STUDENT NAME	**PORTIA BOATENG**
STUDENT ID	**2131350**
PROGRAMME	**BSC POLICING**
MODULE	**POLICING THE PUBLIC**
MODULE CODE	**BMPSL 5003**
ASSIGNMENT TITTLE	**AN EXAMINATION OF HOW CRIME AND ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR CAN IMPACT LOCAL COMMUNITIES**

In England and Wales, the section 2 clause 1a of the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014, defines Anti-Social Behaviour as an act that has caused or expected to cause nuisance, panic or pain to any person'. According to (Hutton & Mullock, 2017), many a time, Anti-Social Behaviour is described as 'low level crime' and associated with actions such as vandalism, robbery, noise, drug trafficking, drunkenness, and other public harassment. In contrast, an act or omission that do not conform to the rules and regulations that are promulgated by legislative bodies which is well-thought-out as a breach of right and duties of the public punishable by law is seen as a crime (Cane & Conaghan, 2008). Conducts such as burglaries, assaults, fraud, drug crimes and many others can be termed as crimes. Often, acts that are considered as crimes and anti-social behaviours do not correspond to the socially accepted norms and values which may have a lasting impact on the well-being and quality of life of those involved and the communities to which they belong. The data available at the Crime Survey for England and Wales shows that a high record of 39.6% of residents observed ASB in their area, and the police recorded 1.5 million conducts of ASB (Office for National Statistics, 2020; 2019). This essay aims to observe the impact of crime and anti-social behavior on victims and the community. It shall also debate on the effective and appropriate police response actions, analyze the consequences and its effects on trust between the community and the police and suggest strategies in addressing this problem, prevent and respond to crime and anti-social behavior in local communities.

From the British Crime Survey data, 10% of individuals living in poor areas, being unemployed and are social renters are most likely to deduce high levels of crime and ASB (Flatley et al., 2008). Crimes and Anti-social behaviours have significant effect physically, emotionally, and psychologically on victims and the community. Victimized individuals and the community at large may suffer physical damage, monetary loss, fear, and loss of trust

amongst themselves and the police because of the impact of crime and anti-social behaviours (Pilkington, 2009). These impacts may lead to breaking of social unity, increasing of fear and general declining of quality of life and therefore not limited to individuals but having a ripple effect on the community (Smith, 2018). The incidents of George Floyd and Fiona Pilkington are examples of the weighty impacts of crime and anti-social behavior on individuals and their communities. Fear of crime, social separation and loss of trust are common known consequences of such incidents and the fear of crime among individuals and communities is an important aspect. Victims of crime or people living in areas with high crime rates often experience increased fear and nervousness, which changes their daily routines and limits their movement (Fisher & Nasar, 1992). However, the research paper conducted by the Independent Press Standards Organization with the titled "Anti-social behaviour: the impacts on individuals and communities" also argued that Crimes and ABS can have positive impacts on communities and individuals since it can bring people together to fight a common cause.

Sexual crime and abuse can weaken establishments such as schools, trades, and community organizations and this disruption affects the overall functioning and well-being of the community, leading to negative impacts on the constituents. For instance, according to (Farrington & Murray, 2005), crimes and anti-social behaviours are likely to happen in deprived communities and children who are exposed to them often have problems in learning, loss of confidence, and avoid social interactions. The sudden experience of shock, fear, anger, and vulnerability because of the emotional and psychological impact of crime and ASB can be lasting on victims. (Farrington & Murray, 2005). Some may experience nightmares, flashbacks and hypervigilance which are developed symptoms of post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) for quite some long time (Meško, 2017). In research conducted by Tamar Dinisman and Ania Moroz on "Understanding Victims of Crime: The Impact of the Crime

and Support Needs", it was observed that, these symptoms could lead to a sense of separations within the community due to the detrimental effect Trauma can have on the mental health and disruption of their social relationships (Dinisman & Moroz, 2017). Crime and ASB can also destruct trust in communities. Social relationship and trust are essential to fostering a sense of security and happiness. When crime rates increase or ASB becomes rampant, community members may loss trust in each other, leading to lack or underdevelopment of social integration and disengagement from community activities (Skogan, 1990). This loss of trust hinders effective collective action, individuals personal networks and limiting community resilience and the ability to tackle the root causes of crime (Sampson, Raudenbush, & Earls, 1997). A case study conducted in Los Angeles found that gang-related crime not only directly affects victims but also disrupts community life. Fear of violence and retaliation has led to limited participation of community activities, decrease economic productivity and increased social isolation, increasing the impact of crime on communities (Farrington & Murray, 2005).

To add to that, neighborhoods with high crime rates may experience reduce property values and economic opportunities, and increased social disorganization (Skogan, 1986). The stigma related with crime can lead to social marginalization and worsen social disparity, making a horrendous cycle of crime and evil (Welsh & Farrington, 2012). Victims of ASB may experience reduced anxiety, stress, and feelings of security (Hutton & Mullock, 2017). Persistent ASB can disrupt individuals' daily lives and limit their freedom to move, socialize, or enjoy public spaces. ASB significantly disrupts the fabric of local communities. The persistent presence of ASB weakens community cohesion and social trust, leading to people's feelings of fear and insecurity (Flint & Nixon, 2006). Communities affected by ASB may experience reduced community engagement, which negatively impacts the sense of belonging

and connection between individuals living in the area. ASB causes significant economic loss to the community since it can lead to property damage, increased demand for police and utilities, and reduced commercial activity in affected areas to reduced property values and reduced foreign investment (Hutton & Mullock, 2017). These economic costs hinder community development, limit resources for community improvement, and perpetuate cycles of decline. By addressing ASB at an early stage, communities can maintain their well-being and prevent cumulative negative impacts (Flint & Nixon, 2006). One influential case study supporting the consequences of crime on the community was the application of the broken windows theory in the New York in the 1990s. With its emphasis on reducing petty crime and maintaining environment, Urban schools were controlled, crime rates were significantly reduced, leading to improved community welfare and increased investment in neighborhoods (Welsh & Farrington, 2012).

Effective and appropriate policing responses to crime and anti-social behavior (ASB) requires a comprehensive approach. It should go beyond traditional law enforcement methods to community-driven policies, problem-solving approaches and evidence-based strategies play a critical role in addressing these issues and promoting safer communities. Policing by Consent emphasizes building collaborations between police and the community, building trust, and mitigating problems together. According to (Blackburn, et al., 2022), policing is feasibly effective when it has the support of the community in which they police. Policing is therefore effective when Police's capacity to do their work is reliant on being perceived as not a separate force but as an extension of the community. This action recognizes that effective policing must focus not only on reactive responses to crime but also proactive measures to address underlying problems and prevent future problems (Cordner, 2019). Problem-solving approaches include identifying recurring problems, analyzing their underlying causes, and

developing appropriate solutions. Through problem-oriented policing, police officers work closely with community members, community agencies and other agencies to solve the root causes of crime and ASB, rather than focusing only on individual incidents (Eck & Spelman, 1987). This approach promotes the identification and implementation of evidence-based approaches that have been successful in decreasing crime and improving community safety (Goldstein, 1979). For Police actions to be effective and have appropriate direction, there is the need for their acts to be guided by an evidence-based strategies. (Weisburd & Eck, 2004) indicated that, these strategies should be based on rigorous research that examines the effectiveness of various measures in preventing and decreasing crime and ABS. Policing acts which are based on research and data-driven in decision-making will enable them to prioritize limited resources and tailor their responses to specific issues and communities. Proactive policing, early intervention and community engagement play a vital role in preventing and combating crime and ASB. Police do not necessarily have to wait for individuals to held liable to crimes and ABS but should be activity involved in searching for potential crime hotspots or high-risk individuals. It relies on predictive analytics, problem analysis and intelligence-based approaches to prevent crime and disrupt criminal networks (Weisburd et al., 2010). Early interventional programs target at-risk individuals, especially adolescents, by providing appropriate support, counseling and intervention to prevent their involvement in crime and ASB are efficient and effective policing (Chesney- Lind & Shelden, 2019). Community engagement is critical to foster trust, promote communication, and build strong relationships between police and community members. Through partnerships and collaboration with the community, police can gather vital information, effectively respond to community needs and receive the support needed to fight crime and ASB (Kelling & Coles, 1996). It also allows the community to actively participate in crime prevention efforts, thereby reinforcing a sense of collective responsibility and ownership. A multidisciplinary

approach, including collaboration between law enforcement, local government, and community organizations, is critical to identify root causes and implement interventions that fit in combating crimes and anti-social behaviours. Police action should prioritize prevention, early intervention, thorough investigation and appropriate punishment to bring justice to victims, deter future offenders and restore wellbeing to the community (Smith, 2017).

Incidents like the murder of George Floyd where it is widely believed that he was discriminated against, and an excessive force was used can have a profound impact on trust between communities and police. Misconduct by a few officers can tarnish the reputation of the entire police force, exacerbating existing tensions and leading to a breakdown of trust (Barnes, 2020). To rebuild trust, police departments must actively engage with the community, establish effective accountability mechanisms, and demonstrate transparency and fairness in their actions (Scott, 2015). The perception that police do not treat all individuals fairly and impartially can lead to feelings of resentment, anger and distrust. This can further increase the gap between marginalized communities and law enforcement, leading to reduced cooperation and information sharing hence affecting policing by consent (Skogan, 1990).

Accountability and transparency are essential to rebuilding trust. Holding police officers accountable for their actions through internal and external investigations can demonstrate that the system values integrity and fairness (Cordner, 2019). Additionally, transparent reporting and sharing of information about incidents and their consequences can help rebuild trust by ensuring the community is aware of the steps being taken to resolve the problem and prevent future events. Community involvement in decision-making processes is another crucial strategy for rebuilding trust. Including community members in the development and execution of policies, procedures, and initiatives can foster a sense of ownership and empowerment (Welsh & Farrington, 2012). This involvement can be achieved through

community advisory boards, regular forums, and partnerships between police and community organizations, allowing community members to actively participate in shaping the future of policing in their neighborhoods. Enhancing cultural competency and diversity within the police force is also important. Ensuring that the police force represents and understands the communities they serve can help foster trust and reduce incidents of bias and discrimination (Cordner, 2019). Recruiting diverse officers, providing cultural sensitivity training, and encouraging positive interactions between police and the community can help build stronger relationships and improve community awareness about the police.

Community-oriented policing plays an important role in rebuilding trust. By emphasizing problem solving, collaboration, and respect for community values, this approach can create opportunities for open dialogue and mutual understanding between police and the community (Kelling & Coles, 1996). Participating in community outreach initiatives, building positive relationships, and proactively responding to community concerns can demonstrate a commitment to collaborating for safer neighborhoods.

Strategies to prevent and respond to crime and anti-social behavior (ASB) in communities include a combination of approaches, including multi-agency partnerships, community partnerships and early intervention programs. Additionally, restorative justice, diversion programs and community initiatives play a key role in mitigating the root causes of crime and ASB (Bullock et al, 2015). Multi-agency collaboration is necessary because it involves collaboration between various agencies such as law enforcement, social services, educational institutions, and community organizations (Pesce, 2018). This partnership enables information sharing, pooling of resources and coordination of efforts to effectively prevent and respond to crime and ASB. By working together, agencies can better understand

community problems, target resources where needed, and develop comprehensive strategies. Community partnerships involve fostering relationships between law enforcement and the community. This approach emphasizes trust-building, active involvement of community members, and shared responsibility for community safety (Sherman et al, 2002). Community partnerships enable the development of localized strategies focused on the specific needs of the community, increasing the likelihood of successful crime avoidance and reduction initiatives (Crawford & Evans, 2017). Early intervention policies focus on identifying and treating associated risk factors with criminal behavior at an early stage (Crawford & Lister, 2019). These policies aim to target individuals, families, or communities at-risk and provide support, resources, and opportunities to prevent potential involvement in criminal activities. By intervening early, these programs can address underlying issues, such as poverty, drug abuse, or illiteracy, which are often linked to crime and ASB (Felson et al, 2019). Restorative justice is an alternative approach to traditional criminal justice that emphasizes repairing harm caused by crime, involving victims, offenders, and the community. It focuses on accountability, rehabilitation, and addressing the root causes of crime (Dignan & Cavadino, 2016). Through restorative justice practices, offenders can understand the impact of their actions, make amends, and reintegrate successfully into the community, thereby reducing the likelihood of reoffending. Diversionary programs offer non-punitive alternatives to traditional criminal justice processes. These programs are intended to divert individuals from formal court proceedings and instead provide opportunities for rehabilitation, counselling or community service. Diversion programs recognize that sanctions alone cannot address the underlying causes of criminal behavior and that by providing appropriate interventions, they can address these problems and reduce the risk of recidivism (Rosenbaum & Maisel, 2016). Community initiatives involve mobilizing local resources and engaging community members in crime prevention efforts. By engaging the community, these initiatives can promote a

sense of ownership and responsibility, leading to sustained reductions in crime over the long term (Crawford and Evans, 2017).

In conclusion, crime and anti-social behavior have significant impacts mostly negative ones on victims and communities, often leading to profound trauma and deterioration of community development. Effective and appropriate police action is important in addressing these issues, restoring community confidence, and developing overall safety. Prevention and response strategies that prioritizes community engagement, collaboration, and addressing root causes are essential to creating safer and resilient communities. By understanding the complexity of these issues and implementing evidence-based responses, the community can work to create environments in which all individuals can thrive without fear of crime or anti-social behaviour.

References:

Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014

Barnes, L. (2020). *Policing in the 21st Century: Building Trust and Legitimacy*. Criminal Justice Policy Review, 33(7), 805-825.

Bullock, K., Tilley, N., Farrell, G. (2015). *Crime Prevention. In T. Newburn & G. Pease (Eds.), Policing: Politics, Culture and Control* (pp. 295-324). Oxford University Press.

Cane, P. & Conaghan, J., 2008. *The New Oxford Companion to Law.* s.l.:Oxford University Press.

Chesney-Lind, M., & Shelden, R. G. (2019). *Girls, Delinquency, and Juvenile Justice*. Routledge.

Cordner, G. W. (2019). *Police Administration*. Routledge.

Crawford, A., & Evans, K. (2017). *Early Intervention and Prevention in Policing. In Handbook of Policing* (pp. 829-848). Routledge.

Crawford, A., & Lister, S. (2019). *Community Engagement and Partnerships. In E. McLaughlin, T. Newburn, & A. Crawford (Eds.),* The Sage Handbook of Criminological Research Methods (pp. 425-440). Sage Publications.

Davies, M., Croall, H & Tyrer, J. (2005), *Criminal Justice. An Introduction to the Criminal Justice System in England and Wales.* England: Pearson Education Limited.

Dignan, J., Cavadino, M. (2016). *Restorative Justice. In The Oxford Handbook of Criminology* (pp. 1002-1033). Oxford University Press.

Eck, J. E., & Spelman, W. (1987). *Problem-solving: Problem-oriented policing in Newport News.* Police research and development reports, US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute for Justice.

Farrington, D. P., & Murray, J. (2005). *Psychosocial Causes of Crime, Monitoring and Prevention. In M. Tonry (Ed.),* Crime and Justice: A Review of Research (Vol. 32, pp. 77-150). University of Chicago Press.

Felson, M., Eckert, E., & Viano, E. (2019). *Routine Activity and Crime Prevention. In D. Das & M. Good (Eds.),* The Routledge International Handbook of Crime and Gender Studies (pp. 143-157). Routledge.

Fisher, B. S., & Nasar, J. L. (1992). *Fear of crime in relation to three exterior site features: Prospect, refuge, and escape*. Environment and behavior, 24(1), 35-65.

Flatley, J., Moley, S. & Hoare, J. (2008) *Perceptions of Anti-Social Behaviour: Findings from the 2007/08 British Crime Survey. Supplementary Volume 1 to Crime in England and Wales 2007/08*. Home Office Statistical Bulletin 15/08. London: Home Office.

Flint, J., & Nixon, J. (2006). *Anti-social Behaviour in Britain: Victorian and Contemporary Perspectives.* Policy Press.

Goldstein, H. (1979). *Improving policing: A problem-oriented approach. Crime and Delinquency*, 25(2), 236-258.

Gov.uk (2023) *Anti-social behaviour: impacts on individuals and local communities*. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/impacts-of-anti-social-behaviour-on-individuals-and-communities/anti-social-behaviour-impacts-on-individuals-and-local-communities#Overview (Accessed: 25 October 2023).

Home Office (2012) *Putting Victims First: More Effective Responses to Anti-Social Behaviour*. London: Home Office.

Hutton, F., & Mullock, K. (2017). *Anti-social Behaviour Law: Perspectives from the UK.* Oxford University Press.

Jones, R., Smith, J., & Davis, M. (2019). *'Community Policing and Crime Prevention Strategies: Towards an Effective Response to Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour'*. Policing and Society, 29(7), 884-901.

Kelling, G. L., & Coles, C. M. (1996). *Fixing broken windows: Restoring order and reducing crime in our communities*. Simon and Schuster.

Meško, G. (2017). *Emotional and psychological impact of crime on victims.* World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology, International Journal of Social, Behavioral, Educational, Economic, Business and Industrial Engineering, 11(5), 1009-1013.

Office for National Statistics (2019) *Crime in England and Wales, Year Ending March 2019.* London: ONS.

Office for National Statistics (2020) *Crime in England and Wales, Year Ending December 2019. London: ONS Pesce, F. (2018). Diversionary programs: An overview.* European Journal of Criminology, 15(4), 393-413.

Pilkington, F. (2009). *'Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour: Impact on Individuals and Local Communities'*. Journal of Criminology, 45(2), 165-182.

Rosenbaum, D. P., & Maisel, N. C. (2016). *Community-Based Crime Prevention. In D. P. Rosenbaum (Ed.), Community Policing: Can It Work?* (pp. 39-54). Wadsworth

Sampson, R. J., Raudenbush, S. W., & Earls, F. (1997*). Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. Science*, 277(5328), 918-924.

Scott, A. (2015). *'Rebuilding Trust between Communities and the Police: A Multidimensional Approach'. Policing Perspectives*, 18(4), 456-474.

Sherman, L. W., & Eck, J. E. (2002). *Policing for Crime Prevention. In Community Policing, Chicago Style* (pp. 36-53). Oxford University Press.

Skogan, W. G. (1986). *Fear of crime and neighborhood change*. Crime and justice, 8, 203-229.

Skogan, W. G. (1990). *Disorder and decline: Crime and the spiral of decay in American neighborhoods.* University of California Press.

Smith, J. (2017). *'Addressing Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour from a Community-Centered Approach: Strategies for Effective Police Action'*. Journal of Community Safety, 32(1), 23-39.

Smith, T. (2018). *'The Ripple Effect of Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour on Communities'*. Social Science Review, 42(3), 421-439.

Weisburd, D., Telep, C. W., Hinkle, J. C., & Eck, J. E. (2010). *Is problem-oriented policing effective in reducing crime and disorder? Findings from a Campbell systematic review.* Campbell systematic reviews, 6(1-18).

Welsh, B. C., & Farrington, D. P. (Eds.). (2012). *The Oxford Handbook of Crime Prevention.* Oxford University Press.

Wemmers, J.-A. (2013). *Victims' experiences in the criminal justice system and their recovery from crime*. International Review of Victimology, 19(3), 221-233.

Wilson, J. Q., & Kelling, G. L. (1982). *Broken windows*. Atlantic Monthly, 249(3), 29-38.