# Home Office

# Defining and measuring anti-social behaviour

# Defining and measuring anti-social behaviour

## 1. Introduction

There is an increasingly high emphasis being placed by the Government on anti-social behaviour (ASB) and methods to tackle it. This is particularly evident through the setting up of the Anti-Social Behaviour Unit (ASBU) within the Home Office, the launch of the Anti-Social Behaviour 'Together' Action Plan and the introduction of the Anti-Social Behaviour Act during 2003. Anti-social behaviour is a key issue of public concern. A count of reports conducted by ASBU in England and Wales in September 2003 found that over 66,000 reports of anti-social behaviour were made to agencies on one day. The 2003/04 British Crime Survey (BCS) shows that over a quarter of the public perceive particular behaviours such as vandalism, graffiti, litter and teenagers hanging around as a problem in their local area. Public perceptions, however, have been improving recently. The 2003/04 BCS estimates that 16 per cent of the public perceive high levels of anti-social behaviour in their local area, compared with 21 per cent in 2002/03 (Dodd, Nicholas, Povey and Walker, 2004).

In order to be able to tackle anti-social behaviour effectively it is important that practitioners with responsibility for addressing the problem have a clear knowledge and understanding of the behaviours occurring in their locality. However, little work has been published to date on how anti-social behaviour can be defined and measured.

This report sets out possible methods for defining and measuring anti-social behaviour at local level and sources of information that can be drawn upon for this purpose. It is not intended to be prescriptive in terms of recommending any one method or approach. Rather it set outs a range of approaches and some of the potential strengths and weaknesses of each. It presents a series of issues for practitioners to consider when identifying the most appropriate approach.

The report draws from a number of sources in particular:

- the ASBU one-day count of reported anti-social behaviour 2003 and lessons learnt from this;
- a typology of anti-social behaviour developed by the Home Office Research Development and Statistics Directorate (RDS); and
- a RDS follow-up study to the one-day count based on interviews with a sample of respondents to the one-day count, including Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRPs) and Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs), service providers and businesses that receive reports of anti-social behaviour. This research is referred to as the RDS study throughout this report and details of the research methodology are provided at the end of the report.

The report is set out in three main sections. The first section focuses on definitions of anti-social behaviour, describing definitions widely used by crime and disorder reduction practitioners and the RDS typology of anti-social behaviours. It then considers the benefits and purpose of collecting anti-social behaviour data and looks at the types of data that can be collected. The final part of the report is concerned with approaches to collecting anti-social behaviour data, how different methods can be most appropriately used and the strengths and weaknesses of each approach.

*Home Office Development and Practice Reports draw out from research the messages for practice development, implementation and operation. They are intended as guidance for practitioners in specific fields. The recommendations explain how and why changes could be made, based on the findings from research, which would lead to better practice.*

# Key points for practitioners

### Defining anti-social behaviour

The Crime and Disorder Act (1998) definition of anti-social behaviour (ASB) is widely used by Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRPs) and Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) involved in the RDS study. It defines ASB as follows:

*'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).'*

In order to develop a focus for work aimed at tackling local anti-social behaviour problems, CDRPs and CSPs need to identify the behaviours that are a particular problem within their locality. It is therefore important to gain an understanding of the nature and extent of local problems, the impact of the behaviours and how the behaviours are perceived by the local community. A typology of anti-social behaviour developed by the Home Office Research Development and Statistics Directorate (RDS) may be a useful starting point. It can be used to help practitioners draw up a working definition of anti-social behaviour. The typology is set out in Table 2.1.

### Collecting data on anti-social behaviour

The collection of data on anti-social behaviour has a series of benefits. It enables practitioners to:

- identify geographical and temporal hotspots of anti-social behaviour and specific behaviours that are a particular problem in their locality;
- target resources to tackle anti-social behaviour appropriately; and
- evaluate the success of initiatives aimed at addressing anti-social behaviour.

The three key types of data that can be collected are:

- reports of anti-social behaviour from members of the public that are received by local service providers;
- incidents of anti-social behaviour witnessed by service providers or through audits of anti-social activity; and
- public perceptions of anti-social behaviour collected via surveys.

### Methods of data collection

There are a range of sources and approaches to collecting anti-social behaviour data. The main methods are:

- a count of reports of anti-social behaviour;
- analysis of local service providers' records of ASB incidents;
- analysis of police recorded crime figures as a proxy measure of ASB;
- analysis of ASB incidents recorded by CCTV cameras;
- street activity audits;
- visual audits;
- community consultation; and
- surveys of public perceptions of ASB.

Each of these methods has both advantages and limitations depending on the purpose of the data collection exercise. Practitioners need to consider these before deciding which method(s) to employ and before using and interpreting the data collected.

### Deciding on the method

In order to identify the most appropriate method of data collection the following questions should be considered.

- What is the purpose of the data collection exercise? The purpose of the exercise should be considered when selecting the data collection method, that is whether it is to gain a quick overview or scan of the key ASB problems across the locality, an in-depth understanding of specific local problem behaviours and geographical hotspots, or to evaluate ASB reduction initiatives. Table 4.1 provides a summary of the approaches most appropriate for each of these objectives.

- Incident or report data? Some methods of data collection will provide information on reports of anti-social behaviour made by the public and others information on incidents of anti-social behaviour. Practitioners will need to decide whether they want to collect information on incidents or reports of anti-social behaviour or both. Data on ASB reported by the public to local services may be more easily accessible but under-reporting is a significant issue. A large proportion of ASB incidents is likely to be unreported due to apathy, tolerance of the behaviour, fear of repercussions of reporting or lack of knowledge of where to report.

- What resources are available? Certain methods of data collection are resource intensive, for example collection of primary data through large-scale visual audits, street activity audits and public perception surveys. Practitioners should consider what methods can be successfully implemented with the resources available and determine whether the benefit derived from the exercise justifies the cost involved.

- What types of behaviour are being measured? Certain methods of data collection are suited to specific behaviours, for example visual audits are useful for measuring environmental damage and street activity audits can be used to measure the extent of behaviours such as street drinking and begging.

- Are data available and accessible? While practitioners may want to collect specific data, the data may not be available or accessible. Practitioners will need to consider whether they can instigate the collection of the data they require and overcome any barriers that prevent access. Data sharing between local services is a key issue. Local partnerships may need to establish agreements and commitments between partner agencies in order to facilitate effective data sharing.

## 2.   Definitions of anti-social behaviour

People's understanding of what constitutes anti-social behaviour (ASB) is determined by a series of factors including context, location, community tolerance and quality of life expectations (Nixon *et al*. 2003). As a result, what may be considered anti-social behaviour to one person can be seen as acceptable behaviour to another. The subjective nature of the concept makes it difficult to identify a single definition of anti-social behaviour. To overcome this issue, a range of approaches to defining anti-social behaviour is set out below.

### The Crime and Disorder Act definition (1998)

A widely used definition of anti-social behaviour is the definition contained in the Crime and 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).'*

Most of the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships or Community Safety Partnerships interviewed as part of the RDS study took this approach. The definition is broad and allows for a range of activities to be included within it. This is appropriate given that, as noted above, people's understanding of anti-social behaviour is based on individual perception and can encompass a range of behaviours. It recognises the need for local definitions to reflect local problems. However, by describing the consequences of the behaviour rather than defining the behaviour itself, the definition lacks specificity and measurability (Armitage, 2002). It does not provide practitioners with an indication of the specific behaviours that they should be monitoring and attempting to address in order to tackle the problem of anti-social behaviour within their locality.

### Local partnership definitions

A number of partnerships that responded to the RDS study had developed a working definition of anti-social behaviour by drawing up a list of behaviours that were causing particular problems within the locality. The definitions provided a clear focus for the partnerships' anti-social behaviour work and other practitioners may find it beneficial to adopt this approach. The typology detailed below can be used to identify behaviours to be included in the list.

## RDS typology of anti-social behaviour

Table 2.1 below sets out the typology of anti-social behaviour. This has been based on a range of anti-social behaviour definitions currently in use, including those detailed in the CDRP Audits (2001) or Strategies (2002) and definitions used in Home Office funded research and by other government departments. It also draws on the experiences of anti-social behaviour identified by respondents in the 2000 British Crime Survey (BCS).

The purpose of the typology is to provide a practical framework and guide to the main categories of behaviour that are widely accepted to be anti-social by both practitioners and the public. The categories are divided into four core areas 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. Examples are provided of specific activities, which could fall into each category. The list of examples is not intended to be exhaustive and it is likely that CDRPs and CSPs will be able to identify additional examples based on local experience.

### Table 2.1: RDS typology of anti-social behaviour

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

Source: Research Development and Statistics Directorate

## Inclusion and exclusion of behaviours

The typology is intended to provide a guide to the types of behaviours that local practitioners may want to include in a definition of anti-social behaviour and tackle locally. In general the practitioners that participated in the RDS study found the typology to be comprehensive. However, a number of 'grey areas' were identified, which are discussed below. If practitioners use the typology to help them identify a local working definition of anti-social behaviour, they will need to draw their own conclusions on the appropriateness of including or excluding certain behaviours. This decision will be informed by the nature and extent of local problems, the impact of the behaviours and how the behaviours are perceived by the local community.

● **Distinction between criminal and anti-social** The inclusion of behaviours such as drug abuse and harassment in the typology was questioned on the basis that these are criminal rather than anti-social acts.

  There is a general acceptance that some low-level crimes can also be classed as anti-social behaviour but a clear explanation of when a behaviour is criminal and when anti-social has not been provided. In some situations a distinction can be made according to the seriousness of the act. In the case of harassment, for example, extremely intimidating or violent behaviour would be considered a criminal offence but a one-off threat would be deemed anti-social given that it causes distress to the victim but is unlikely to result in a charge. In relation to drug dealing and use the anti-social element lies less in the act, which is criminal, and more in the fact that drugs are being illegally sold and used in public areas which has an impact on those who work and live nearby.

● **Prostitution** The inclusion of prostitution was also queried given that it tends to be a response to personal circumstance rather than a deliberately anti-social activity. As with drug dealing and use, the anti-social element of prostitution relates to the presence of prostitutes and their clients engaging in an illegal activity in a public space, which can cause distress to others who use the area.

● **Thoughtless or malicious behaviours** The question was also raised as to whether certain nuisance behaviours should be included given that they are generally committed by young people acting thoughtlessly, not maliciously.

  In relation to nuisance behaviour by young people, a distinction can be drawn between normal, youthful activities and anti-social acts. Games in public places are not necessarily anti-social but can be if, for example, they are undertaken in a restricted area, which prevents other people using or crossing the space. It is also the case that certain behaviours, which would be tolerated if carried out once or twice, can become a nuisance if they are engaged in persistently over a period of time.

● **Youth nuisance** A number of respondents felt that a specific 'youth nuisance' category should be added to the typology. It is recognised that groups of young people are often perceived as a problem. The British Crime Survey (BCS) 2002/03 shows that 25 per cent of the public perceive teenagers hanging around as the biggest ASB problem in their local area (Nicholas and Walker, 2004). However, the decision was taken not to include a youth category in the typology as it was felt that anti-social behaviour should be defined by the nature of the activity, not the age of the perpetrator. It was also felt that a youth category would attract reports of young people 'hanging around' and, while it is recognised that a group of young people can appear intimidating to members of the public, gathering in a group is not in itself necessarily anti-social. Only when these groups engage in nuisance or threatening activities can their behaviour be considered as anti-social behaviour and it is then the nature of the activity that defines it as such.

● **Begging** The RDS study participants defined begging in a number of ways. There was general agreement that aggressive begging, that is actively approaching people for money or begging in a way that causes harassment, fear or alarm is anti-social. Many participants agreed that ticket touts and unofficial Big Issue sellers should be defined as beggars. However, some study participants did not include passive begging in their definition. For example, a few participants felt that it was open to question whether sitting in doorways without actively asking for money could be considered begging. The Anti-Social Behaviour Unit defines all begging as anti-social. Begging is illegal under the 1824 Vagrancy Act and the National Police Records (Recordable Offences) (Amendments) Regulations 2003 made it a recordable offence. In identifying local begging problems that need to be tackled, practitioners need to consider the nature and impact of the local problem.

● **Street drinking** The definition of anti-social street drinking was also a subject of debate. Again consideration needs to be made of the behaviours associated with the street drinking and the extent to which these are perceived to be a problem. Examples of local definitions drawn from the RDS study include groups of people who gather to drink in public areas, drunken behaviour involving violent or intimidating behaviour and young people drinking alcohol in local communities resulting in nuisance behaviour.

Careful thought should be given to whether the behaviours outlined above should be included in a local definition of anti-social acts that need to be tackled and whether these behaviours are having a detrimental impact on the local population. This will be informed by the collection of data on local problems as set out in the following sections.

## 3.    Data collection

### Why collect data on anti-social behaviour?
Once a working definition of anti-social behaviour has been identified, practitioners need to consider what data it would be useful to collect on the anti-social behaviours.

### Benefits of data collection
The benefits of collecting anti-social behaviour data are that it:

● allows for the identification of 'hotspots' of anti-social behaviour in terms of geographical areas where anti-social behaviour is prevalent, particular times of day, week or year when ASB takes place and specific behaviours that are a problem locally;

● informs the implementation of initiatives and targeting of resources to tackle identified problems; and

● provides a monitoring and evaluation tool to determine the success of initiatives to address anti-social behaviour and actions against perpetrators of ASB.

### Objectives of data collection
In order to identify the most appropriate method of data collection, practitioners need to decide what they want to achieve as a result of the exercise. Using the SARA model (see Box 3.1) to address the issue of anti-social behaviour may help practitioners to determine their data needs.

---

**Box 3.1:    The SARA model**

The problem-solving approach to crime reduction is based on the idea that the underlying problems within an area that lead to crime and disorder should be addressed. This involves collecting and analysing data on the crime or disorder problem. Police officers working within a problem-solving framework have widely adopted the 'SARA' model and practitioners may find this a useful tool to use in their work to reduce anti-social behaviour. Leigh *et al*. (1996: 17) describe the four stages of the problem-solving process in the following terms:

● Scanning – spotting problems using knowledge, basic data and electronic maps;
● Analysis – using hunches and IT to dig deeper into problems' characteristics and causes;
● Response – working with the community, where necessary and possible, to devise a solution; and
● Assessment – looking back to see if the solution worked and what lessons can be learned.

Possible objectives of data collection are detailed below:

Scanning:    Practitioners may initially want to undertake a quick scanning exercise. This will give an indication of what the main problems are within an area and provide an indication of hotspots of anti-social behaviour. Scanning can be undertaken using local data that are already available and accessible such as police recorded crime figures. If a scan suggests that anti-social behaviour is not a problem, further data collection may be unnecessary. However, practitioners may want to repeat the exercise after a period of time to check that the situation has not altered.

Hotspots    Once hotspots have been identified, practitioners may want to collect more in-depth data to gain a better understanding of the nature, extent, causes and impact of a particular problem (or range of

---

problems within a specific locality). This information will inform the development of appropriate action to tackle the problem(s) and provide baseline data against which future assessment of the extent of the problem(s) can be measured.

Evaluation: Once initiatives to address anti-social behaviour have been established, data collection should be conducted on a regular basis to determine whether the initiatives have been effective.

Evidence: Data on anti-social acts by individuals can provide evidence for civil orders such as Anti-Social Behaviour Orders (ASBOs). The collection of evidential data will not be covered in this report, which focuses on identifying and evaluating efforts to tackle local anti-social behaviour problems.

### Types of data

There are three key types of anti-social behaviour data that can be collected.

- Reports of anti-social behaviour from members of the public that are received by local service providers, such as the police or local authority, although under-reporting is a key issue.

- Incidents of anti-social behaviour, for example, data can be collected through counts of the number of abandoned cars, visual audits of graffiti or audits of street activity such as begging.

- Public perceptions of local anti-social behaviour problems. Data can be collected through surveys of residents or people who work or visit an area to collect information on views of local problems.

Details of how to collect each of these types of data are provided in the following section of this report. Data can also be collected on interventions to tackle anti-social behaviour such as numbers of Anti-Social Behaviour Orders (ASBO) served or breached, use of Parenting Orders, Fixed Penalty Notices, Acceptable Behaviour Contracts, removal of abandoned vehicles and graffiti. These are all indicators of processes to tackle anti-social behaviour. They are likely to be of interest to both partner agencies and the local community in order to gain knowledge of what is being done to tackle ASB and how effectively. However, they do not measure the scale and nature of local ASB problems and are therefore not helpful measures to use in this context of gaining an understanding of local problems.

## 4.    Measuring anti-social behaviour

Sources and methods of collecting the three types of data on anti-social problems are set out in the following sections. Table 4.1 summarises the most appropriate data sources and types of data according to the objective of the data collection exercise.

**Table 4.1: Sources and types of anti-social data that can be collected by data collection objective**

| Objective | Data source | Type of data |
|---|---|---|
| Scanning | ● Count of reported ASB | ● Reports |
| | ● Local service provider data | ● Reports and incidents |
| | ● Police recorded crime figures | ● Incidents |
| Hotspots | ● CCTV | ● Incidents |
| | ● Street audits | ● Incidents |
| | ● Local service provider data | ● Reports and incidents |
| | ● Community audits | ● Incidents |
| | ● Community consultation | ● Perceptions |
| | ● Community survey | ● Perceptions |
| Evaluation | ● Local service provider data | ● Reports and incidents |
| | ● Street audits | ● Incidents |
| | ● Community survey | ● Perceptions |
| | ● Police recorded crime figures | ● Incidents |

## Report data

### ASBU one-day count of reported anti-social behaviour

The Home Office Anti-Social Behaviour Unit conducted a count of all reports from the public of anti-social behaviour in England and Wales recorded on one day. Details of this count and the data collected are provided in Box 4.1 below. Further details are available at http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/crime/antisocialbehaviour/daycount/index.html and www.together.gov.uk . The exercise has been useful in that it has provided a snapshot of the type of anti-social behaviour that is reported nationally and the type of data that are being collected by services.

### Box 4.1: The ASBU one-day count of reported anti-social behaviour 2003

### Objectives and methodology

The aim of the Anti-Social Behaviour Unit 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 2003 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 RDS 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) and Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) were approached and asked to encourage appropriate organisations in their area to take part.

### Results

In total, 66,000 reports of anti-social behaviour were made to participating organisations in England and Wales on the day of the count. It has been estimated that this is equivalent to 13.5 million reports per year or one report every two seconds. More than 1,500 organisations took part and information was received from every CDRP and CSP area in England and Wales.

| Behaviours reported within the one-day count of anti-social behaviour | number of reports |
|---|---|
| Drug/substance misuse and drug dealing | 2,920 |
| Street drinking and begging | 3,239 |
| Prostitution, kerb crawling and other sexual acts | 1,011 |
| Vehicle-related nuisance and inappropriate vehicle use | 7,782 |
| Intimidation and harassment | 5,415 |
| Noise | 5,374 |
| Rowdy behaviour | 5,339 |
| Nuisance behaviour | 7,660 |
| Hoax calls | 1,286 |
| Animal-related problems | 2,546 |
| Abandoned vehicles | 4,994 |
| Criminal damage/vandalism | 7,855 |
| Litter/rubbish | 10,686 |
| TOTAL | 66,107 |

### How the information can and cannot 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. Information about day count results for each CDRP and CSP is available from the Anti-Social Behaviour Unit website (details of web addresses are provided at the end of the report). It can provide partnerships with a starting point in order to assess what ASB is reported in their local area, to whom and at what cost. However, the number and source of returns

was not consistent across CDRPs and CSPs and for this reason the data should not be used to make comparisons between areas. In some partnership 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.

### 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 the 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 £14m; this equates to around £3.4 billion 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.[1] Because the costs were based on the one day count data and that participation in the count was voluntary, the costs arrived at possibly underestimate the true cost.

### Lessons learnt from the one-day count

If practitioners choose to undertake a similar exercise to the one-day count there are a series of points, which should be taken into consideration.

- It is important to ensure that the services included in the count are not providing the same data. If the police are asked to provide figures it is important to ensure that police data are not also included in figures provided by, for example, the local authority.

- Consideration needs to be taken over the day the exercise takes place. Holding a count in some rural areas on market day or when the post office opens, for example, may influence the results obtained.

- Consideration also needs to be given to how behaviours are grouped for measurement purposes. Drug/substance misuse and drug dealing were included in the same category in the one-day count. However, dealing and using are different behaviours and ten reports of dealing indicate a more serious problem than ten reports of drug use. Similarly street drinking and begging were grouped together for the purpose of the count but are distinct behaviours. Recording different behaviours together can prevent effective analysis of the nature and seriousness of the problem.

- Engaging a large number of services in a count can be resource intensive. It may be appropriate to only involve key services, for example the police, environmental health, housing associations/authorities and street wardens, in the exercise. This approach will enable CDRPs to work closely with services to ensure that they are clear about the types of behaviour they are expected to record and should make it easier to manage the exercise and ensure that results are returned when required.

  It should be borne in mind that information from some services may only identify a finite number of behaviours relating specifically to the organisation or acts witnessed or experienced by a particular section of the population, for example housing association tenants. Practitioners should ensure that the data collected by services included in the count covers the behaviours that they want to measure.

- A distinction should be made between who has made the report, i.e. is it a member of the public or members of staff of local service providers? For example street wardens record incidents that are both reported to the wardens and witnessed by them during the course of their rounds. Therefore caution should be exercised when interpreting data that may be a mix of public and staff reports. The ASBU one-day count was restricted to direct first-hand reports from the public. For further information about reports made by staff of local service providers, see section on incident data below.

---

1. Further information can be found at http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/crime/antisocialbehaviour/daycount/index.html

### Limitations of report data

There are also a number of limitations that should be considered when using report data.

- Reports of anti-social behaviour may be skewed towards activities that are witnessed or experienced by people who actually choose and know where to make a report. It is recognised that a large proportion of anti-social behaviour is not reported due to apathy, tolerance of the behaviour or fear of repercussions amongst members of the public, or because people do not know where to report the problem.

- Report data can include false reports either made intentionally against an individual or due to a misinterpretation of behaviour. Nonetheless, false reports may be worth recording in a count as they can result in a considerable drain on resources, for example hoax calls.

- A count of reports cannot identify the number of anti-social behaviour incidents occurring in an area. Some incidents will go unreported and some incidents will be reported more than once.

- 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, for example 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. It is therefore important for a count only to include first-hand reports, that is reports made directly by a member of the public.

### Collecting report data on a regular basis

Collecting data on reports of anti-social behaviour on a regular basis can provide a more representative picture of local anti-social problems than a one-off count. This approach will take account of any variation in the levels of reporting according to the time of the week or month. It will also allow trends in the type and number of reports received by services to be identified. Clearly such an approach will be resource intensive if data are collected on a wide range of anti-social behaviours. Therefore, this is a useful approach when collecting information on specific problem behaviours, after the scanning stage and once hotspots have been identified. This will be in order to gain a better understanding of the nature of a particular problem.

Table 4.2 gives an indication of the organisations that receive reports of anti-social behaviour and the types of information that they collect. It is drawn from the ASBU one-day count of reported anti-social behaviour. Practice, in terms of what data are recorded and the extent to which information can be shared, may vary by local area. It is important to note that the figures provided by the police for the one-day count relate to reports of anti-social behaviour received from the public on the day of the exercise and not to recorded crime figures, which are discussed below. Other services, which collect anti-social behaviour data and which participated in the count, include local public transport providers, outreach teams working with the street population and education services. Practitioners may want to consider using data from these services if the information that they collect is relevant to the practitioners' data needs.

*See Table 4.2 opposite.*

## Incident data

Incident data relate to individual acts of anti-social behaviour. This is in contrast to data on reports made about anti-social behaviour that can contain multiple reports of the same incident. There are a number of sources that can be drawn upon for information on actual incidents of anti-social behaviour.

### Local service provider data

In addition to recording the number of reports of anti-social behaviour that they receive, many local services will also keep records of the cases of anti-social behaviour that they witness or take action against. For example, housing associations are likely to record information on action that they take against incidents of anti-social behaviour committed by tenants.

**Table 4.2: ASBU one-day count of reported anti-social behaviour: reports of ASB received by local service providers**

| Behaviour | Police | Local Authority Environmental Health | Local Authority Housing | Local Authority General | Street Wardens | Housing Associations | Other* | Total number of reports |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Drug/substance misuse and drug dealing | 714 | 87 | 274 | 1,014 | 150 | 288 | 393 | 2,920 |
| Street drinking and begging | 600 | 179 | 181 | 1,153 | 328 | 118 | 680 | 3,239 |
| Prostitution, kerb crawling and other sexual acts | 248 | 42 | 77 | 326 | 103 | 76 | 139 | 1,011 |
| Vehicle-related nuisance and inappropriate vehicle use | 2,321 | 132 | 412 | 2,921 | 527 | 362 | 1,107 | 7,782 |
| Intimidation and harassment | 2,183 | 110 | 359 | 1,328 | 160 | 411 | 864 | 5,415 |
| Noise | 1,301 | 272 | 449 | 1,969 | 176 | 543 | 664 | 5,374 |
| Rowdy behaviour | 1,901 | 47 | 298 | 1,797 | 184 | 272 | 840 | 5,339 |
| Nuisance behaviour | 2,675 | 119 | 619 | 2,177 | 253 | 705 | 1,112 | 7,660 |
| Hoax calls | 889 | 2 | 12 | 178 | 24 | 17 | 164 | 1,286 |
| Animal-related problems | 465 | 231 | 207 | 1,023 | 136 | 200 | 284 | 2,546 |
| Abandoned vehicles | 1,500 | 299 | 227 | 2,132 | 146 | 321 | 369 | 4,994 |
| Criminal damage/vandalism | 2,327 | 512 | 492 | 2,394 | 577 | 391 | 1,162 | 7,855 |
| Litter/rubbish | 716 | 1,190 | 708 | 4,763 | 656 | 553 | 2,100 | 10,686 |

* Other includes: CDRP, fire service, health authority, local authority education, social services and advice services, voluntary organisations, businesses, British Transport Police and National Probation Service

Source: ASBU one-day count of reported anti-social behaviour 2003

### Police recorded crime figures

Recorded crime figures provide information on offences and can be used to measure low-level crimes, which are also classed as anti-social behaviour. This could include common assault and less serious wounding (bruising, scratches etc.) and assault; possession of weapons; criminal damage (which includes vandalism and graffiti); drug offences; and begging.

A disadvantage of using crime figures is they only relate to acts that have been reported to or witnessed by the police and which have resulted in a caution or conviction. Further, they only measure a subset of anti-social behaviour, which is biased towards 'upper end' or criminal anti-social activity.

### CCTV

CCTV can be used to collect information on the level and type of anti-social behaviour, or the activities of particular individuals, in very specific areas. This can be useful once geographic hotspots for anti-social problems have been identified and to monitor trends over time.

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 engage in anti-social behaviour out of sight of CCTV to prevent their actions being monitored.

### Audits

Street audits can be used to identify observable signs of anti-social behaviour within a locality.

### Street activity audits

Street activity audits are useful for measuring types of behaviour such as begging and street drinking. Box 4.2 provides an example of a street activity audit and the data that can be collected. Street activity audits 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 about the individuals engaging in anti-social behaviour.

---

**Box 4.2:    Street activity audit – example**

Monthly audits of people begging have been conducted in Brighton and Hove since November 2003. Three to four audits are carried out on one day each month between 8am and 12 midnight. A set route is covered each time, which incorporates the begging hotspots. The hotspots were identified at a meeting with local stakeholders. The list was then revised following the first audit and consultation with local businesses.

In addition to counting the number of beggars, interviewers also collect information from those who are begging. The interviewers are sensitive in their approach and carefully explain that the purpose of the survey is to improve their understanding of begging and its causes. They ask whether individuals are happy to answer some questions. The information collected includes the time, date and location of begging, the individual's name, whether they have a key worker and a fixed address, whether they use drugs and a description of their drug habit and, if they are a Big Issue seller, their badge number. This has worked very well so far and individuals have been happy to take part in the survey. The information provided has helped the council build a picture of the nature of the begging problem, reasons for begging and the underlying problems faced by those who beg.

In addition to collecting information the interviewers also discuss the beggars' problems and give advice and help as appropriate. The interviewers also explain that if the individuals continue to beg, enforcement measures will be brought against them. This approach allows rapport to be built between the council and the begging population and prevents the perpetrators from feeling threatened. However, it also means that the perpetrators are aware that action will be taken to tackle their anti-social behaviour.

---

A series of points need to be considered before undertaking a street activity audit. These are as follows.

● When to undertake the exercise: levels of street activity in an area are likely to differ at different times of the day and week. Rather than conducting a single audit it may be appropriate to conduct two or three audits in the course of a week at different points in the day. For example, the average number of beggars recorded can then be calculated in order to gain a more representative picture of the problem. If begging is seasonal consideration may need to be given to the time of the year the audit is conducted.

- Where to undertake the exercise: the route followed during the audit should incorporate the main areas where anti-social behaviour occurs and the same route should be used each time an audit is carried out. It may, however, be necessary to extend the route for later audits to determine whether the problem has been displaced or to change the route if the problem is known to have moved.

- What data to collect: practitioners need to decide whether they want to count the number of people engaging in anti-social behaviour or the number of incidents witnessed (in the latter case somebody witnessed begging in two different locations during the course of the audit would be counted twice). They also need to consider whether they want to collect information from individuals who are engaging in anti-social acts, such as the person's age and name and the reason for their behaviour, or just count the number of incidents or people witnessed. If additional information is required practitioners need to think about what information they want to collect, what it will be used for, whether it will be shared and how it will be collected and stored.

- Who conducts the audit: practitioners need to consider who will carry out the audit and whether training will be needed to ensure consistency in the data collated.

- Resources: street activity audits are resource intensive. Practitioners need to identify the amount of resource required and how the exercise will be funded.

- Displacement: practitioners need to establish how they will determine whether a problem has been displaced to another area. It may be necessary to extend the route of the audit to different geographical areas or contact neighbouring towns/cities to determine whether they have witnessed an increase in anti-social acts. Similarly, begging may be displaced to another activity. For this reason, it is useful to monitor data such as recorded crime levels alongside the street activity audit.

- Missing people: it is possible to miss people who should be counted if they move while the audit is taking place or are located in a place where they are not easily visible. Consideration should be given to how auditors can try to minimise the risk of this happening. This should inform the route followed during the exercise.

### Visual audits

Visual audits can be used to measure incidents of physical disorder, for example vandalism, graffiti, abandoned vehicles, litter, fly tipping and fly posting. For instance, one of the CDRP areas included in the RDS study ran a project in which researchers noted through observation every incident of environmental damage in a 500-dwelling area. These observations were mapped and on the basis of the evidence a co-ordinated 'clean-up' was initiated. An example of a form that is completed when conducting a visual audit is given in Box 4.3.

Many of the considerations for street activity audits are also relevant for visual audits. The locality in which the audit is conducted should incorporate the main areas in which physical disorder occurs and the same route should be taken each time an audit is carried out. It is also important that the area covered by the audit is not too large so that an in-depth study of the area is feasible. Practitioners will need to consider who should carry out the audit. Training will be necessary to ensure that all observers define and record incidents in a standardised way. As noted below, the local community can be involved in conducting visual audits. As with street activity audits, visual audits are resource intensive and consideration will need to be given to how the exercise will be funded. Finally, practitioners will need to establish how they will determine whether anti-social behaviour has been displaced to a different locality.

**Box 4.3:    Audit form**

Date of audit:   . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

Start time: . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .          End time:   . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

Note of any special circumstances (e.g. Severe weather conditions):

. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

|  | None | 1-4 | 5+ |
|---|---|---|---|
| Damaged/abandoned cars |  |  |  |
| Abandoned items e.g. furniture |  |  |  |
| Fly posters |  |  |  |
| Vandalised telephones/telephone boxes |  |  |  |
| Vandalised bus shelters |  |  |  |
| Vandalised street furniture |  |  |  |
| Vandalised buildings |  |  |  |
| Vandalised trees / hedges / plants |  |  |  |
| Graffiti |  |  |  |

Assessment made after audit (tick)

|  | Check list (keep a tally of occurrence) | Minor problem | Serious problem | Very serious problem |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Dog dirt |  |  |  |  |
| Litter/rubbish |  |  |  |  |

### Community audits

Businesses and residents within an area can be asked to record the number of anti-social acts they witness in a locality each week or month or to conduct a visual audit of specific areas. A possible limitation of this approach is it may be difficult to secure a representative sample of the community to participate in the audit. The data will therefore be biased towards acts that are witnessed or experienced by individuals who choose to take part in the exercise and those that 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.

### Public perception data

Research and consultation within the community can provide information on what anti-social behaviours the public perceives to be occurring. Such information provides an indication of the types of problems that are causing public concern and having an impact on quality of life. Nonetheless, the relationship between perceptions and experience 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's perception of it. There are also likely to be other factors that influence changes in perceptions, beyond a change in actual incidence, such as crime levels and media reporting. Tolerance levels are also likely to vary and this will have an impact on perceived local problems.

### Existing surveys

There are a number of on-going surveys, which provide information on people's perception and experience of anti-social behaviour in their local area.

#### British Crime Survey

The British Crime Survey (BCS) is a face-to-face continuous survey of around 50,000 adults living in private households. It asks respondents about their experience of criminal victimisation in the previous 12 months.

As well as the main crime counting element, a number of other crime-related issues are covered, including respondents' perception of anti-social behaviour. The survey examines a range of anti-social behaviours including:

- noisy neighbours or loud parties;
- teenagers hanging around on the streets;
- rubbish, or litter lying around;
- vandalism, graffiti, and other deliberate damage to property;
- abandoned vehicles;
- people dealing drugs; and
- people being drunk or rowdy in public places.

Questions have also been introduced on people's experience of anti-social behaviour, its impact and about other anti-social behaviours such as people being attacked or harassed because of the colour of their skin, ethnic origin or religion. Some of these additional questions are only asked of part of the full sample and as a result analysis is only possible 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, even where they are asked of the full sample, and cannot provide evidence for areas smaller than Police Force Areas such as the geographic areas covered by CDRPs. However, partnerships may want to replicate the BCS questions in a local survey and then compare local perception data with the national or regional picture. Points to consider if conducting local surveys are presented below. The latest version of the BCS questionnaire is available from the Home Office — email bcsinfo.rds@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk.

#### Best Value Performance Indicator satisfaction surveys

All English local authorities are statutorily required to undertake Best Value Performance Indicator (BVPI) surveys on a three-yearly basis to collect data for satisfaction performance indicators. These surveys are carried out following a methodology prescribed by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM). In 2000/01 95 per cent of local authorities used a postal method of data collection and this figure is likely to be similar for the 2003/04 round of surveys.

Local authorities collect data for the survey using a standardised questionnaire template. In addition to questions used to collect data for BVPIs, there are several non-BVPI questions. This includes a question module on perceptions of anti-social behaviour, comparable to BCS questions. Respondents are asked about their perceptions of the seven anti-social behaviours included in the BCS as set out above and in addition about people sleeping rough on the streets or in other public places and people being attacked or harassed because of the colour of their skin, ethnic origin or religion.

The BVPI surveys are undertaken every three years. They can provide a useful baseline or snapshot of perceptions of ASB in local authority areas. However, as the surveys are only run triennially it is not possible to use these results for annual monitoring. When comparing this data with the BCS, it should be noted that the majority of BVPI surveys are run using postal methodologies, while the BCS uses face-to-face interviews. It is difficult to make reliable comparisons when different methodologies are used. Moreover, postal surveys tend to have lower response rates than interview-based questionnaires.

It should also be remembered that the questions on the BVPI survey focus on local government and its services, or general attitudes to the local area, while the BCS focuses on crime-related issues. Therefore, the posing of these ASB questions within a different context may also impact on survey results.

Further information on the BVPI surveys can be obtained from the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (http://www.odpm.gov.uk, email bvpi.surveys@odpm.gsi.gov.uk).

### Local surveys

None of the partnerships interviewed for the RDS study had conducted their own local public perception surveys. A likely reason for this is the amount of resource required to conduct a local survey. However, there is some evidence that local partnerships are using surveys to inform their crime and disorder audits and strategies. Local surveys can be useful to supplement the data already available through the BCS and BVPI local satisfaction survey.

It is beyond the scope of this report to provide detailed guidance on conducting surveys. There is, however, a wide literature on survey methodology to draw from, for example:

- Groves, R. Fowler, F. Couper, M. Lekowski, J. Singer, E. and Tourangeau, R. (2004) *Survey Methodology* John Wiley and Sons.
- Kershaw, C. and Myhill. (2001) *Conducting Community Surveys: Results of a Feasibility Study* Home Office Briefing Note 8/01.

This publication is available from www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pubsintro1.html

Guidance on commissioning surveys is provided in:

- Social Research Association (2002) *Commissioning Social Research a Good Practice Guide.*

This publication can be downloaded free from the SRA's website www.the-sra.org.uk

Before considering conducting a survey, it is important to think about what is required from the results of the research. This will inform how the survey should be conducted. For example:

- Do you want to be able to make comparisons with the regional or national picture for monitoring purposes? Or is it more important to be able to understand the local picture and the specific issues there? Are you looking to understand the problems or just measure them?
- Who are you interested in surveying: a representative sample of the area or a more localised sample or a sample of people with specific interests or needs?
- Will the topic areas or questions of interest be appropriate for a self-completion postal survey, a telephone interview or face-to-face approaches?
- What are the sub-groups that you want to be able to analyse by (e.g. different age or ethnic groups)?

Some further considerations when conducting local surveys are set out below.

### Considerations when conducting local surveys

- Surveys are expensive to carry out. 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 are 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.
- Structured surveys, such as a self-completion postal survey, will provide quantitative results on the scale and type of local problems. They do not allow more detailed probing on the nature of the local problem. This could come from more in-depth qualitative exploration through community consultation exercises, as set out in the following section.
- Consideration needs to be given to where a survey is conducted depending on the type of information required. For instance, 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, for example a 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. This should inform the type of survey used and the method of sampling respondents, for example a household survey or a survey conducted in the street.
- Surveys can ask questions about perceptions of anti-social problems or experience of problems. Respondents can be asked about what evidence they have seen of anti-social problems or their own personal experience of problems and the impact this has had, as well as their perceptions about the problems.

- Sample size also needs to be carefully considered. For example, in order to collect reliable data of perceptions across a CDRP or CSP area, which can be broken down by factors such as characteristics of the respondent, an achieved sample size of approximately 500 respondents would be required. This will vary to some extent by size of the local population and how the data are to be analysed. At least 100 respondents would be needed in each sub-group to be analysed. Response rates to the survey are also important. The lower the response rate the less reliable the data collected will be.
- Omnibus services: it may be that surveys of residents in an area are already being conducted for other purposes (for example by another department within a local authority) and questions on anti-social behaviour can be added on to these.

### Community consultation

Anti-social behaviour problems can be highly localised. In one area graffiti may be a particular problem and in another prostitution. In recognition of this, one CDRP in the RDS study plans to ask communities which behaviours need to be tackled in their immediate locality (communities are very small areas, i.e. a few streets known to be hotspots of anti-social behaviour within wards). The CDRP will then decide which behaviours, overall, are the most important to address.

The use of community consultation is a method that other practitioners may want to adopt, particularly amongst communities, which are less likely to report problem behaviours to local services and whose experience of anti-social behaviour may go unrecorded. When engaging in consultation practitioners should try to ensure that a representative sample of the community is involved in the process. A possible method of consultation is through a focus group. Again it goes beyond the scope of this report to present details of how to set up and conduct focus groups, but there is a wide literature available on this topic, for example:

- Ritchie, J. and Lewis, J. (eds) (2003) *Qualitative Research Practice: a Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers* Sage.

### Barriers to data collection

RDS study respondents identified a number of difficulties that prevented them from collecting as much anti-social behaviour data as they might have liked. The main barriers to collection and possible solutions for overcoming them are noted below.

*See Table 4.3 page 18.*

# Conclusions

This report identifies the benefits of collecting data on anti-social behaviour that is a problem within a CDRP or CSP area. The report has attempted to set out the types of data that might be readily available locally and methods of collecting further information on anti-social behaviour. Each of the approaches has advantages and disadvantages, which practitioners need to consider before deciding which method(s) to employ and before using and interpreting the data collected. Data collection should enable partnerships to better plan their programme of anti-social behaviour work and target their resources appropriately. It should also allow partnerships to determine whether initiatives implemented to tackle anti-social behaviour are effective.

**Table 4.3: Barriers to data collection and possible solutions**

| Issue | Specific obstacles | Possible solution |
|---|---|---|
| Partnership issues | Lack of shared definition: local service providers record anti-social behaviour under different categories to one another. This can make it difficult to compare information and collect total figures for individual behaviours.  It can also make it difficult to identify where double counting of reports or incidents of anti-social behaviour has occurred. Incompatibility of data collection systems: electronic databases containing local anti-social behaviour data may be incompatible and some services only collect data in paper format Data-sharing protocols: Accessing and comparing data may be complicated by rules governing data sharing. Lack of communication between partners: in one area the CDRP anti-social behaviour co-ordinator is located away from the core local authority services, which deal with anti-social behaviour such as the Enforcement Team. The co-ordinator feels that being in closer geographical proximity would facilitate a better flow of information. between the services. | These obstacles all relate to partnership working between local agencies. In order to overcome these difficulties, agreements and commitments need to be obtained between local partners. Good practice guidance on making partnerships work effectively can be obtained from: http://www.crimereduction.gov.uk/partnerships8.htm www.together.gov.uk Together Actionline 0870 220 2000 |
| Resources | Lack of staff resources: it was noted that the role of the anti-social behaviour co-ordinator is to make a difference at street level and not to collect statistics. While data are useful in terms of identifying problem areas, many co-ordinators in the RDS study felt they had insufficient resources to be able to dedicate to the collection and analysis of data. Limitations of computer packages: some packages used by CDRPs have a series of limitations e.g. they do not allow data to be mapped. | As the SARA model sets out, problems cannot be tackled effectively without understanding the nature of the local problem. The relative merits of putting resources into collecting data as opposed to tackling the problem should be carefully considered. Without the evidence, it will not be possible to demonstrate action taken to tackle ASB has had any impact on the ground. Possible additional resources may be obtained from other local partners. |
| Data issues | Different types of data: some services collect report data and others incident data, which cannot be combined. Under-reporting of anti-social behaviour: a key problem with reliance on reports of anti-social behaviour incidents is under-reporting. Incidents may go unreported because a member of the public thinks 'nobody does anything, what is the point of reporting?' Alternatively the public do not know where to report incidents or are afraid to do so or will tolerate behaviour and not report it until it gets to a critical and intolerable stage. Lack of geographical information: data collection systems do not always identify where anti-social behaviour incidents have, or are said to have, occurred.  This makes it difficult to map behaviours and identify hotspots. Errors in the data: data provided by other local services may not always be clean. | As set out in this report, each source of data has a number of strengths and weaknesses depending on what it is to be used for. Some of these problems may be overcome by agreeing protocols and setting standards for the data collected. Under-reporting of anti-social behaviour can be improved by providing and publicising a single access point or good points of first contact for the public to report ASB in the local area. Publicising action being taken locally to tackle ASB can also demonstrate to the public that reporting ASB can make a difference. The resources that will be required to improve the quality of the data needs to be considered against the purpose and benefit of the data collection exercise. |

# Useful information

## Useful websites

Anti-Social Behaviour Unit Together website:
www.together.gov.uk

Anti-Social Behaviour Unit website:
http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/crime/antisocialbehaviour/index.html

One-day count of anti-social behaviour
http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/crime/antisocialbehaviour/daycount/index.html

One-day count of anti-social behaviour local area results
http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/docs2/asb_update_results.html

Anti-social Behaviour Act 2003
http://www.legislation.hmso.gov.uk/acts/acts2003/20030038.htm

Anti-social behaviour crime reduction toolkit
http://www.crimereduction.gov.uk/toolkits/as00.htm

Audits and strategies toolkit
http://www.crimereduction.gov.uk/aud00.htm

Alcohol-related crime reduction toolkit
http://www.crimereduction.gov.uk/toolkits/ar00.htm

The Annual Local Environmental Quality Survey of England 2002/2003
http://www.encams.org/information/publications/research/leqse2003full.pdf

NACRO provide community safety practice briefings on crime audits and monitoring and evaluation on their website:
www.nacro.gov.uk

## Together Actionline

The Anti-Social Behaviour Unit Actionline provides help and advice on tackling ASB. Tel: 0870 220 2000.

## Government Offices

More information about the crime and disorder work of the Government Offices can be obtained from the following websites.

| Government Office | Website | Telephone enquiries |
| --- | --- | --- |
| North West | General: www.go-nw.gov.uk<br>Crime reduction: http://www.go-nw.gov.uk/crime/crime.html | 0161 952 4367 |
| North East | General: www.go-ne.gov.uk<br>Crime reduction: crimereduction.gone@go-regions.gsi.gov.uk | 0191 202 3737 |
| Yorkshire &<br>the Humber | General: http://www.goyh.gov.uk/<br>Crime reduction: www.goyh.gov.uk/crimereduction/default.htm | 0113 280 0600 |
| East Midlands | General: www.go-em.gov.uk<br>Crime reduction: http://www.go-em.gov.uk/crime/index.php | 0115 971 2759 |
| East of England | www.go-east.gov.uk | 01223 372500 |
| West Midlands | General: www.go-wm.gov.uk<br>Crime reduction: www.go-wm.gov.uk/cru/ | 0121 212 5050 |
| South East | www.go-se.gov.uk | 01483 882255 |
| London | General: www.go-london.gov.uk<br>Crime reduction: http://www.go-london.gov.uk/crime/index.asp | 020 7217 3328 |
| South West | www.gosw.gov.uk | 0117 900 1700 |
| Wales | www.wales.gov.uk | 029 20 825111 |

## Research methodology of RDS study

The research was undertaken by central and regional RDS researchers and students from Cardiff University and the University of Glamorgan.

Interviews were conducted in 12 CDRP and CSP areas with at least one partnership being included from each of the Government Office Regions in England and the Welsh Assembly. CDRPs were chosen on the basis of their socio-economic characteristics and on their different levels of reports of anti-social behaviour as measured by the ASBU one-day count of anti-social behaviour 2003.

Face-to-face or telephone interviews were conducted with 11 CDRP ASB co-ordinators or CDRP representatives who had responsibility for managing the one-day count at local level. Interviews were also conducted with a sample of public services and businesses that submitted returns for the day count in each partnership area, as well as agencies that were sent a form but did not complete it. Interviews were also carried out with agencies, which the CDRP representatives identified as receiving reports of anti-social behaviour or are involved in collecting/collating anti-social behaviour data but which were omitted from the count. An interview schedule was used which included mainly structured questions.

## References

Armitage, R. (2002) *Tackling antisocial behaviour: what really works.* NACRO Community Safety Practice Briefing.

Dodd, T., Nicholas, S., Povey. D. and Walker, A. (2004) *Crime in England and Wales 2003/2004.* Home Office Statistical Bulletin 10/04. London: Home Office

Leigh, A., Read, T. and Tilley, N. (1996) *Problem-Oriented Policing: Brit Pop.* Home Office Crime Detection and Prevention Series Paper 75. London: Home Office.

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.

Nicholas, S. and Walker, A. (eds.) 2004 *Crime in England and Wales 2002/2003: Supplementary Volume 2: Crime, Disorder and the Criminal Justice System – public attitudes and perceptions.* Home Office Statistical Bulletin 02/04. London: Home Office

## Acknowledgements