the 29th April 2004 the Police Standards Unit in the Home Office published "Violent Crime - Tackling Violent Crime in the Night-Time Economy - Guidelines and Tactical Options". This set out specific measures that police forces and CDRPs could use to intensify action to reduce violent crime in the NTE. Police forces and CDRPs need to use the full range of legislative and other tactical options to tackle alcohol-related crime and disorder and to prevent such violence.

On the 29th April 2004 it was also announced that this summer the Home Office Police Standards Unit and ACPO would be spearheading a robust enforcement campaign in towns and cities across the country, to cut alcohol fuelled violence and target the irresponsible few who encourage underage and binge drinking. Development of this campaign is being taken forward with other partner agencies.

On the 20th May 2004 the Prime Minister spoke at an alcohol seminar which included key players in the alcohol industry and the voluntary sector. He said it was vital that the industry engage in partnership working to help to reduce alcohol fuelled violence

- **Potential Data Sources**

For guidance on how best to gather and utilise data on alcohol related crime and disorder see [Guidance for Local Partnerships on Alcohol Related Crime and Disorder Data](#). This focuses on the collection and analysis of alcohol-related crime and disorder data within the context of conducting audits under the terms of the 1998 Crime and Disorder Act.

- **Further information**

Alcohol Related Crime Toolkit - www.crimereduction.gov.uk/toolkits/ar00.htm

Home Office (2004) Alcohol audits, strategies and initiatives: lessons from Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships
www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs04/dpr20.pdf

Home Office (2004) Violent Crime - Tackling Violent Crime in the Night-Time Economy - Guidelines and Tactical Options
www.policereform.gov.uk/psu/

Prime Minister's Strategy Unit (2004) – Alcohol Harm Reduction Strategy for England www.number-10.gov.uk/output/Page3669.asp

Domestic violence

Information on domestic violence may not be as readily available as for other crime types. The key reasons for this are:

- ✓ Under-reporting. Only 12% of incidents are reported to the police and therefore police data alone cannot be relied upon to provide a full picture.
- ✓ Lack of data collection. Many agencies do not regularly collect information on the number of cases where domestic violence is an issue.
- ✓ Where agencies do collect data, it has been shown that there is a significant level of under recording.
- ✓ Domestic violence is not a recorded offence type - so no crime data published.
- ✓ Because of the personal and hidden nature of domestic violence, public surveys - whatever their methodology - will not reveal the true extent of domestic violence.

- **Potential Data sources**

Partnerships may wish to investigate the following data sources:

The main source of data on domestic violence is from the police.

As the majority of incidents are not reported, it is also important to gather information from other sources. A whole range of agencies will come into contact with victims of domestic violence:

- ✓ Health professionals
- ✓ Schools
- ✓ Housing services
- ✓ Social services
- ✓ Voluntary sector
- ✓ Specialist support projects
- ✓ Victim support
- ✓ Relate
- ✓ Family law solicitors
- ✓ Civil courts
- ✓ Criminal justice services

These agencies are potential sources of information about prevalence, incidence, patterns of help seeking and need. Some agencies will record the number of victims either by systematically collecting information and entering it onto a database or by recording information in case files.

It is possible to implement a multi-agency data collection system where each agency will systematically record information - this will provide an overview of the number of victims seeking help, help seeking patterns, the type of support which is received and is needed and will also highlight areas for improvement. Practical advice about how best to manage domestic violence data and about maximising the use of data that has been collected can be found on the [Crime Reduction website](#).

Another option is to conduct a "Day to Count" (or, indeed, a "Week to Count", or a "Month to Count". Generally the longer the data collection period the better). This is where all relevant partner agencies are asked to collect information on domestic violence for the relevant period of time. This method will provide a snapshot of help seeking and referrals, and can potentially provide useful information without placing too much burden on service providers. A "Day to Count" of this kind was conducted on a national basis by [Professor Betsy Stanko](#) in September 2000. However, some caution must be used when selecting the day to conduct the count. For example Saturday will produce different results to Tuesday.

Further information

[Domestic Violence Data Source](#)

Guidance for agencies: Collecting and Managing Data -
www.homeoffice.gov.uk/docs/crpguide.html

Making it Count: A practical Guide to Collecting Domestic Violence Data -
www.nacro.org.uk

Home Office (2004) Safety and justice: sharing personal information in the context of domestic violence – an overview
www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/dprpubs1.html

Fear of crime

The Public Reassurance agenda is now a high priority for many partnerships and an issue that most will address in crime, disorder and drug audits and strategies.

The Fear of Crime Toolkit www.crimereduction.gov.uk/toolkits/fc00.htm has been developed to help identify some of the possible factors that may create fear of crime. A Fear of Crime Matrix has been designed to help Partnerships identify local fear issues and indicate the approach best suited to their particular area [Fitting into the Fear of Crime Matrix](#).

- **Potential Data sources**

Partnerships may wish to investigate the following data sources:

- The main source of data regarding fear of crime is the British Crime Survey (BCS). The BCS looks at people's attitudes to crime, such as how much they fear crime and what measures they take to avoid it. The British Crime Survey (BCS) moved to an annual cycle from 2001/02, with 40,000 interviews of people aged 16 or over now taking place per year. Latest full results are contained in [Crime in England and Wales 2002/2003](#). Data on fear of crime is now available at police force area. You can find this information contained in Crime in England and Wales 2002/2003 in [Chapter 6](#), table 6.06.
- Many partnerships now undertake their own fear of crime surveys. These are a source of local primary data.
- Research conducted by partner agencies, for example citizens panels and life style surveys, where fear of crime questions may be included.

Further information

E-mail the Home Office Fear of Crime Team with any enquiries:

Fearofcrime@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk

More information is available on the Home Office [Patterns of Crime](#) webpage.

Victims and Witnesses

Partnerships should consider how to involve victims and witnesses in the audit and strategy process, and be aware of and make the appropriate links to the work of Local Criminal Justice Boards. (Further guidance will be available shortly providing information and specific examples of the work being taken forward locally by some partnerships and CJBs to work more closely together). The Government has stated its commitment to improving services to victims and witnesses. The 'Justice for all' White Paper set out how the Government wanted to put victims at the heart of the criminal justice system and the Criminal Justice Act 2003 took forward some of these recommendations, for example special measures to protect witnesses. A New Deal for Victims and Witnesses, the Government's Strategy to improve services was published in July 2003 and stressed the importance of work across Government to improve confidence. Every CJB has produced a Confidence Plan, which includes actions in relation to victims and witnesses. Feedback on the plans has stressed the importance of work with CDRPs/Community Safety partners whose provision (e.g for victims of domestic violence) to support victims of crime is critical alongside the work of the CJS to improve victims' experiences following a crime. Victims of anti-social behaviour should be given the same level of support as victims of crime.

Partnerships may wish to consider identifying:

- ✓ the needs of victims and witnesses of crime and anti-social behaviour, understanding the incentives that make them take a stand and the support they value
- ✓ current provision that supports victims and witnesses in the criminal justice system and outside the criminal justice system
- ✓ the main providers of local support services
- ✓ how provision could be enhanced and/or better co-ordinated to meet identified needs

- **Potential Data sources**

Partnerships may wish to investigate the following data sources:

- ✓ Victim Support
- ✓ Witness Survey
- ✓ British Crime Survey

- **Further Information**

Home Office (2003) A new deal for victims and witnesses - a national strategy to deliver improved services www.homeoffice.gov.uk/docs2/vicwitstrat.pdf

Together: Tackling Anti-Social Behaviour the Government's Action Plan can be downloaded at http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/docs2/asb_action_plan.html

Home Office (2003) Restorative Justice: the Government's Strategy
www.crimereduction.gov.uk/workingoffenders42.htm

Audit Commission (2003) Victims and Witnesses: Providing Better Support
www.audit-commission.gov.uk/reports/NATIONAL-REPORT.asp?CategoryID=english^576&ProdID=7CF96FD1-C357-4fe8-AD04-CC1783620077

Home Office (2003) Tackling Witness Intimidation: an outline strategy
www.cjonline.org/library/pdf/witness_intimidation_strategy.pdf

Work Related Violence

- **Potential Data Sources**

The findings of the British Crime Survey will be available on the Home Office RDS website <http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds> will enable you to see the statistics on violence in the work place.

- **Further information**

www.hse.gov.uk/violence
www.hse.gov.uk/lau/lacs/88-2.htm