

Evaluation of the Lincoln Crime and Disorder Reduction Strategy

Year 2 Report

Peter Somerville and Alan Rust

Summary

This report relates to the second year of the audit of crime prevention and reduction in the City of Lincoln. In this year, two main surveys were conducted: a postal survey of households in Lincoln and a telephone survey of businesses in Lincoln. The purpose of these surveys was to ascertain the experiences, perceptions and views of residents and employers in the City concerning issues and initiatives relating to crime.

The report is divided into three parts: Part 1 presents the findings of the household survey, Part 2 the findings of the survey of businesses, and Part 3 compares the findings from the two surveys and draws conclusions concerning the effectiveness of crime prevention/reduction activity in the city.

PART I: HOUSEHOLD SURVEY

Section 1: Household characteristics (all Lincoln wards)

Area of Residence

Numbers of respondents were fairly evenly distributed throughout Lincoln. The average response rate per ward was 25%, with the highest in Hartsholme and Minster (29%), and the lowest in Park (20%) [table 1].

Table 1
Responses by Ward

Ward	Total Addresses	Valid Returns	Response rate (%)
Glebe	376	81	22
Castle	323	72	22
Abbey	319	81	25
Carholme	334	94	28
Park	366	72	20
Boultham	368	86	23
Moorland	371	96	26
Bracebridge	397	99	25
Minster	353	104	29
Hartsholme	441	126	29
Birchwood	352	94	27
Total	4000	1005	25

Length of Residence

The survey results suggest a quite high longevity of residency- 26.1% of respondents have been resident at present address for more than 20 years and 25.8% for between 11 and 20 years. However, those respondents who have been present for less than 1 year is also quite high at 8.7%, indicating a fairly recent high turnover [table 2].

Table 2
Length of residence

	Number	%
Less than 1 year	87	8.7
Between 1 and 2 years	94	9.4
Between 3 and 5 years	151	15.0
Between 6 and 10 years	146	14.5
Between 11 and 20 years	259	25.8
More than 20 years	262	26.1
Non response	6	0.6
Total	1005	100.0

Housing Tenure

In general, the tenure status of the sample is quite close to the UK distribution. Over 2/3rd or 69.1% of respondents are owner occupiers (constituted by 41.9% with a mortgage and 27.2% outright owners), compared with 67.8% owner occupiers throughout the UK in 1999/00¹. However, in comparison to the UK average the percentage of Council tenants is quite low at 14.4% (c.f. 16.5% UK 1999/00). Similarly, a comparatively low 4.5% of the sample lodge with friends or relatives (c.f. 7.8% UK 1999/00²) [table 3].

Table 3
Housing Tenure

	Number	%
Owner occupier with mortgage	421	41.9
Outright owner occupier	273	27.2
Council tenant	145	14.4
Tenant of private landlord	72	7.2
Lodging with relatives/ friends	45	4.5
Housing Association tenant	18	1.8
Non response	13	1.3
Another housing situation	13	1.3
Shared owner	5	0.5
Total	1005	100.0

¹ Department of the Transport and the Regions (2001), 'Table 1.1: Stock of Dwellings by Country and Tenure 1999/00' located at <http://www.housing.detr.gov.uk/research/hss/hs2000/> and accessed on Tuesday 17 April 2001.

² Department of the Transport and the Regions (2001), 'Table 4.6: Estimates and projections of numbers of households in England: 1999' located at <http://www.housing.detr.gov.uk/research/hss/hs2000/> and accessed on Tuesday 17 April 2001.

House type

Over $\frac{3}{4}$ of respondents reside in houses (75.5%) with only 11.9% in bungalows, 9.0% in flats and 1.9% residing in maisonettes [table 4]. Also, 85% of all respondents residing in bungalows were aged 45 years and over [table 5]

Table 4

House type	Number	%
House	759	75.5
Bungalow	120	11.9
Flat	90	9.0
Maisonette	19	1.9
Non response	12	1.2
Another type of home	5	0.5
Total	1005	100.0

Table 5

House Type by age (bungalows)

	Number	%
Non response	2	1.7
Under 25 years	3	2.5
Between 25 and 34 years	7	5.8
Between 35 and 44 years	6	5.0
Between 45 and 54 years	18	15.0
Between 55 and 59 years	16	13.3
Between 60 and 64 years	18	15.0
Between 65 and 74 years	23	19.2
75 years or over	27	22.5

Size of Household

By far the largest category of household size is 2 persons (42.2%), although most (68.5%) of this category is constituted by respondents aged 55 or over. Single-person households constituted the second largest household type at 18.1% (again, predominantly older people), followed by 3-persons (17.7%) and 4-persons (13.3%). Larger households constitute a much smaller proportion of the sample with only 5.2% of households containing 5 persons, 1.5% 6 persons, 0.2% 7 persons and 0.1% (1 household) 8 persons [table 6].

	Number	%
Non response	17	1.7
1	182	18.1
2	424	42.2
3	178	17.7
4	134	13.3
5	52	5.2
6	15	1.5
7	2	0.2
8	1	0.1
Total	1005	100.0

Household Type

An analysis of household composition suggests a fairly even spread of types. The most predominant family group is *'two adults both under 60'* (20.8%), followed by *'two adults at least one 60 or over'* (18.4%), *'two parent family with at least one child under 16'* (17.1%) and *'three or more adults 16 or over'* (15.2%). Less represented household types include *'one adult under 60'* (11.1%), *'one adult aged 60 or over'* (10.2%) and a small number of lone-parent families (2.5%) [table 7].

	Number	%
Non response	11	1.1
One adult under 60	112	11.1
One adult aged 60 or over	103	10.2
Two adults both under 60	209	20.8
Two adults at least one 60 or over	185	18.4
Three or more adults 16 or over	153	15.2
One parent family with at least one child under 16	25	2.5
Two parent family with at least one child under 16	172	17.1
Another type of household	35	3.5
Total	1005	100.0

Household Income

The largest group or nearly $\frac{1}{4}$ (24.3%) of respondents stated a total weekly net income of £400 (the national weekly average) or over³. However, this suggests that over $\frac{3}{4}$ of respondents have a net income of less than the national average-9.3% of respondents stated a weekly income of less than £100 per week, and nearly $\frac{1}{3}$ rd (31.4%) an income of less than £200 per week. It is also important to note that this question attracted a large percentage of non-responses (11.7%) [table 8].

Table 8
Household income

	Number	%
Non response	115	11.4
Less than £100 per week	93	9.3
£100-£199 per week	222	22.1
£200-£299 per week	185	18.4
£300-£399 per week	146	14.5
£400 or more per week	244	24.3
Total	1005	100.0

³ £398.70 per week for all persons in 1999-ONS 2000 'United Kingdom in Figures'

Car and caravan ownership

Similar to the above question, the extent of car and caravan ownership reflects the uneven distribution of wealth. Although 76.7% of respondents own a car or caravan [table 9] only 29.0% of respondents earning £100 or less own a car or caravan in comparison to 96.7% of respondents earning over £400 per week net [table 10].

Table 9
Car or caravan ownership

	Number	%
Non response	23	2.3
Yes	771	76.7
No	211	21.0
Total	1005	100.0

Table 10
Household income by car/caravan ownership

	NR	%	Yes	%	No	%	Total	%
Non response	9	7.8	81	70.4	25	21.7	115	100.0
Less than £100 per week	6	6.5	27	29.0	60	64.5	93	100.0
£100-£199 per week	2	0.9	135	60.8	85	38.3	222	100.0
£200-£299 per week	2	1.1	158	85.4	25	13.5	185	100.0
£300-£399 per week	1	0.7	134	91.8	11	7.5	146	100.0
£400 or more per week	3	1.2	236	96.7	5	2.0	244	100.0
Total	23	2.3	771	76.7	211	21.0	1005	100.0

Gender of respondent

There was a fairly even spread of gender within the sample, which consisted of 52.0% females and 46.6% males [table 11]

Table 11
Gender of respondent

	Number	%
Non response	14	1.4
Male	468	46.6
Female	523	52.0
Total	1005	100.0

Age of respondent

The respondents were predominantly ‘middle-aged’ with the largest age group 35-44 years (17.7%), and similar sized groups aged 45-54 (16.9%) and 25-34 (14.7%). A large group of persons were aged 60 and over (24.6%) in comparison to a small number of younger people (7.9%) [table 12].

Table 12
Age of respondent

	Number	%
Non response	13	1.3
Under 25 years	79	7.9
Between 25 and 34 years	148	14.7
Between 35 and 44 years	178	17.7
Between 45 and 54 years	170	16.9
Between 55 and 59 years	92	9.2
Between 60 and 64 years	77	7.7
Between 65 and 74 years	131	13.0
75 years or over	117	11.6
Total	1005	100.0

Employment Status

An analysis of employment within the sample indicates a dichotomy between two main groups: over half (50.4%) of respondents working either full-time (32.5%), part-time (11.7%) or self-employed (6.2%) and over a ¼ (25.1%) of respondents are retired. 8.0% of respondents stated that they are looking after their family, 5.9% permanently sick or disabled and only 2.0% stating unemployed and available for work. Other less represented groups include 4.2% in either full-time education (4.0%) or government-supported training (0.2%) [table 13].

Table 13
Employment Status

	Number	%
Employee in full time job	327	32.5
Wholly retired from work	252	25.1
Employee In part time job	118	11.7
Looking after family/ home	80	8.0
Self employed	62	6.2
Permanently sick/ disabled	59	5.9
In full time education at school, college or university	40	4.0
Non response	31	3.1
Unemployed and available for work	20	2.0
Doing something else	14	1.4
In government supported training programme	2	0.2
Total	1005	100.0

Occupation Type

There was a fairly wide spread of occupational types, with nearly 1/5th of respondents describing themselves as ‘professional’ (19.7%). Other occupations constituting more than 10% of the sample included clerical and secretarial (12.5%), craft and related occupations (10.9%) and personal and protective (10.1%). A fairly large number of respondents described themselves as housewife/unemployed/retired (15.1%) and ‘other occupations’ constituted 12.1% of the sample. Less prominent occupations included sales (8.3%), managers and administrators (5.8%), plant and machinery (2.9%) and associate professional and technical (2.5%) [table 14].

Table 14
Occupation type

	Number	%
Non Response/ Housewife/ Unemployed/ Retired	152	15.1
Managers and Administrators	58	5.8
Professional Occupations	198	19.7
Associate Professional & Technical Occupations	25	2.5
Clerical & Secretarial Occupations	126	12.5
Craft and Related Occupations	110	10.9
Personal & Protective Service Occupations	102	10.1
Sales Occupations	83	8.3
Plant & Machinery Occupations	29	2.9
Other Occupations	122	12.1
Total	1005	100.0

Ethnic origin

At first glance there appears to be a fairly representative distribution of ethnic diversity⁴ amongst the sample, with 5.5% of respondents from ethnic minority groups. However, the largest groups are Other White (1.1%) and Irish (0.6%) and there is even less representation of Black and Asian ethnic groups, with none of these constituting more than 0.3% of the sample. The largest of these are White and Asian (0.3%), Other Asian (0.3%), Chinese (0.3%) and Indian (0.2%). White and Black Caribbean, Caribbean, White and Black African, Other Black and Other Ethnic groups each constitute only 0.1% of sample [table 15].

Table 15
Ethnic origin

	Number	%
British	950	94.5
Non response	22	2.2
Any other White background	11	1.1
Irish	6	0.6
White and Asian	3	0.3
Chinese	3	0.3
Any other Asian background	3	0.3
Indian	2	0.2
White and Black Caribbean	1	0.1
White and Black African	1	0.1
Caribbean	1	0.1
Any other Black background	1	0.1
Another ethnic group	1	0.1
Total	1005	100.0

⁴ ethnic minorities constitute 6.4% of UK population in 1999- ONS 2000, ibid

Section 2: Household characteristics (central Lincoln wards)

Nearly half (49.1%) of the respondents lived in the Lincoln central wards of Carholme, Birchwood, Glebe, Abbey, Castle and Park.

In general, the social and economic characteristics of the central wards closely reflected those of all Lincoln wards. There were slight differences between the central wards and all Lincoln, however, in relation to housing tenure: owner occupation with mortgage in the central wards was slightly lower at 36.6% (c.f. 41.9% for all Lincoln wards); the percentage of council tenants was slightly higher (18.4% c.f. 14.4%); as was the percentage of respondents in the private rented sector (10.7% c.f. 7.2%) [table 16]. Significantly, there was very little difference between the two areas with regards to weekly net income [table 17].

Table 16
Tenure status

	central wards	Percent	all Lincoln	Percent
Non response	7	1.4	13	1.3
Owner occupier with mortgage	181	36.6	421	41.9
Outright owner occupier	129	26.1	273	27.2
Council tenant	91	18.4	145	14.4
Housing Association tenant	10	2.0	18	1.8
Tenant of private landlord	53	10.7	72	7.2
Shared owner	1	0.2	5	0.5
Lodging with relatives/ friends	16	3.2	45	4.5
Another housing situation	6	1.2	13	1.3
Total	494	100.0	1005.0	100.0

Table 17
Household net income

	central wards	Percent	all Lincoln	Percent
Non response	50	10.1	115	11.4
Less than £100 per week	56	11.3	93	9.3
£100-£199 per week	121	24.5	222	22.1
£200-£299 per week	84	17.0	185	18.4
£300-£399 per week	76	15.4	146	14.5
£400 or more per week	107	21.7	244	24.3
Total	494	100.0	1005	100.0

Section 3: Problems in areas (all Lincoln wards)

Problems in areas

None of the 25 area problems that were listed in the survey was more likely to be described as a ‘major’ problem than as a ‘minor’ one. However, there are four problems which a significant number of respondents stated were ‘major’: litter and rubbish (25.8%), dogs or dogs mess (31.1%), busy roads/traffic (23.0%) and poor policing (24.1%). The problems more likely to be stated as ‘minor’ were: vandalism to property (38.2%), litter and rubbish (46.0%), dogs or dogs mess (43.1%) and burglaries (38.2%). The remainder were predominantly categorised by the respondents as ‘not a problem’ [table 18]

However, combining both the ‘major’ and ‘minor’ responses to the question provides a more comprehensive overview, with more than half of respondents stating the following to be a major or minor problem: dogs or dogs mess (74.2%), litter and rubbish (71.7%), burglaries (64.7%), poor policing (57.9%), busy roads or traffic (54.6%), and vandalism to property (51.4%). Between 10% and 49% of respondents stated that a further 16 problems were either major or minor. According to respondents the least important problems (those with a combined response rate of less than 10%) are: racial harassment or assaults (9.6%), squatters or unauthorised occupation (5.3%) and kerb crawling and prostitution (1.6%) [table 19].

Table 18

Problems in area	Non response Major problem Minor problem Not a problem			
	%	%	%	%
Dogs or dogs mess	6.3	31.1	43.1	19.5
Litter and rubbish	8.0	25.8	46.0	20.3
Poor policing	7.8	24.1	33.8	34.3
Busy roads/ traffic	9.2	23.0	31.6	36.2
Burglaries	9.2	17.1	47.6	26.2
Rowdy children and teenagers	10.0	13.5	33.2	43.2
Vandalism to property	10.7	13.2	38.2	37.8
Unsafe parking	10.8	12.1	27.3	49.8
Neglected or run down open spaces	12.4	10.7	25.9	50.9
Thefts from vehicles	11.8	10.6	36.5	41.0
Drug dealing and drug use	12.2	10.1	18.5	59.1
Neglected or derelict property	11.9	8.9	19.3	59.9
Poor lighting	10.6	8.0	22.2	59.2
Thefts of vehicles	11.9	7.7	28.6	51.8
Neighbours causing problems	11.7	6.7	18.2	63.4
Street drinkers	12.2	6.4	18.2	63.2
Problems caused by alcohol	11.7	6.1	23.8	58.4
Muggings and assaults	12.5	4.0	19.3	64.2
Fighting and violence	12.2	3.4	14.9	69.5
Graffiti on walls and buildings	12.1	2.7	28.7	56.5
Abandoned vehicle	12.3	2.7	11.2	73.7
Domestic violence	13.0	1.6	9.1	76.3
Racial harassment and assaults	13.2	1.1	8.5	77.2
Squatters or unauthorised occupants	12.8	0.7	4.6	81.9
Kerb crawling and prostitution	13.3	0.5	1.1	85.1

Problems in area	Table 19		Major or
	Major problem	Minor problem	minor problem
	%	%	%
Dogs or dogs mess	31.1	43.1	74.2
Litter and rubbish	25.8	46.0	71.7
Burglaries	17.1	47.6	64.7
Poor policing	24.1	33.8	57.9
Busy roads/ traffic	23.0	31.6	54.6
Vandalism to property	13.2	38.2	51.4
Thefts from vehicles	10.6	36.5	47.2
Rowdy children and teenagers	13.5	33.2	46.8
Unsafe parking	12.1	27.3	39.4
Neglected or run down open spaces	10.7	25.9	36.6
Thefts of vehicles	7.7	28.6	36.2
Graffiti on walls and buildings	2.7	28.7	31.3
Poor lighting	8.0	22.2	30.1
Problems caused by alcohol	6.1	23.8	29.9
Drug dealing and drug use	10.1	18.5	28.7
Neglected or derelict property	8.9	19.3	28.2
Neighbours causing problems	6.7	18.2	24.9
Street drinkers	6.4	18.2	24.6
Muggings and assaults	4.0	19.3	23.3
Fighting and violence	3.4	14.9	18.3
Abandoned vehicle	2.7	11.2	13.9
Domestic violence	1.6	9.1	10.6
Racial harassment and assaults	1.1	8.5	9.6
Squatters or unauthorised occupants	0.7	4.6	5.3
Kerb crawling and prostitution	0.5	1.1	1.6

Analysis by ward of those respondents stating a problem is ‘major’ provides further useful comparisons. For example, whilst over half of respondents in Park (54.2%) stated that dogs or dogs’ mess is a major problem, only about 1/5th (21.9%) of respondents in Moorland gave the same response (compared with an average of 31.7% for all Lincoln). Other notable comparisons (where the response to a problem as ‘major’ was around more than twice the average for all Lincoln) include: neglected or derelict property in Abbey (25.9% c.f. average of 9.7% for all Lincoln), with high proportions also in Glebe (18.5%) and Carholme (18.1%); problems caused by alcohol in Abbey (17.3% c.f. 6.2%); drug dealing and drug use in Abbey (17.3%) and Glebe (16.0%) compared with an average of 10.4% for the City; fighting and violence in Abbey (9.9% c.f. 3.5%); street drinkers in Abbey (23.5% c.f. 6.6%); busy roads/traffic in Abbey (40.7% c.f. 23.7%); racial harassment in Park (4.2% c.f. 1.1%); vandalism to property in Glebe (22.2%) and Birchwood (22.3%) compared with an average of 13.2% for the City; unsafe parking in Park (23.6% c.f. 12.4%); and graffiti on walls and buildings in Glebe (4.9%) and Abbey (4.9%) compared with a Lincoln average of 2.7% [table 20].

Table 20**Problems in area by major problem by ward (%)**

	Glebe	Castle	Abbey	Carholme	Park	Boultham	Moorland	Bracebridge	Minster	Hartsholme	Birchwood	Average
Graffiti on walls and buildings	4.9	1.4	4.9	1.1	2.8	2.3	0.0	1.0	2.9	4.0	4.3	2.7
Vandalism to property	22.2	12.5	21.0	6.4	9.7	3.5	6.3	8.1	14.4	18.3	22.3	13.2
Litter and rubbish	22.2	26.4	35.8	35.1	47.2	17.4	20.8	15.2	12.5	23.8	35.1	26.5
Dogs or dogs mess	32.1	27.8	29.6	42.6	54.2	27.9	21.9	25.3	24.0	30.2	33.0	31.7
Neglected or run down open spaces	16.0	11.1	17.3	17.0	11.1	9.3	3.1	5.1	2.9	12.7	14.9	11.0
Neglected or derelict property	18.5	15.3	25.9	18.1	12.5	4.7	1.0	2.0	1.9	2.4	4.3	9.7
Neighbours causing problems	6.2	11.1	8.6	9.6	11.1	3.5	5.2	2.0	3.8	4.8	10.6	7.0
Problems caused by alcohol	1.2	9.7	17.3	5.3	2.8	5.8	5.2	1.0	5.8	7.1	6.4	6.2
Squatters or unauthorised occupants	2.5	0.0	1.2	1.1	1.4	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Rowdy children and teenagers	11.1	20.8	18.5	12.8	19.4	7.0	12.5	13.1	7.7	12.7	17.0	13.9
Fighting and violence	6.2	4.2	9.9	1.1	4.2	2.3	2.1	0.0	1.9	4.8	2.1	3.5
Domestic violence	1.2	2.8	2.5	2.1	2.8	2.3	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.6	0.0	1.7
Poor lighting	4.9	11.1	12.3	10.6	6.9	4.7	4.2	5.1	6.7	8.7	12.8	8.0
Unsafe parking	9.9	8.3	16.0	14.9	23.6	10.5	10.4	7.1	10.6	11.1	13.8	12.4
Abandoned vehicles	2.5	4.2	3.7	3.2	1.4	2.3	2.1	1.0	2.9	2.4	4.3	2.7
Drug dealing and drug use	16.0	9.7	17.3	6.4	15.3	5.8	8.3	3.0	8.7	10.3	13.8	10.4
Street drinkers	2.5	6.9	23.5	3.2	8.3	5.8	4.2	1.0	2.9	7.1	7.4	6.6
Thefts of vehicles	3.7	4.2	6.2	8.5	12.5	10.5	6.3	4.0	7.7	10.3	9.6	7.6
Thefts from vehicles	11.1	5.6	13.6	10.6	16.7	15.1	9.4	4.0	8.7	11.1	12.8	10.8
Kerb crawling and prostitution	1.2	0.0	1.2	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.6	0.0	0.5
Busy roads/ traffic	24.7	15.3	40.7	28.7	37.5	20.9	17.7	23.2	19.2	14.3	18.1	23.7
Burglaries	19.8	18.1	23.5	16.0	25.0	18.6	16.7	6.1	13.5	14.3	22.3	17.6
Muggings and assaults	3.7	4.2	7.4	3.2	6.9	3.5	1.0	1.0	1.9	5.6	6.4	4.1
Racial harassment and assaults	3.7	0.0	1.2	0.0	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4	1.1	1.1
Poor policing	23.5	26.4	27.2	21.3	25.0	16.3	20.8	23.2	20.2	29.4	30.9	24.0

Table 21 indicates which ward mostly experiences a particular problem and table 22 indicates how many problems exist in each ward. Both tables suggest that problems are concentrated around the central wards. Of the non-Central wards Hartsholme experiences one problem more than any other ward (busy/roads traffic), whilst Carholme, Boultham, Moorland, Bracebridge and Minster experience none. In comparison Glebe experiences 2, Castle 3, Abbey 9, Park 8 and Birchwood 4 [Table 21].

Problems in area by major problem by main ward	
Problem in area	Main ward
Graffiti on walls and buildings	Glebe/Abbey
Vandalism to property	Birchwood
Litter and rubbish	Park
Dogs or dogs mess	Park
Neglected or run down open spaces	Abbey
Neglected or derelict property	Abbey
Neighbours causing problems	Castle
Problems caused by alcohol	Abbey
Squatters or unauthorised occupants	Glebe/Abbey
Rowdy children and teenagers	Castle
Fighting and violence	Abbey
Domestic violence	Castle/Park
Poor policing	Birchwood
Abandoned vehicle	Park
Drug dealing and drug use	Birchwood
Street drinkers	Abbey
Thefts of vehicles	Abbey
Thefts from vehicles	Park
Kerb crawling and prostitution	Park
Busy roads/ traffic	Hartsholme
Burglaries	Abbey
Muggings and assaults	Park
Racial harassment and assaults	Abbey
Poor lighting	Park
Unsafe parking	Birchwood

Number of problems in each ward	
Glebe (central) *	2
Castle (central) \$	3
Abbey (central) *	10
Carholme (central)	0
Park (central) \$	8
Boultham	0
Moorland	0
Bracebridge	0
Minster	0
Hartsholme	1
Birchwood (central)	4
Total	27

* equal responses regarding graffiti and squatters

\$ equal responses regarding domestic violence

Changes in problems

Taking into account the total sample (1005) no problem was stated by the majority of respondents to have become worse and all problems were stated by the majority to have stayed more or less the same. Problems that were most likely to be stated as having become worse over the previous five years were burglaries, dogs or dogs mess and litter/rubbish (cited by 19.4%, 18.7% and 17.8% of respondents, respectively). Relatively smaller proportions of the sample reported any changes for the better, with the highest proportion being only 5.1%, for dogs or dogs mess [table 23].

An analysis including only those respondents who stated that a major problem exists serves to confirm the overall picture. Problems that these respondents mentioned most frequently as having become worse over the previous 5 years included: burglaries (55.7%); litter and rubbish (45.8%); dogs or dogs mess (42.7%); rowdy children and teenagers (41.0%); street drinkers (36.8%); unsafe parking (36.2%); muggings and assaults (35.0%); and abandoned vehicles (32.7%). Again, relatively smaller proportions of respondents reported changes for the better, with the most commonly cited improvements being for: graffiti on walls and buildings (18.9%); neighbours causing problems (16.3%); busy roads/traffic (16.2%); fighting and violence (15.9%); and squatters/unauthorised occupants (15.1%). For most listed problems, the majority of respondents stated that they had remained more or less the same – the main exception was burglaries, which only 35.1% felt had stayed unchanged [table 24].

Table 23
Change in problems (all respondents)

	Non response	Much better	A little better	More or less the same	A little worse	Much worse
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Graffiti on walls and buildings	77.9	1.8	2.4	15.1	1.5	1.3
Vandalism to property	72.3	1.1	2.6	17.0	3.5	3.5
Litter and rubbish	61.3	0.6	1.9	18.5	8.1	9.7
Dogs or dogs mess	56.2	1.1	4.0	20.0	7.5	11.2
Neglected or run down open spaces	76.0	1.6	1.5	15.9	2.0	3.0
Neglected or derelict property	76.4	1.5	1.9	14.8	2.4	3.0
Neighbours causing problems	78.1	1.7	1.9	13.7	2.1	2.5
Problems caused by alcohol	78.5	1.4	1.4	12.9	3.1	2.7
Squatters or unauthorised occupants	84.2	1.8	0.6	12.9	0.2	0.3
Rowdy children and teenagers	73.5	1.0	2.1	12.5	4.4	6.5
Fighting and violence	81.9	1.4	1.5	11.9	2.1	1.2
Domestic violence	83.3	1.3	0.9	12.8	1.2	0.5
Poor policing	77.8	1.5	1.8	15.7	1.9	1.3
Abandoned vehicle	74.4	1.2	1.3	14.7	3.6	4.8
Drug dealing and drug use	82.2	1.4	0.9	13.2	1.3	1.0
Street drinkers	77.3	1.4	1.0	11.9	3.3	5.1
Thefts of vehicles	79.9	1.2	1.1	11.8	2.8	3.2
Thefts from vehicles	77.6	1.1	1.9	13.6	2.8	3.0
Kerb crawling and prostitution	77.2	0.7	1.4	14.0	3.8	2.9
Busy roads/ traffic	84.1	1.7	0.9	12.8	0.2	0.3
Burglaries	65.4	2.2	1.0	12.1	9.7	9.7
Muggings and assaults	70.4	1.1	1.9	16.2	6.0	4.4
Racial harassment and assaults	82.2	0.9	0.8	12.4	2.3	1.4
Poor lighting	83.6	1.4	0.6	13.0	1.3	0.1
Unsafe parking	65.4	1.7	2.7	17.7	5.4	7.2

Table 24

Change in problems by perceived major problem

	Much better	A little better	More or less the same	A little worse	Much worse	Worse or much worse
Graffiti on walls and buildings	8.1	10.8	68.5	6.8	5.9	12.6
Vandalism to property	4.0	9.4	61.5	12.6	12.6	25.2
Litter and rubbish	1.5	4.9	47.8	20.8	24.9	45.8
Dogs or dogs mess	2.5	9.1	45.7	17.0	25.7	42.7
Neglected or run down open spaces	6.6	6.2	66.4	8.3	12.4	20.7
Neglected or derelict property	6.3	8.0	62.9	10.1	12.7	22.8
Neighbours causing problems	7.7	8.6	62.7	9.5	11.4	20.9
Problems caused by alcohol	6.5	6.5	60.2	14.4	12.5	26.9
Squatters or unauthorised occupants	11.3	3.8	81.8	1.3	1.9	3.1
Rowdy children and teenagers	3.8	7.9	47.4	16.5	24.4	41.0
Fighting and violence	7.7	8.2	65.9	11.5	6.6	18.1
Domestic violence	7.7	5.4	76.8	7.1	3.0	10.1
Poor policing	6.7	8.1	70.9	8.5	5.8	14.3
Abandoned vehicle	4.7	5.1	57.6	14.0	18.7	32.7
Drug dealing and drug use	7.8	5.0	74.3	7.3	5.6	12.8
Street drinkers	6.1	4.4	52.6	14.5	22.4	36.8
Thefts of vehicles	5.9	5.4	58.9	13.9	15.8	29.7
Thefts from vehicles	4.9	8.4	60.9	12.4	13.3	25.8
Kerb crawling and prostitution	3.1	6.1	61.6	16.6	12.7	29.3
Busy roads/ traffic	10.6	5.6	80.6	1.3	1.9	3.1
Burglaries	6.3	2.9	35.1	27.9	27.9	55.7
Muggings and assaults	3.7	6.4	54.9	20.2	14.8	35.0
Racial harassment and assaults	5.0	4.5	69.8	12.8	7.8	20.7
Poor lighting	8.5	3.6	79.4	7.9	0.6	8.5
Unsafe parking	4.9	7.8	51.1	15.5	20.7	36.2

Safety

For most respondents safety was not regarded as a major problem: 89.4% of respondents stated that they felt very or fairly safe in their area; 83.5% felt very or fairly safe in home at night; and 80.7% felt very or fairly safe walking alone at night. However, 23.7% of respondents stated that they felt not at all- or not very- safe whilst walking alone at night and 15.5% stated that they never walked alone at night.

Safety						
Safe:	in area ?		in home at night ?		walking alone ?	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Non response	12	1.2	12	1.2	12	1.2
Very safe	210	20.9	269	26.8	81	8.1
Fairly safe	688	68.5	570	56.7	518	51.5
Not very safe	79	7.9	84	8.4	193	19.2
Not at all safe	16	1.6	28	2.8	45	4.5
Never alone at night	0	0.0	42	4.2	156	15.5

Reasons for not going out after dark

Again, only a few respondents stated reasons as to why they did not go out after dark. Of these, the most important were: fear of being attacked (16.2%) and busy working or content to stay in (15.2%) [table 26].

Reasons for not going out after dark	%
Too old	7.0
Too ill/ sick/ disabled	4.0
Family responsibilities	3.9
Fear of being attacked	16.2
Fear of burglary/ damage	6.6
Fear of dark/ night	3.7
Fear of going out alone	11.2
No money/ too expensive	5.6
No where to go/ nothing to do	3.6
Busy working/ content to stay in and watch TV	15.2
Don't want to go out	9.4
No transport	9.6
Other reasons	4.0
Total	100

Victims of crime/type of crime

Just over 1/5th (20.1%)⁵ stated that they had been a victim of crime in the last year [table 27]. Of those that responded, the most commonly reported crimes were burglary (33.3%) and car theft (25.2%). Relatively few respondents were the victims of assault (7.9%) or mugging (1.5%) [table 27].

Table 27
Victim of crime in last year ?

	Number	%
Non response	39	3.9
Yes	171	17.0
No	795	79.1
Total	1005	100.0

Table 28
Victim of which type of crime ?

	Number	%
Burglary	67	33.2
Mugging	3	1.5
Assault	16	7.9
Car theft	51	25.2
Other crime	65	32.2
Total	202	100.0

Most important action to reduce crime

By far the most commonly mentioned action to reduce crime in the area suggested by respondents was more bobbies on the beat (54.9%)- all other categories were stated as being most important by less than 10% of the respondents. The most frequently cited of these other actions were responding more quickly to vandalism etc. (8.0%), the use of CCTV (5.8%) and Neighbourhood Watch (5.5%) [table 29]. However, concatenating all the responses to each category (i.e. including the first, second and third most important actions cited) provides a more varied distribution of responses. Whilst the most commonly mentioned action is still bobbies on the beat (74.5%) there are a number of other significant categories: neighbourhood watch (35.7%), CCTV (29.7%), respond more quickly etc. (23.3%), more or better places for young people to go (19.3%), more for young people to do (15.8%) and evict trouble-makers (15.3%) [table 30].

⁵ Some discrepancy exists between those respondents that stated they were the victim of crime (171) and the type of crime stated (202). The latter figure has been used for analysis.

Most important action to reduce crime in area (first choice)		
Action	Number	%
More bobbies on the beat	552	54.9
Respond more quickly to vandalism, burglary etc	80	8.0
CCTV	58	5.8
Neighbourhood Watch	55	5.5
More for young people to do	42	4.2
Evict trouble-makers	39	3.9
More or better places for young people to go	38	3.8
Non response	35	3.5
More jobs for local people	23	2.3
Make properties more secure	20	2.0
Drug misuse prevention project	16	1.6
Restriction for drinking alcohol in the street	10	1.0
Better street lighting	9	0.9
Remove possible hiding place	8	0.8
Secure off street parking	7	0.7
Advice from crime prevention officers	7	0.7
Better maintenance of open areas and common areas	4	0.4
Reduce number of empty properties	2	0.2
Total	1005	100.0

Most important action to reduce crime in area (1st, 2nd and 3rd choices)		
Action	Number	%
More bobbies on the beat	749	74.5
Neighbourhood Watch	359	35.7
CCTV	298	29.7
Respond more quickly to vandalism, burglary etc	234	23.3
Non response	207	20.6
More or better places for young people to go	194	19.3
More for young people to do	159	15.8
Evict trouble-makers	154	15.3
Restriction for drinking alcohol in the street	91	9.1
More jobs for local people	86	8.6
Remove possible hiding place	85	8.5
Drug misuse prevention project	77	7.7
Better street lighting	72	7.2
Make properties more secure	66	6.6
Secure off street parking	47	4.7
Better maintenance of open areas and common areas	46	4.6
Advice from crime prevention officers	42	4.2
Reduce number of empty properties	35	3.5
Witness support scheme	14	1.4
Total	1005	300.3

Change in crime in area

The majority of respondents (56.5%) stated that crime has stayed more or less the same in the last two years, whilst 25.5% stated that crime had gone up a little. Only 9.3% stated that crime had gone up a lot, 5.4% down a little and 0.7% gone down a lot [table 31].

	Number	%
Stayed more or less the same	568	56.5
Gone up a little	256	25.5
Gone up a lot	93	9.3
Gone down a little	54	5.4
Non response	27	2.7
Gone down a lot	7	0.7
Total	1005	100.0

Crime prevention and reduction

Respondents were presented with a list of crime prevention/reduction schemes in Lincoln. The analysis of their responses suggests some fairly wide distribution between those schemes that the respondents have heard of, used or know to exist in their area. Those schemes that respondents were more likely to have heard of included: CCTV (75.9%), neighbourhood watch (64.9%), adult education (61.5%), North Lincs FE college (59.4%) and proof of age cards (58.1%). Between half and 1/5th of respondents had heard of 19 schemes and between 1/10th and 1/5th had heard of 15 schemes. Five schemes were known to less than 10% of respondents including Healthy Living Centre (9.5%), Operation Castle (8.3%), Reward 99/Dovetail (7.9%) and Operation Carriage (6.3%).

However, very few respondents had used any of the schemes listed. Those most used by respondents included adult education (12.5%), property marking (11.1%) and North Lincs FE college (10.8%). Less than 1% of respondents had used 28 schemes and three schemes (Home Office Burglary Initiative, Operation Castle and Operation Carriage) had been used by no respondents. In comparison, the number of respondents who were aware that the schemes existed in their area was slightly higher, the most notable of these being neighbourhood watch (32.0%), adult education (14.0%), CCTV (13.8%), North Lincs FE college (10.9%), improved street lighting (10.2%) and Pub Watch (10.2%). Less than 5% of respondents knew whether or not each of the 32 remaining schemes existed in their area [table 32].

Table 32
Heard of, used or know service exists in area

	Heard	%	Used	%	Exists	%
CCTV	763	75.9	18	1.8	139	13.8
Neighbourhood Watch	652	64.9	87	8.7	322	32.0
Adult Education	618	61.5	126	12.5	141	14.0
North Lincolnshire College Further Education	597	59.4	109	10.8	110	10.9
Proof of age cards	584	58.1	22	2.2	95	9.5
Pub Watch	435	43.3	7	0.7	103	10.2
Property Marking	423	42.1	112	11.1	63	6.3
Birchwood Access and Training Centre	411	40.9	27	2.7	86	8.6
City Centre Ranger	377	37.5	12	1.2	89	8.9
Lincoln Womens Aid	377	37.5	6	0.6	45	4.5
Publicity on Child Abuse and Domestic Violence	353	35.1	4	0.4	29	2.9
Secured Car Parks	336	33.4	98	9.8	36	3.6
De Montfort Learning and Training Support Services	299	29.8	14	1.4	38	3.8
Retail Radio Link	296	29.5	15	1.5	43	4.3
Improved street lighting	286	28.5	20	2.0	103	10.2
Estate Environmental Improvements	270	26.9	10	1.0	47	4.7
Lifeline Services	266	26.5	9	0.9	30	3.0
Retail Crime Initiative	262	26.1	7	0.7	44	4.4
Abbey Access Centre	255	25.4	13	1.3	37	3.7
Racist graffiti removal	224	22.3	4	0.4	33	3.3
Football and Basketball in the Community	222	22.1	14	1.4	78	7.8
Substance Misuse Counselling	218	21.7	6	0.6	28	2.8
Violence Prevention Programme	207	20.6	3	0.3	18	1.8
Home Secure	203	20.2	5	0.5	39	3.9
Sure Start	199	19.8	4	0.4	20	2.0
Car Offenders Programme	197	19.6	2	0.2	16	1.6
Escape	175	17.4	12	1.2	29	2.9
Problem-oriented policing	174	17.3	6	0.6	18	1.8
Lindum Substance Misuse Project	166	16.5	5	0.5	26	2.6
Employment Key Skills Programme	161	16.0	2	0.2	27	2.7
Substance Misuse Education	159	15.8	4	0.4	23	2.3
New Start Mentoring Project for Young Offenders	152	15.1	3	0.3	15	1.5
Community Detoxification & Relapse Prevention	144	14.3	2	0.2	24	2.4
Door Watch	144	14.3	8	0.8	24	2.4
Home Office Burglary Initiative	142	14.1	0	0.0	22	2.2
Lincoln Youth Matters	131	13.0	5	0.5	19	1.9
Arrest/ Referral Scheme	127	12.6	1	0.1	15	1.5
More balanced press reporting	115	11.4	2	0.2	21	2.1
Architect Liaison	111	11.0	5	0.5	17	1.7
Healthy Living Centre	95	9.5	1	0.1	14	1.4
Operation Castle	83	8.3	0	0.0	18	1.8
Reward 99/ Dovetail	79	7.9	2	0.2	9	0.9
Operation Carriage	63	6.3	0	0.0	9	0.9

Reduction in crime by scheme

Very few respondents stated that any of the schemes had reduced crime in their area although there was greater confidence that these had positively affected crime in general. The schemes which were suggested to have impacted most positively on areas were: neighbourhood watch (26.0%), CCTV (22.1%), improved street lighting (11.4%) and pub watch (10.7%). Less than 5% of respondents stated that any of the other schemes had reduced crime in their area. However, more respondents stated that the schemes had reduced crime generally including: CCTV (54.3%), neighbourhood watch (36.7%), secured car parks (23.9%), improved street lighting (23.3%), pub watch (23.3%) and proof of age cards (23.0%). Between 10% and 20% of respondents stated that another 11 schemes had generally reduced crime, and similarly between 5% and 10% of respondents stated that 24 schemes were effective. Only Operation Carriage (4.9%) and Reward 99/Dovetail (4.7%) were regarded by fewer than 5% of respondents to have generally reduced crime [table 33]

Which scheme has reduced crime ?	In area		Generally	
	No.	%	No.	%
Neighbourhood Watch	261	26.0	369	36.7
CCTV	222	22.1	546	54.3
Improved street lighting	115	11.4	234	23.3
Pub Watch	108	10.7	234	23.3
Secured Car Parks	94	9.4	240	23.9
City Centre Ranger	90	9.0	133	13.2
Birchwood Access and Training Centre	84	8.4	95	9.5
Proof of age cards	70	7.0	231	23.0
Property Marking	69	6.9	182	18.1
Estate Environmental Improvements	67	6.7	93	9.3
Retail Radio Link	63	6.3	145	14.4
Home Secure	59	5.9	108	10.7
Football and Basketball in the Community	54	5.4	89	8.9
Retail Crime Initiative	52	5.2	151	15.0
Adult Education	49	4.9	183	18.2
North Lincolnshire College Further Education	47	4.7	145	14.4
Publicity on Child Abuse and Domestic Violence	46	4.6	147	14.6
Door Watch	44	4.4	88	8.8
Problem-oriented policing	43	4.3	74	7.4
Racist graffiti removal	43	4.3	87	8.7
Lincoln Womens Aid	39	3.9	126	12.5
Abbey Access Centre	36	3.6	69	6.9
De Montfort Learning and Training Support Services	34	3.4	96	9.6
Escape	34	3.4	79	7.9
Home Office Burglary Initiative	32	3.2	71	7.1
Lifeline Services	32	3.2	95	9.5
New Start Mentoring Project for Young Offenders	28	2.8	67	6.7
Sure Start	27	2.7	72	7.2
Violence Prevention Programme	27	2.7	98	9.8
Lincoln Youth Matters	26	2.6	65	6.5
Community Detoxification & Relapse Prevention	25	2.5	69	6.9
Arrest/ Referral Scheme	24	2.4	65	6.5
Car Offenders Programme	24	2.4	101	10.0
Healthy Living Centre	23	2.3	50	5.0
Substance Misuse Counselling	23	2.3	102	10.1
Lindum Substance Misuse Project	22	2.2	85	8.5
More balanced press reporting	22	2.2	76	7.6
Substance Misuse Education	22	2.2	80	8.0
Architect Liaison	21	2.1	57	5.7
Reward 99/ Dovetail	19	1.9	47	4.7
Operation Castle	18	1.8	60	6.0
Employment Key Skills Programme	17	1.7	81	8.1
Operation Carriage	14	1.4	49	4.9

PART TWO: SURVEY OF BUSINESSES

Introduction

This part of the report represents the findings from research undertaken by the University of Lincoln between April and July 2001. The aim of the research was primarily to determine:

- the types of crime Lincoln businesses perceive as most problematic;
- the effectiveness of local crime reduction and prevention projects; and
- attitudes towards the multi-agency approach to crime prevention and reduction.

A total of 27 telephone interviews, using a semi-structured questionnaire, were conducted with randomly selected businesses operating in Lincoln.

Nature of the business

A wide range of businesses and trade organisations were interviewed with representation from commerce, industry and government agencies. These included, for example, interviews with people working in the IT, media and communications, legal, training, retailing, car hire and printing sectors. In general, the number of employees in each business was quite small, with 15 (58%) of businesses employing between 1 and 10 employees and 9 (35%) between 11 and 50 employees. One business employed 80 staff, one 250 staff (Lincolnshire County Council) and one did not state the number of employees.

Perceptions of crime

Despite the wide range of businesses and organisations 'theft' (including car theft) was most frequently cited as the crime associated with their type of business (12 or 44% of respondents). Other crimes cited included damage to vehicles, late payments, fraud and burglary. Respondents were most likely (12 or 44% of the total) to believe that crime had stayed the same during the last two years, with 7 (25.9%) stating that it had gone up and only 1 (3.7%) that it had gone down.

Type of problem experienced

Whilst all of the listed problems were experienced by some of the businesses (although three businesses experienced no problems at all) only a few were stated as presenting a 'major' problem. The most important of these were: '*busy roads/traffic*', which was stated as a major problem by 5 businesses (18.5%), the '*poor condition of surrounding areas*' (4 [14.8%]) and '*burglaries*' (3 [11.1%]). Six problems were perceived by between one half and one third of businesses to be 'minor' including '*litter and rubbish*' (12 [44.4%]), '*vandalism*' (12 [44.4%]), '*neglected or derelict property*' (10 [37.0%]), '*burglaries*' (9 [33.3%]), '*poor condition of surrounding*

area' (8 [29.6%]) and 'thefts from vehicles' (7 [29.6%]). Combining the 'major' with the 'minor' problem responses produces a similar result to the latter with only 'busy/roads traffic' (10 [37.0%]) as an important addition [table 1]. Interestingly, only 4 businesses (14.8%) identified shoplifting as a problem, and none suggested that it was a major problem for them (approximately a third of the businesses were located on premises from which items for sale could be stolen).

Table 1: Type of problem	Major		Minor		Major or Minor	
	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%
litter or rubbish	2	7.4	12	44.4	14	51.9
vandalism	0	0.0	12	44.4	12	44.4
poor condition of surrounding area	4	14.8	8	29.6	12	44.4
burglaries	3	11.1	9	33.3	12	44.4
neglected or derelict property	1	3.7	10	37.0	11	40.7
busy roads/traffic	5	18.5	5	18.5	10	37.0
thefts from vehicles	1	3.7	7	25.9	8	29.6
neighbours causing problems	0	0.0	5	18.5	5	18.5
unruly children or teenagers	0	0.0	5	18.5	5	18.5
thefts of vehicles	1	3.7	4	14.8	5	18.5
graffiti	1	3.7	3	11.1	4	14.8
squatters or unoccupied properties	0	0.0	4	14.8	4	14.8
poor lighting	0	0.0	4	14.8	4	14.8
shoplifting	0	0.0	4	15.4	4	14.8
poor policing or police response	2	7.7	2	7.7	4	14.8
abandoned vehicles	0	0.0	3	11.1	3	11.1
assaults on staff	0	0.0	3	11.1	3	11.1
racial harassment/abuse of staff	0	0.0	3	11.1	3	11.1

Preferred actions to prevent crime

Five actions were regarded by more than half of the respondents to be 'very important' including: 'respond more quickly to vandalism etc.' (15 [60%]), 'more bobbies on the beat' (14 [53.8%]), '(more) CCTV' (14 [53.8%]), 'drug misuse or prevention projects' (13 [52.0%]) and 'more or better places for young people to go' (13 [52.0%]). Combining the 'very important' with the 'important' responses produces a similar but more comprehensive result to the above with all the crime prevention solutions except one ('security guards on premises') being regarded as 'important' or 'very important' by more than half of the respondents. Combining these responses also results in 'more jobs for local people' (23 [85.2%]) and 'make premises more secure' (22 [81.5%]) becoming more important crime prevention or reduction actions [table 2].

Table 2 Actions to prevent crime	very important		important		not so important		not at all important		very/important	
	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%	no.	%
more jobs for local people	11	42.3	12	46.2	2	7.7	1	3.8	23	85.2
more bobbies on beat	14	53.8	9	34.6	2	7.7	1	3.8	23	85.2
respond more quickly to vandalism, etc.	15	60.0	8	32.0	2	8.0	0	0.0	23	85.2
make premises more secure	11	42.3	11	42.3	4	15.4	0	0.0	22	81.5
(more) CCTV	14	53.8	8	30.8	3	11.5	1	3.8	22	81.5
better maintenance of open areas	9	36.0	12	48.0	4	16.0	0	0.0	21	77.8
drug misuse or prevention projects	13	52.0	8	32.0	3	12.0	1	4.0	21	77.8
secure off-street parking	6	23.1	14	53.8	5	19.2	1	3.8	20	74.1
witness support schemes	9	36.0	11	44.0	4	16.0	1	4.0	20	74.1
advice from crime prevention officers	10	40.0	10	40.0	5	20.0	0	0.0	20	74.1
more or better places for young people to go	13	52.0	7	28.0	4	16.0	1	4.0	20	74.1
better street lighting	8	33.3	11	45.8	5	20.8	0	0.0	19	70.4
Neighbourhood Watch/Pub Watch/Door Watch	10	41.7	9	37.5	2	8.3	3	12.5	19	70.4
more for young people to do	11	44.0	8	32.0	5	20.0	1	4.0	19	70.4
more checks on job applicants	6	25.0	11	45.8	6	25.0	1	4.2	17	63.0
better environmental design	6	23.1	11	42.3	8	30.8	1	3.8	17	63.0
security guards on premises	7	29.2	4	16.7	9	37.5	4	16.7	11	40.7

Crime prevention/reduction schemes/services (general)

In general, questions referring to which crime prevention/reduction schemes local businesses had heard of, used, knew to exist in their area or believed reduced crime in their area or generally, elicited a relatively low response rate. On average: only 26.8% of respondents had heard of any one crime prevention/reduction scheme; 5.4% had used any one scheme; 9.2% were aware that any one scheme existed in their area; 7.7% believed that any one scheme reduced crime in their area; and 10.9% believed that any one scheme reduced crime generally. Each of the questions has been analysed separately below and a summary of the findings is contained in table 8.

Awareness of crime prevention/reduction schemes

Three services or projects were heard of by nearly all of the respondents: *Neighbourhood Watch* (25 [96.22%]), *CCTV* (24 [96.0%]) and *Adult Education* (22 [91.7%]). A further five schemes were known to between 50% and 70% of respondents: *North Lincolnshire College of Further Education* (18 [72.0%]), *Improved Street Lighting* (15 [60.0%]), *Property Marking* (13 [52.0%]), *Pub Watch* (12 [52.0%]) and *Proof of Age Cards* (12 [52.2%]). Of the remaining 36 services or projects 11 had been heard of by between 25.0% and 50% of respondents, 12 had been heard of by between 10% and 20% of respondents and 13 by fewer than 10% of respondents [table 3].

Table 3: Awareness of crime prevention		
Services or projects	yes	%
Neighbourhood Watch	25	96.2
CCTV	24	96.0
Adult Education	22	91.7
North Lincs College FE	18	72.0
Improved street lighting	15	60.0
Property Marking	13	52.0
Proof of age cards	12	52.2
Pub Watch	12	52.2
Secured Car Parks	11	44.0
Retail Radio Link	10	38.5
Home Secure	9	34.6
Lincoln Women's Aid	8	38.1
Estate Environmental Improvements	7	26.9
Publicity on Child Abuse and Domestic Violence	7	26.9
Sure Start	7	29.2
Car Offenders Programme	6	23.1
Football and Basketball in the Community	6	26.1
New Start Mentoring Project	6	26.1
Racist graffiti removal	6	23.1
Birchwood Access and Training Centre	5	20.8
Door Watch	5	20.8
Lifeline Services	5	22.7
Substance Misuse Counselling	5	21.7
City Centre Ranger	4	16.0
Substance Misuse Education	4	16.0
Support Services	4	16.0
Arrest/Referral Scheme	3	13.0
Employment Key Skills Programme	3	12.5
Retail Crime Initiative	3	11.5
Violence Prevention Programme	3	13.0
Abbey Access Centre	2	8.3
Escape	2	8.7
Lincoln Youth Matters	2	8.0
Lindum Substance Misuse Project	2	9.1
More balanced press reporting	2	10.0
Architect Liaison	1	3.8
Community Detox Programme	1	4.5
De Montfort Learning and Training	1	4.2
Healthy Living Centre	1	4.3
Home Office Burglary Initiative	1	4.5
Operation Carriage	1	4.2
Operation Castle	1	4.3
Problem-oriented policing	1	3.8
Reward 99/Dovetail	1	4.3

Use of crime prevention/reduction schemes

This question elicited a much lower response rate than the previous one. The most frequently used or contacted services or projects were: *CCTV* (10 [37.0%]), *Adult Education* (7 [25.9%]), *Neighbourhood Watch* (6 [22.2%]), *Property Marking* (5 [18.5%]), *North Lincolnshire College of FE* (5 [18.5%]), *Secured Car Parks* (4 [14.8%]) and *Improved Street Lighting* (3 [11.1%]). Of the remaining 37 services or projects listed 19 had been used by between 3.7% and 7.4% of respondents and 18 by none at all [table 4].

Table 4: Services/projects used or contacted	yes	%
CCTV	10	37.0
Adult Education	7	25.9
Neighbourhood Watch	6	22.2
North Lincs College FE	5	18.5
Property Marking	5	18.5
Secured Car Parks	4	14.8
Improved street lighting	3	11.1
Abbey Access Centre	2	7.4
Birchwood Access and Training Centre	2	7.4
Proof of age cards	2	7.4
Racist graffiti removal	2	7.4
Sure Start	2	7.4
Architect Liaison	1	3.7
Employment Key Skills Programme	1	3.7
Estate Environmental Improvements	1	3.7
Home Secure	1	3.7
Lifeline Services	1	3.7
New Start Mentoring Project	1	3.7
Operation Carriage	1	3.7
Operation Castle	1	3.7
Pub Watch	1	3.7
Publicity on Child Abuse and Domestic Violence	1	3.7
Retail Radio Link	1	3.7
Substance Misuse Counselling	1	3.7
Substance Misuse Education	1	3.7
Support Services	1	3.7
Arrest/Referral Scheme	0	0.0
Car Offenders Programme	0	0.0
City Centre Ranger	0	0.0
Community Detox Programme	0	0.0
De Montfort Learning and Training	0	0.0
Door Watch	0	0.0
Escape	0	0.0
Football and Basketball in the Community	0	0.0
Healthy Living Centre	0	0.0
Home Office Burglary Initiative	0	0.0

Lincoln Women's Aid	0	0.0
Lincoln Youth Matters	0	0.0
Table 4 (continued)		
Lindum Substance Misuse Project	0	0.0
More balanced press reporting	0	0.0
Problem-oriented policing	0	0.0
Retail Crime Initiative	0	0.0
Reward 99/Dovetail	0	0.0
Violence Prevention Programme	0	0.0

Awareness of existence of schemes in respondent's area

Again, this question elicited a low response rate. No scheme or project was known to exist locally by more than 50% of businesses and only five schemes or projects were known to exist by between a quarter and a half of the respondents: *CCTV* (11 [40.7%]), *Neighbourhood Watch* (11 [40.7%]), *Adult Education* (10 [37.0%]), *Pub Watch* (8 [29.6%]) and *North Lincolnshire College of FE* (7 [25.9%]). Of the remaining 39 schemes or projects 10 were known to exist locally by between 10% and 15% of respondents, 23 by between 3% and 7% of respondents and 6 by none at all [table 5].

Table 5: Awareness of schemes in the area	yes	%
CCTV	11	40.7
Neighbourhood Watch	11	40.7
Adult Education	10	37.0
Pub Watch	8	29.6
North Lincs College FE	7	25.9
Improved street lighting	4	14.8
Retail Radio Link	4	14.8
Sure Start	4	14.8
Birchwood Access and Training Centre	3	11.1
Door Watch	3	11.1
Home Secure	3	11.1
Lincoln Women's Aid	3	11.1
Proof of age cards	3	11.1
Secured Car Parks	3	11.1
Substance Misuse Counselling	3	11.1
Abbey Access Centre	2	7.4
Car Offenders Programme	2	7.4
Estate Environmental Improvements	2	7.4
New Start Mentoring Project	2	7.4
Property Marking	2	7.4
Substance Misuse Education	2	7.4
Architect Liaison	1	3.7
Arrest/Referral Scheme	1	3.7
City Centre Ranger	1	3.7
De Montfort Learning and Training	1	3.7
Employment Key Skills Programme	1	3.7
Escape	1	3.7

Table 5 (continued)		
Football and Basketball in the Community	1	3.7
Lifeline Services	1	3.7
Lindum Substance Misuse Project	1	3.7
More balanced press reporting	1	3.7
Operation Carriage	1	3.7
Operation Castle	1	3.7
Problem-oriented policing	1	3.7
Publicity on Child Abuse and Domestic Violence	1	3.7
Racist graffiti removal	1	3.7
Retail Crime Initiative	1	3.7
Support Services	1	3.7
Community Detox Programme	0	0.0
Healthy Living Centre	0	0.0
Home Office Burglary Initiative	0	0.0
Lincoln Youth Matters	0	0.0
Reward 99/Dovetail	0	0.0
Violence Prevention Programme	0	0.0

Effectiveness in preventing/reducing crime in the area

None of the schemes was believed by more than half of the respondents to have prevented or reduced crime in their area although three were believed by around a third to have done so. These were *CCTV* (9 [33.3%]), *Neighbourhood Watch* (9 [33.3]) and *Adult Education* (8 [29.6%]). Of the remaining 41 schemes or projects 11 were believed to have prevented or reduced crime in their area by between 10% and 20% of respondents, 8 by between 5% and 10% of respondents, 10 by between 1% and 5% of respondents and 12 by none at all [table 6].

Table 6: Prevented or reduced crime in the area	yes	%
CCTV	9	33.3
Neighbourhood Watch	9	33.3
Adult Education	8	29.6
Improved street lighting	5	18.5
Proof of age cards	5	18.5
Pub Watch	5	18.5
Secured Car Parks	4	14.8
Birchwood Access and Training Centre	3	11.1
Home Secure	3	11.1
New Start Mentoring Project	3	11.1
North Lincs College FE	3	11.1
Publicity on Child Abuse and Domestic Violence	3	11.1
Substance Misuse Education	3	11.1
Sure Start	3	11.1
Abbey Access Centre	2	7.4
Door Watch	2	7.4
Employment Key Skills Programme	2	7.4

Table 6 (continued)		
Football and Basketball in the Community	2	7.4
Lincoln Women's Aid	2	7.4
Property Marking	2	7.4
Retail Radio Link	2	7.4
Support Services	2	7.4
Architect Liaison	1	3.7
Car Offenders Programme	1	3.7
City Centre Ranger	1	3.7
Escape	1	3.7
Healthy Living Centre	1	3.7
Lindum Substance Misuse Project	1	3.7
Operation Carriage	1	3.7
Operation Castle	1	3.7
Racist graffiti removal	1	3.7
Substance Misuse Counselling	1	3.7
Arrest/Referral Scheme	0	0.0
Community Detox Programme	0	0.0
De Montfort Learning and Training	0	0.0
Estate Environmental Improvements	0	0.0
Home Office Burglary Initiative	0	0.0
Lifeline Services	0	0.0
Lincoln Youth Matters	0	0.0
More balanced press reporting	0	0.0
Problem-oriented policing	0	0.0
Retail Crime Initiative	0	0.0
Reward 99/Dovetail	0	0.0
Violence Prevention Programme	0	0.0

Effectiveness in preventing/reducing crime generally

This question elicited a slightly more favourable response rate in comparison to the previous question. Of the schemes or projects listed, *CCTV* was most commonly regarded (by 16 [59.3%] respondents) as being effective in reducing or preventing crime generally, followed by *Neighbourhood Watch* (12 [44.4%]), *Improved Street Lighting* (12 [44.4%]), *Pub Watch* (9 [33.3%]), *Adult Education* (8 [29.6%]), *Proof of Age Cards* (8 [29.6%]) and *Secured Car Parks* (7 [25.9%]). Of the remaining 37 schemes or projects 10 were believed to prevent or reduce crime by between 10% and 20% of respondents, 6 between 5% and 10%, 9 between 1% and 5% and 12 by none at all [table 7].

Table 7: Prevented or reduced crime generally		
	yes	%
CCTV	16	59.3
Neighbourhood Watch	12	44.4
Improved street lighting	10	37.0
Pub Watch	9	33.3
Adult Education	8	29.6
Proof of age cards	8	29.6
Secured Car Parks	7	25.9
Home Secure	5	18.5
New Start Mentoring Project	5	18.5
Birchwood Access and Training Centre	4	14.8
Door Watch	4	14.8
North Lincs College FE	4	14.8
Retail Radio Link	4	14.8
Abbey Access Centre	3	11.1
Lincoln Women's Aid	3	11.1
Substance Misuse Education	3	11.1
Sure Start	3	11.1
Employment Key Skills Programme	2	7.4
Football and Basketball in the Community	2	7.4
Operation Carriage	2	7.4
Publicity on Child Abuse and Domestic Violence	2	7.4
Racist graffiti removal	2	7.4
Support Services	2	7.4
Architect Liaison	1	3.7
Arrest/Referral Scheme	1	3.7
City Centre Ranger	1	3.7
Escape	1	3.7
Estate Environmental Improvements	1	3.7
Operation Castle	1	3.7
Property Marking	1	3.7
Retail Crime Initiative	1	3.7
Substance Misuse Counselling	1	3.7
Car Offenders Programme	0	0.0
Community Detox Programme	0	0.0
De Montfort Learning and Training	0	0.0
Healthy Living Centre	0	0.0
Home Office Burglary Initiative	0	0.0
Lifeline Services	0	0.0
Lincoln Youth Matters	0	0.0
Lindum Substance Misuse Project	0	0.0
More balanced press reporting	0	0.0
Problem-oriented policing	0	0.0
Reward 99/Dovetail	0	0.0
Violence Prevention Programme	0	0.0

Table 8: Summary – crime prevention schemes	heard		used		exists		reduced crime in area ?						reduced crime generally?					
	yes	%	yes	%	yes	%	yes	%	no	%	d/k	%	yes	%	no	%	d/k	%
CCTV	24	96.0	10	37.0	11	40.7	9	33.3	5	18.5	2	7.4	16	59.3	1	3.7	2	7.4
Retail Crime Initiative	3	11.5	0	0.0	1	3.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	7.4	1	3.7	0	0.0	1	3.7
Retail Radio Link	10	38.5	1	3.7	4	14.8	2	7.4	1	3.7	4	14.8	4	14.8	1	3.7	3	11.1
Estate Environmental Improvements	7	26.9	1	3.7	2	7.4	0	0.0	1	3.7	2	7.4	1	3.7	2	7.4	0	0.0
Racist graffiti removal	6	23.1	2	7.4	1	3.7	1	3.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	7.4	0	0.0	1	3.7
Architect Liaison	1	3.8	1	3.7	1	3.7	1	3.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
Problem-oriented policing	1	3.8	0	0.0	1	3.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Neighbourhood Watch	25	96.2	6	22.2	11	40.7	9	33.3	2	7.4	3	11.1	12	44.4	0	0.0	4	14.8
Improved street lighting	15	60.0	3	11.1	4	14.8	5	18.5	2	7.4	3	11.1	10	37.0	1	3.7	0	0.0
Home Secure	9	34.6	1	3.7	3	11.1	3	11.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	18.5	0	0.0	1	3.7
Home Office Burglary Initiative	1	4.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Secured Car Parks	11	44.0	4	14.8	3	11.1	4	14.8	0	0.0	1	3.7	7	25.9	0	0.0	1	3.7
Violence Prevention Programme	3	13.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.7
Car Offenders Programme	6	23.1	0	0.0	2	7.4	1	3.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.7	1	3.7
Publicity on Child Abuse and Domestic Violence	7	26.9	1	3.7	1	3.7	3	11.1	0	0.0	1	3.7	2	7.4	1	3.7	0	0.0
Property Marking	13	52.0	5	18.5	2	7.4	2	7.4	1	3.7	1	3.7	1	3.7	2	7.4	3	11.1
Door Watch	5	20.8	0	0.0	3	11.1	2	7.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	14.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
Pub Watch	12	52.2	1	3.7	8	29.6	5	18.5	2	7.4	1	3.7	9	33.3	1	3.7	1	3.7
Lincoln Women's Aid	8	38.1	0	0.0	3	11.1	2	7.4	3	11.1	1	3.7	3	11.1	2	7.4	1	3.7
Lifeline Services	5	22.7	1	3.7	1	3.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.7	0	0.0	1	3.7	0	0.0
More balanced press reporting	2	10.0	0	0.0	1	3.7	0	0.0	1	3.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.7	0	0.0
Lindum Substance Misuse Project	2	9.1	0	0.0	1	3.7	1	3.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Arrest/Referral Scheme	3	13.0	0	0.0	1	3.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.7	1	3.7	0	0.0	1	3.7
Community Detox Programme	1	4.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Substance Misuse Counselling	5	21.7	1	3.7	3	11.1	1	3.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
Adult Education	22	91.7	7	25.9	10	37.0	8	29.6	7	25.9	5	18.5	8	29.6	7	25.9	5	18.5

Table 8 (continued)																		
Substance Misuse Education	4	16.0	1	3.7	2	7.4	3	11.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	11.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
Football and Basketball in the Community	6	26.1	0	0.0	1	3.7	2	7.4	1	3.7	0	0.0	2	7.4	1	3.7	1	3.7
New Start Mentoring Project	6	26.1	1	3.7	2	7.4	3	11.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	18.5	1	3.7	0	0.0
Reward 99/Dovetail	1	4.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Escape	2	8.7	0	0.0	1	3.7	1	3.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
Lincoln Youth Matters	2	8.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Proof of age cards	12	52.2	2	7.4	3	11.1	5	18.5	1	3.7	0	0.0	8	29.6	2	7.4	1	3.7
Operation Castle	1	4.3	1	3.7	1	3.7	1	3.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
Operation Carriage	1	4.2	1	3.7	1	3.7	1	3.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	7.4	0	0.0	0	0.0
Sure Start	7	29.2	2	7.4	4	14.8	3	11.1	1	3.7	0	0.0	3	11.1	1	3.7	1	3.7
Healthy Living Centre	1	4.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
City Centre Ranger	4	16.0	0	0.0	1	3.7	1	3.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.7	0	0.0	2	7.4
De Montfort Learning and Training	1	4.2	0	0.0	1	3.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Support Services	4	16.0	1	3.7	1	3.7	2	7.4	0	0.0	1	3.7	2	7.4	0	0.0	1	3.7
North Lincs College FE	18	72.0	5	18.5	7	25.9	3	11.1	5	18.5	3	11.1	4	14.8	6	22.2	6	22.2
Birchwood Access and Training Centre	5	20.8	2	7.4	3	11.1	3	11.1	1	3.7	0	0.0	4	14.8	0	0.0	1	3.7
Abbey Access Centre	2	8.3	2	7.4	2.0	7.4	2	7.4	0	0.0	1	3.7	3	11.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
Employment Key Skills Programme	3	12.5	1	3.7	1.0	3.7	2	7.4	1	3.7	0	0.0	2	7.4	0	0.0	0	0.0

Multi-Agency Partnerships and Other Projects

This section of the telephone interview consisted of a number of open-ended questions relating to respondents' views regarding the multi-agency approach to crime prevention and reduction, and their ideas regarding other projects or services. Overall, there was very little response to the first three questions which related to the multi-agency approach. Only one respondent was aware of a specific multi-agency partnership in Lincoln- The City-Centre Group for Retailers- although another stated that he was aware of partnerships formed with regard to road safety and drugs related schemes. No respondents stated either that they were a member of such partnerships or that they actively participated in such partnerships. However, despite the above, nine respondents stated that they believed that the multi-agency approach to crime reduction and prevention was a good idea with only two critiques of this approach. The advantages mentioned included: *'resources can be pooled'*, *'it ensures that people don't fall through the net'*, *'it makes organisations stronger as they can share ideas'*, and it *'can provide a rounded approach'*. The two reservations were that policy duplication and organisational conflict could occur.

The question referring to which other services or projects in Lincoln respondents thought were helping to reduce or prevent crime attracted a less comprehensive response. Only four schemes were mentioned: *CCTV*, *Youth Schemes (Army Cadets, Youth Clubs etc.)*, *'Drug-Abuse' Schemes*, and *City Centre Rangers*. However, the final question, which asked respondents which other crime reduction or prevention services they would like to see in Lincoln, provided by far the most comprehensive response rate. Two-thirds (19) of the respondents offered comments relating to this question. The responses were, in general, varied, although two key themes can be observed: education and young people, and the desire for more visible policing. Six respondents stated that the key to crime reduction and prevention was for policy to focus more on the needs of young people. Again, some comments were quite general such as *'keeping young people off the streets'* or *'getting them more to do'* although three respondents specifically linked the low educational attainments of some young people to crime. One respondent also mentioned the need for businesses to be more closely involved in the education and training of young people. One suggested the return of National Service. The comments regarding the police were less varied with five respondents stating explicitly that the solution to crime in Lincoln is a greater visible presence of the police. There were a number of other comments that are worth noting: two respondents stated that crime prevention policy should focus on *'drugs problems'*; one suggested the increased use of CCTV; and one suggested that there are too many crime reduction or prevention schemes and that policy should focus on punitive deterrence.

Conclusion

A number of relevant conclusions can be drawn from the research findings. In general, according to the respondents, local businesses experience little crime in Lincoln. Two of three major problems noted by businesses relate to environmental factors- busy roads or traffic, and litter and graffiti- the third being burglaries. With regards to crime prevention nearly all possible actions were deemed by the respondents to be either important or very important. The most commonly cited of these included more jobs for local people, more bobbies on the beat, a quicker response rate to vandalism etc., making premises more secure, and more CCTV.

The response rate to the questions relating to existing crime prevention schemes and projects in Lincoln was particularly low. Whilst a number of schemes were known to local businesses, very few of them were known to exist in local areas and respondents displayed little confidence that they contributed positively to crime reduction either locally or in general.

It is important to note that those schemes which were most known and considered to be effective were CCTV, Neighbourhood Watch and Adult Education, whilst those that were least known and considered to be effective were *'local'* schemes such as Operation Castle, Operation Carriage and Reward 99/Dovetail. An important factor is probably that these schemes are not active in all areas

in Lincoln, although the results also suggest that there is a need for greater publicity of local crime prevention schemes.

The section relating to the multi-agency approach to crime prevention similarly suggests that, although local businesses believe that this is a good idea, they are neither aware of nor involved in such partnerships in Lincoln. Despite the above, the final section of the research indicates that local businesses hold a wide range of beliefs relating to the possible ways by which crime in Lincoln can be reduced or prevented. These can be summarised as: providing better educational services to young people and ensuring that they have greater access to leisure facilities, and a more visible police presence.

PART THREE: COMPARISON AND CONCLUSION

Comparing the findings from the household survey with those from the survey of businesses, a large measure of agreement can be detected. A majority of both residents and business people found litter or rubbish to be a problem, and high proportions of both groups also felt that burglaries, vandalism and busy roads/traffic were problematic for them. Few respondents in either group suggested that they had a problem with racial harassment or assaults or squatting. However, whereas most respondents in the household survey complained about poor policing or lack of policing, few business respondents did so. Most respondents in both groups believed that problems in their areas had remained more or less the same in recent years, but business people were more likely than householders to say that problems had got worse and less likely to say that they had got better.

Another important issue of comparison relates to respondents' views about what actions should be taken to prevent or reduce crime in their areas. Here clear differences emerged between the two groups, with residents overwhelmingly favouring 'more bobbies on the beat', while business people were most likely to regard 'responding more quickly to vandalism etc' as very important. Even so, a majority of business respondents also stated that 'more bobbies on the beat' was a very important action to be taken and a relatively high proportion of residents (nearly a quarter) regarded responding more quickly to vandalism as one of the three most important actions to be taken to reduce crime. Both groups also attached importance to the use of CCTV – very important for most business respondents and one of the three most important actions for 29.7% of householder respondents. However, whereas a majority of business respondents stated that drug misuse or prevention projects were very important in preventing or reducing crime, very few residents ranked such projects as one of their three most important actions to be taken. Understandably, perhaps, business respondents were also keener than residents on taking action to provide more jobs for local people and in making properties more secure as ways of preventing/reducing crime. Both groups, however, appeared to agree on the importance of providing more or better places for young people to go – a majority of business respondents rated this as very important, and nearly one in five residents placed it in their top three most important actions to be taken to prevent or reduce crime.

When presented with a list of crime prevention/reduction schemes in Lincoln, most respondents in both groups had heard of CCTV, Neighbourhood Watch, adult education, North Lincolnshire College of Further Education and proof of age cards, while very few in either group had heard of Operation Carriage, Operation Castle, Reward 99/Dovetail or Healthy Living Centre. No clear differences emerged between the two groups in this respect. With regard to the use of such schemes, however, householders were most likely to have used adult education, property marking and North Lincs College, whereas businesses were most likely to have used CCTV as well. No respondents in either group stated that they had used or contacted the Home Office Burglary Initiative; no householders, and only one business respondent, had used or contacted Operation Carriage or Operation Castle; and only one householder, and no business respondents, had used or contacted the Arrest/Referral Scheme or the Healthy Living Centre. This pattern of use was repeated in the responses to the question about whether they were aware of the existence of such schemes in their area, with both groups being most likely to mention neighbourhood watch, adult education, North Lincs College and Pub Watch but with businesses being much more likely than householders to mention CCTV. Similarly, less than 1% of householders, and hardly any business people, knew whether Reward 99/Dovetail or Operation Carriage existed in their area. Finally, respondents in both groups were most likely to report that Neighbourhood Watch, CCTV, improved street lighting, Pub Watch and secured car parks prevented or reduced crime both in their area and generally, but business people were more likely than householders to cite adult education in comparison with other schemes.