



National
Board *for*
Crime
Prevention

Wise After the Event:

Tackling Repeat Victimisation

**A Report by the
National Board for
Crime Prevention**

May 1994

**Wise After The Event:
Tackling Repeat Victimisation**

**A report by the National Board for Crime Prevention
Prepared by Cressida Bridgeman and Alice Sampson
Home Office Police Research Group**

Behind all the statistics of crime one must never forget that there are real people whose lives may have been blighted by crime. Victims of crime need emotional support and practical help.

Research has shown that some people and places are repeatedly vulnerable to crime. One obvious example is the problem of domestic violence. But it is emerging that repetition occurs in other crimes including domestic burglary and car crime. The National Board for Crime Prevention believes that there is considerable scope for targeting effort on the tackling of "repeat victimisation". Focusing on the victims of crime and preventing further crimes being committed against them should form part of a local crime prevention strategy.

This first report of the National Board for Crime Prevention sets out what is known about repeat victimisation, demonstrates why its prevention is important and provides a number of examples of good practice in responding to it.

Crime touches the whole community. Tackling crime cannot therefore be left simply to the police. This report concludes that an effective response to repeat victimisation needs the involvement and commitment of a number of key organisations and practitioners working in partnership at local level.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Charles Wardle". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with a large initial 'C'.

CHARLES WARDLE MP

Parliamentary Under Secretary of State, Home Office

Chairman, National Board for Crime Prevention

May 1994

	<i>Page</i>
Foreword	(ii)
1. Setting the scene	1
What is repeat victimisation?	2
Why is it important?	2
What we know	3
2. Facing the challenge: how can we respond?	4
Under-reporting	4
Recording repeat incidents	6
Heightened risk period	7
Sustained protection	9
Maintaining a focus on repeat victimisation	11
3. Conclusion: an agenda for action	13
Annex A: The extent of repeat victimisation	14
Annex B: The National Board for Crime Prevention	15
References	16

1. Setting the scene

The National Board for Crime Prevention (NBCT) recognises the need to raise the profile of crime prevention, and that this should be underpinned by a coherent strategy which can inform public debate and encourage effective action.¹ One element of the Board's strategy is the prevention of repeat victimisation.

The Board has chosen this as the theme of its first working paper as a way of stressing the importance of putting the victim centre-stage. Victims of crime should have "the full consideration they deserve",² especially as the distress suffered by those who have been victimised can be devastating and can have long term effects. Preventing further revictimisation is therefore an important consideration for any crime reduction strategy.

The paper is divided into three sections. Section 1 begins with a definition of repeat victimisation and explains its importance as a crime prevention approach. It then documents current knowledge about the phenomenon. The second section sets out a practical response and explores some of the key issues which need to be addressed, with examples from successful initiatives. Section 3 suggests ways of moving the debate forward, with calls for action from a number of national and local agencies. Annex A presents key research findings on the extent of repeat victimisation for a number of offence types. Annex B gives details about the National Board for Crime Prevention.

What is repeat victimisation?

Repeat victimisation occurs when the same person or place suffers from more than one criminal incident over a specified period of time.¹

Why is it important?

- Research has shown that repeatedly victimised people and places account for a significant proportion of all crime. One study found that of the 1992 British Crime Survey respondents, half of those who were victimised were repeat victims and suffered 81% of all reported crimes. Of these, 4% were chronically victimised. That is, they suffered four or more crimes in a year, and accounted for 44% of all the reported crime.⁴ Effectively preventing crime against these people and places should ultimately have an impact on overall crime levels.
 - Given finite resources, identifying priorities and targeting effort is an essential component of a crime prevention strategy. Focusing on repeat victims provides such a priority. Furthermore, the rate of revictimisation is three times higher in high crime areas than in low crime areas.⁵ This approach targets areas most prone to criminal activity.
 - Research has found that those who are most vulnerable in society are likely to be repeatedly victimised. Preventing repeat victimisation protects these people, without having to identify them as disadvantaged members of society.⁶
 - A history of victimisation against a person or place provides the police with an opportunity to combine their investigative and preventive tasks to improve detection rates and victim protection. By pointing to the most probable times and places of future offences, repeat victimisation also helps identify the times and places where offenders may be found and apprehended. There is potential for the development of a symbiotic relationship between crime prevention and offender detection, involving closer links between, for example, police crime prevention officers and CID.
 - One of the most frequent obstacles to the successful reduction of crime is the lack of co-operation and co-ordination between and within agencies with responsibilities for tackling crime. Focusing on the victim helps to unite these agencies and promotes improved collaboration and agreed solutions, both in providing a "reactive" response when a crime has occurred, and in providing a longer term "proactive" response to prevent recurrence.
-

What we know⁷

Certain facts about repeat victimisation make it an attractive crime prevention approach. We know it is:

- ☛ **real** – evidence suggests certain people and certain places are chronically victimised.
- ☛ **predictable** – victimised people or dwellings are more likely to be victimised again.
- ☛ **rapid** – victimisation is likely to happen again within a short time period.
- ☛ **widespread** – across different types of offences. Whilst it is commonly recognised that crimes like racial attacks and domestic violence are often repeated attacks, the repetition of other types of offence may be less obvious. Analysis of burglary, car crime, assaults, fraud and criminal damage have all found patterns of repeat incidents.
- ☛ **devastating** – the cumulative effect on people can be debilitating, particularly when suffered by more vulnerable members of the community, for example, some minority ethnic groups, old people and children.
- ☛ **increasing in some geographic areas** – recent work has found that during the 1980s large increases in crime were due mainly to victims being victimised more often, rather than to more non-victims becoming victims.⁸
- ☛ **under-recorded** – official data under-records the extent of repeat victimisation. This is particularly so when reporting rates are low.
- ☛ **costly** – the hidden and long term costs are high. Immediate intervention is, therefore, cost-effective.

2. Facing the challenge: how can we respond?

Translating this knowledge into policy and practice is still largely under-developed.⁹ To redress this balance, policy-makers and practitioners should consider three elements which relate to any crime reduction strategy:

- *where* to focus effort,
- in certain cases, *when*; and,
- *what* action should be taken.

Repeat victimisation provides guidance on *where* and *when*, and whilst it does not tell you precisely *what* to do, a number of demonstration projects have indicated the potential of implementing particular packages of measures.

This section explores some of the key issues raised by the research and demonstration projects: under-reporting; recording repeat incidents; heightened risk period; sustained protection, and maintaining a focus on repeat victimisation. In each case, practical examples of effective responses are given.

The issues highlighted in this section may have implications for the way agencies organise their work and staff responsibilities, if repeat victimisation is to be tackled effectively. In particular, unless responsibility for monitoring repeat victimisation is allocated to an individual or particular part of the organisation, all the good intentions to deal with the problem may flounder.

Under-reporting

Preventing repeat victimisation requires agencies to be aware of its extent; under-reporting can make this difficult. There are a number of different types of under-reporting:

(1) It is well known that people do not report *all* the incidents that they have suffered. One Canadian study, for example, showed that women suffered an average of 35 domestic violence attacks before contacting the police.¹⁰ Sometimes, people report incidents which they think are "major" and therefore will result in a serious response from agencies, but do not report "minor" incidents such as a smashed window, stone-throwing or harassment.¹¹

(2) Crimes can also be reported to people, organisations and agencies outside the criminal justice system.¹² This includes the local authority – housing, youth, social services and legal departments; schools; employers; action groups¹³; hospital casualty departments¹⁴; General Practitioners' surgeries¹⁵; family, friends and neighbours.

(iii) It is well established that property crimes are more likely to be reported to the police than crimes against the person.¹⁶ A study of racial incidents on two estates in Bristol found that only 5% were reported to the police,¹⁷ which compares with a reporting rate of 91% for commercial burglaries on northern industrial estates.¹⁸

(iv) Sometimes, victims are unaware that an offence has been committed. This often may be the case for theft from organisations by employees.

Thus, agencies need to be sensitive to the possibility that a single reported incident may be one of a series; to the fact that a variety of agencies are likely to have information about victimisation, but will not on their own have a complete history of repeat victimisations, and to the probability that repeated violent crimes are most likely to be "hidden".¹⁹ Taking steps to increase reporting or introducing procedures for increasing awareness are therefore likely to reveal increased patterns of repeat victimisation. It should be noted that increased reporting to the police may initially result in an increase in recorded crime.

Responding positively: some examples

- ✱ ***Making it easier to report*** – The procedures for reporting crimes need to be made as clear and straightforward as possible for victims and witnesses. This is particularly important for incidents where there is a low reporting rate, as, for example, with school bullying, domestic violence, and racial attacks. An anti-bullying initiative in an East London school introduced a "bully box" into which pupils could put "bullying forms" requesting a confidential meeting with the staff member of their choice, resulting in a threefold increase in reporting.²⁰ Setting up a language line for racial victims may improve reporting by those who find communicating in English difficult. Since the police are often seen as the last resort, family, friends and community action groups can all have an important role to play in encouraging victims and witnesses to report.
- ✱ ***Listening to the victim*** – Reporting an incident to the police may take a lot of courage for a person who has suffered many previous incidents; they may feel ashamed and vulnerable. Asking about a history of victimisation requires reassuring the victims that they will be taken seriously. It is important to discuss with the victim what will make them feel safer and what they think will stop further victimisation.
- ✱ ***Heightening awareness that there is a problem*** – The aim is to establish an "ethos" about what is acceptable and unacceptable behaviour. This will also help overcome the reluctance of witnesses to intervene. A key element of a school

anti-bullying strategy, for example, is for the school to show its concern about bullying and set the general tone that bullying will not be tolerated.²¹ In order to raise public awareness and send out a clear signal that violence against women is a crime, the Zero Tolerance Campaign in Edinburgh was launched in 1992.²² Organisations can circulate information sheets explaining that personal appropriation of office equipment is not considered a "perk" of the job.

Recording repeat incidents

Agencies need to collect information in a way that enables repeat incidents to be identified. In setting up these systems, agencies should recognise that:

- (i) Subsequent victimisations may be of the same crime type. For example, a household or business suffers three burglaries in succession.
- (ii) For some crime types, individual incidents within the pattern of repeats may vary in nature and severity.²³ For example, "domestic violence" could involve a combination of physical attacks, threats of violence and mental cruelty. "Racial attacks" could encompass verbal abuse, offensive/dangerous material through the letter box and spitting. "Bullying" could include hitting, spreading rumours and locking in a room.
- (iii) An individual or place may suffer more than one type of crime. A local study on a housing estate found that half of all victims suffered from a combination of both property and personal crimes.²⁴ These findings are supported by other studies.²⁵

Responding positively: some examples

- ☛ ***Record all incidents*** – Within organisations, for example a local school, pro forma incident sheets, to be used by all staff to whom incidents are reported, have been found to be useful. Valuable information was collected in this way by an initiative to reduce school vandalism in New Zealand.²⁶
- ☛ ***Use all available sources of information*** – This will give a more complete picture of the problem, and applies both within agencies and between agencies. For example, a full police analysis of repeat victimisation should take into account both reported incidents which are "crimed" and those which are not. In one project, police incident logs were used to identify repeat incidents of domestic violence.²⁷ Police information should be supplemented by data from other relevant agencies. In a demonstration project, community groups recorded six times as many racial incidents as the police.²⁸

-
- ✎ *Explore the development of a computerised crime recording system* – This needs to be capable of reliably identifying all types of reported incidents, by person, property and place.
 - ✎ *Take a flexible approach to data analysis* – Different analyses of the same data will reveal very different patterns of repeat victimisation. For example, a study of crime for a one month period may show virtually no repeat victimisation. Some of the crimes noted during the observed month may be repeats of a crime the month before, or may be precursors of crimes in the subsequent month.²⁹ A more comprehensive picture can be obtained by conducting a number of analyses using different cut-off points and by extending the period of time studied to, for example, three months or longer.

Heightened risk period³⁰

Research has shown that second and subsequent offences tend to follow fairly rapidly after the "first". Although the time course can vary for different crimes and places, a pattern of heightened risk has been identified for:

Domestic burglary – an analysis of the repeat burglaries within one month showed that half of the second victimisations occurred within seven days of the first.³¹

School burglary and property crime – 79% of revictimisations were within one month of a prior victimisation.³²

Domestic violence – after a first incident, 35% of households suffer a second within five weeks, after a second incident, 45% of households suffer a third within five weeks.³³

Racial attacks – subsequent revictimisations were most frequent within the first week following the attack.³⁴

Business crime – a half of reburglaries were committed within six weeks of the first incident.³⁵

This "heightened risk" declines over time, suggesting two implications for local policy makers and practitioners. Firstly, to be effective, crime prevention measures need to be put in place quickly, ideally within twenty four hours. Secondly, "special" measures, for example, mobile alarms, can be implemented on a temporary basis and then reallocated when the risk has diminished. The cost-effectiveness of a "pool" of such measures constantly reallocated on a risk basis increases over time.³⁶

In many cases, the provision of an immediate response will draw on the expertise and resources of a number of different agencies. Co-ordinated action both between and within agencies needs to be part of routine operational practice. Between agencies, this means developing existing relationships, for example between the police and victim support volunteers, and exploring new ones. Within agencies, this means identifying who has responsibility for which tasks. If, for example, the chosen temporary measure in response to domestic violence is a portable safety alarm, then the police Domestic Violence Unit could be responsible for allocation decisions, the police crime prevention officer taking responsibility for installation and maintenance.

Responding positively: some examples

- ***Prompt response and action*** – Agencies' policies and practices should prioritise their response to repeat victims and ensure their immediate security. Those making an immediate response should be well briefed on the history of calls from a victim and the risk of injury, and well-trained to respond to situations which often can be very difficult. In cases of violent crime, for example domestic violence, child abuse or racial attacks, this could mean the police having a positive arrest policy and safe alternative accommodation being made available. Another example of a prompt response is for organisations faced with graffiti to employ a "quick clean" policy.¹⁷
 - ***Immediate "temporary" measures*** – By quickly moving "special" measures into place, agencies can create a "breathing space", in which to identify and implement appropriate longer term strategies. As the measures only need be temporary, more expensive forms of protection become viable. These might include the loan of a portable intruder alarm to sufferers of burglary or domestic violence, or a tracking device for stolen vehicles or property. Quick response pendant alarms, which activated a voice link to a police control room and showed information about the whereabouts and circumstances of victims, were part of the response to domestic violence sufferers in Merseyside – 68% of the alarms allocated were installed within three days of the first contact.¹⁸ In South Yorkshire, burglary victims were loaned alarms adapted to include movement sensors.¹⁹ Equally, measures could take the form of increased police patrols of a specific location at specified times. For example, train depots could be patrolled at night if it is known that trains are being "graffitied" when stored there overnight.
 - ***Information sharing*** – Routine crime prevention advice given by police crime prevention officers and victim support volunteers should be candid about
-

further crime risks, include information about any local support and advice agencies, and possible courses of action. There should be the mechanism in each local area whereby agencies can meet to discuss certain cases. This would be appropriate, for example, when a particular place is a crime "hot spot"; when a person has suffered from a number of different types of crime, or where there is a history of being a victim of a particular crime. The sharing of information about histories of victimisation will enable a more effective safety action plan to be developed. In a project in East London, repeat victims found personal action plans especially useful. In these types of meeting, there should be clear confidentiality guidelines; the victims' wishes should be respected – they may not want some information to become "common" knowledge, and their views on how they would like offenders to be dealt with should be obtained.

Sustained protection

Having ensured the immediate security of a repeat victim, attention needs to focus on their longer term protection, on the principle that, "Everyone ... has the right to live free of fear, intimidation, harassment, abuse and attack."³⁶ Research has shown that a "package of prevention measures" is essential for effective action in this respect. For example, a successful domestic burglary prevention project in Rochdale included a combination of upgrading household security, property marking, "cocoons" neighbourhood watch and offender programmes⁴¹; measures to prevent bullying may include protection on the way to school, in the playground and in the school toilets. A different set of measures again would be required to lessen the vulnerability of certain places and locations. This may require improved surveillance through design changes, the use of CCTV and employing more staff, for example at underground stations, car parks and in retail outlets.

In addition to measures aimed at reducing the opportunities for offending and increasing the risks to those who commit crimes, the phenomenon of repeat victimisation raises the possibility of dealing with the perpetrators directly. Chronically victimised people often know who is committing the crimes, sometimes intimately. Offenders and repeat victims may share the same house (as is often the case for domestic violence and child abuse) or live in close proximity to each other⁴². They may be neighbours, work in the same place, or belong to the same social or sports club. In these circumstances, victims are under continuous threat from a further attack, or another break-in. The best possible reassurance for repeat victims must be to know that offenders are no longer able or motivated to commit offences against them.

Responding positively: some examples

- ✱ ***Victim empowerment*** – Emphasis should be given to the local provision of services to help victims build up confidence and establish their self-worth – “Our aim was not to take over but enable her to make her own decisions.”⁴¹ Some youth service programmes work on self-esteem, and are well placed to play an important role here.⁴² Other measures could include the personal safety action plan, self-defence classes, and English language classes for minority ethnic groups. In their dealings with victims of crime, agencies need to be sensitive to the fine line between victim support and victim blaming. Many people already have self-protection strategies which can be further developed to improve their safety.⁴³
 - ✱ ***Networking*** – Agencies can establish informal networks of support between repeat victims. As far as possible, these should build on existing arrangements and foster new contacts. A study of crime and harassment in Asian-run small shops suggested, for example, setting up local self-help groups of shopkeepers whose aim would be to identify particular local problems, develop and implement ways of preventing them and offer mutual support.⁴⁴
 - ✱ ***Community involvement*** – Encouragement can be given to local people to take on responsibility for preventing revictimisation. For example, schools could involve pupils in formulating a bullying programme, domestic and commercial neighbours can be encouraged to “watch” over at risk premises. Local groups can also have a role, for example, Crime Prevention Panels and Youth Action Groups.
 - ✱ ***Opportunity reduction*** – This encompasses a wide range of measures that are directed at highly specific forms of crime, involve the management, design or manipulation of the immediate environment in as systematic and permanent a way as possible, so as to increase the effort and risks of crime and reduce the rewards as perceived by a wide range of offenders.⁴⁵ Such measures could include: introducing graffiti-resistant paint on daubed walls; replacing coin operated phones with card phones; improving surveillance, both formal and informal, for example, leaving the car in a private car park with security guards, or parking in locations overlooked by neighbouring residences.
 - ✱ ***Dealing with perpetrators*** – Where victims suffer at the hands of repeat offenders, action should be taken to stop reoffending. For example, in some cases of racial or neighbour harassment on local authority owned property, the housing department has applied for eviction orders against the perpetrators, for breaches of tenancy agreement.⁴⁶ Action may also involve programmes
-

designed to address the causes of offending behaviour, of the sort provided by the probation service. In assessing the risk of further offending, probation officers must consider the possibility of the offender revictimising the original victim, and confront that issue where appropriate. Programmes could include alcohol and drug misuse prevention schemes. There are a number of schemes aimed at improving anger management and challenging notions of masculinity – “Boys and men need to be encouraged to believe that violence is an act of failure, not of heroics.”⁴⁹ These types of scheme seem to be on the increase. For example, the voluntary sector in the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham has recently set up violence prevention programmes for abusive men.⁵⁰ Other types of schemes challenge “status seeking” criminals; including those that steal sports cars⁵¹ or steal to buy trainers.⁵²

Maintaining a focus on repeat victimisation

A commitment to maintain reductions in repeat victimisation needs to be integrated into all aspects of local agency community safety policy and practices. This commitment must apply at all levels of responsibility, from senior management through to policy makers and practitioners. It also needs to be backed up by adequate resourcing – “Victims of crime need attention. They need compassion and understanding. But they need more – their needs cannot be fully met without a firm commitment to adequate resourcing.”⁵³

In order to ensure this commitment, it may be necessary for individual agencies to re-examine their way of working and allocation of staff responsibilities. In particular, each agency should identify individuals who would be responsible for monitoring revictimisation. Inter-agency co-operation is more likely to succeed if each agency has put its “own house in order”.

Guidelines for the setting up and running of such partnerships have been well documented.⁵⁴ Leadership emerges as a key feature in co-ordinating an effective response. In some cases, it is clear which agency or individual should take the lead; for example, the police may be the obvious “lead agency” for car crime. In other cases, the local authority or an action group may be more appropriate. Where it is not clear, this must be agreed and acted upon through local consultation.

Responding positively: some examples

- **Signing up to the strategy** – Support from senior management is crucial. This can be shown by agencies incorporating repeat victimisation into their mission statements and policy documents. For example, school policy could promulgate the view that bullying will not be tolerated.
-

-
- *Training* – The expansion of partnership approaches to crime prevention should be underpinned by a coherent training strategy. This should address the various needs of policy makers, senior managers who have community safety as part of their brief, practitioners, and staff who have contributions to make towards an overall community safety strategy.⁵⁵ Crime prevention training, including personal safety information, should be available to all organisations. Joint-agency training should form part of this strategy. This would enable agencies: to draw on each other's expertise; to improve their own skills, for example mediation skills to improve response to conflict situations, and to network with workers from different agencies within the local area.
 - *Performance indicators* – Reducing repeat victimisation would be a powerful measure of performance for all agencies concerned with crime control – not just for the police, but for all agencies who have managerial responsibility for people or places that are the victims of crime. A performance measure of this kind would automatically direct attention and resources to the individuals and areas where the incidence of crime is greatest, and where an effective response is needed most.
 - *Research and evaluation* – This will enable value for money to be ascertained, and good practice to be identified and spread. Many of the response strategies will be simple, requiring small adjustments to existing working methods, with low outlays; others may be more demanding. Further research may be needed on a number of areas including examining displacement and the reasons for repeat victimisation in different crime types.
 - *Publicise success* – It should not be necessary for every agency to have to reinvent the wheel. Examples of good practice should be documented and disseminated. Research has indicated that publicising the initiatives can itself have a positive effect on crime, in providing a deterrent to perpetrators.⁵⁶
-

3. Conclusion: an agenda for action

Research findings and demonstration projects have put the prevention of repeat victimisation high on our crime reduction agenda. The Board feels that it is now time for policy makers, senior managers and practitioners in all relevant organisations to integrate the prevention of repeat victimisation into their crime reduction thinking and planning. To assist in this process, the Board has organised six regional conferences, to be held throughout May 1994. The aim of these conferences is to share and discuss ideas, establish mechanisms for disseminating information, and provide the impetus for activity at the local level. The Board will be reviewing what action has been stimulated by these conferences.

These conferences are, however, only a starting point. The Board fully supports current development work, particularly initiatives which demonstrate how to incorporate the prevention of repeat victimisation into routine operational practice and what can be achieved. One example of this is the work underway in West Yorkshire, where the Home Office has commissioned Manchester University to work with West Yorkshire police to develop strategies to tackle repeat domestic and commercial burglary and theft of and from motor vehicles. We look forward to seeing the final report of this project which is to be published next year.

To develop the full potential of repeat victimisation, innovative policies and practices are required. The Board appreciates that introducing such changes is sometimes difficult, but we hope and have every confidence that you will rise to the challenge.

Annex A

The extent of repeat victimisation

Racial attacks – 67% of the families were multi-victims. (Sampson & Phillips, 1992)

Domestic violence – estimates that only 10% involves an isolated event and that the other 90% involves systematic beatings, often with escalating violence. (Hammer & Stanko, 1985)

Domestic burglary – once a house has been burgled its chance of repeat victimisation was four times the rate of houses that had not been burgled before. (Forrester et al, 1988)

Motor vehicle theft – a quarter of respondents experienced more than one incident. 8% of victims accounted for 22% of the incidents measured in the three surveys. (Mayhew et al, 1993)

Crime against small businesses – 39% of businesses were found to have been reburgled at least once in a year. (Tilley, 1993)

Crime on industrial estates – on the worst estates, businesses could expect to be victimised five times per year. (Johnston et al, 1991)

School burglary and property crime – 98% of the total crimes recorded by thirty three schools on Merseyside were repeat crimes. (Burquest et al, 1992)

Bullying – a study of a comprehensive school in Sussex showed that 9-10% of pupils had been bullied weekly or more. (Yilmaz, cited in Whitney and Smith, 1991)

Annex B

The National Board for Crime Prevention

Aim: To find new ways of involving all sections of the community, including business and the voluntary sector, in the development and delivery of crime prevention, both locally and nationally.

Chairman: Mr Charles Wardle, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State at the Home Office.

Memberships:

Keith Ackroyd	Managing Director, Retail Division, Boots Company PLC; Chairman, the British Retail Consortium.
Peter Batchelor	Executive Director, Sales and Marketing, Vauxhall Motors Ltd.
Janet Paraskeva	Director, National Youth Agency.
Ken Pease	Professor of Criminology, University of Manchester.
Richard Penn	Chief Executive, Bradford Metropolitan Borough Council.
Dr John Rae	Director, The Portman Group (alcohol misuse).
Helen Reeves	Director, National Association of Victim Support Schemes.
Nick Ross	TV and radio Broadcaster/Presenter.
Hon David Sieff	Director, Marks and Spencer PLC.
John Stevens	Chief Constable, Northumbria Constabulary.
David Walton	Chief Probation Officer, Staffordshire Probation Service.

Remit: The Board will:

- (1) advise on the development of measures to prevent crime and reduce the fear of crime;
 - (2) suggest practical local strategies for crime prevention, both generally and in relation to specific situations and types of crime;
 - (3) recommend means by which all sections of the community can be involved in crime prevention.
-

References

1. Ross, N. (1994) unpublished paper presented to the National Board for Crime Prevention 23/2/94.
 2. Reeves, H. (1988) "Afterword" in M. Maguire and J. Pointing (eds.) *Victims of Crime: a new deal?* Milton Keynes: OUP.
 3. This definition includes all incidents which adversely affect the victim. Some of these may not, of course, always be officially recorded as "criminal". For example, many incidents of bullying in schools, spitting and so on.
For further discussion of terminology see: Farrell, G. (1992) "Multiple Victimisation: its extent and significance" *International Review of Victimology*, 2, 89-111; and Farrell, G. (1993) *Repeated Criminal Victimisation* PHD submitted to the University of Manchester, October 1993.
 4. Farrell, G. and Pease, K. (1993) *Once Bitten, Twice Bitten: Repeat Victimisation and its Implications for Crime Prevention*. Crime Prevention Unit Paper 46. London: Home Office.
 5. Trickett, A., Osborn, D.K., Seymour, J. and Pease, K. (1992) "What is different about high crime areas?" *British Journal of Criminology*, 32, 81-90.
 6. Pease, K. (1992) "The Kirkholt Project: Preventing Burglary on a Public Housing Estate" in RV Clarke (ed.) *Situational Crime Prevention: successful case studies*. New York: Harrow & Heston.
 7. The knowledge about repeat victimisation detailed here draws largely on the work of Ken Pease, Professor of Criminology at Manchester University.
 8. Trickett, A., Ellingworth, D., Hope, T.J. and Pease, K. (in preparation) *Changes in Area Inequality in Crime Victimisation 1982-88: Findings from the British Crime Surveys*. University of Manchester: Department of Econometrics.
 9. This is despite the fact that the phenomenon has been long recognised, see for example: Johnson *et al* (1973); Ziegenhagen (1976); Sparks *et al* (1977); Hindelang *et al* (1978); Reiss (1980); Fienberg (1980) and Sparks (1981).
 10. Jaffe, P., Wolfe, D.A., Telford, A. and Austin, G. (1986) "The impact of police charges in incidents of wife abuse" *Journal of Family Violence*, 1 (1): 37-49.
 11. Mayhew, P., Aye Maung, N. and Mirrlees-Black, C. (1993) *The 1992 British Crime Survey*. Home Office Research Study no. 132. London: HMSO.
 12. Dobash, R.E., Dobash, R.P. and Cavanagh, K. (1985) "The contact between battered women and social and medical agencies" in J.Pahl (ed.) *Private Violence and Public Policy*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
-

McGibbon, A. *What Support*, LB Hammersmith and Fulham 1989.

Smith, P.K. (1991) "The silent nightmare: Bullying and victimisation in school peer groups" *The Psychologist*, 4 243-248.

13. Sampson, A. and Phillips, C. (1992) *Multiple Racial Attacks on an East London Estate*. Crime Prevention Unit Paper 36. London: Home Office.

14. Shepherd, J. (1990) "Violent Crime in Bristol; an accident and emergency perspective" *British Journal of Criminology*, 30: 289-305.

15. Stanko, E.A. (1991 unpublished) *Public Violence* summary of research findings, violent crime reduction project.

16. Mayhew, P., Aye Maung, N. and Mirrlees-Black, C. (1993) *The 1992 British Crime Survey*. Home Office Research Study no. 132. London: HMSO.

17. The Hartcliffe and Withywood Black Support Group (1993) *Standing Out. To be black in Hartcliffe and Withywood*. A research report by the Hartcliffe and Withywood Black Support Group, April 1993. Bristol.

18. Johnston, V., Leek, M., Shapland, J. and Wiles, P. (1990) *Crimes and other problems on industrial estates*. Research report by University of Sheffield.

19. Stanko, E.A. (1988) "Hidden violence against women" ch 4 in M. Maguire and J. Pointing (eds.) *Victims of Crime: a new deal?* Milton Keynes: OUP.

20. Linklater, J., Pitts, J. and Smith, P. (1993) *Safer Schools: An anti-bullying Initiative*. Unpublished research report by the West London Institute.

21. Farrington, D.P. (1993) "Understanding and Preventing Bullying" in M. Tonry (ed.) *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research* vol 17. Chicago: University Press.

22. Crime Concern (1993) *Inspirations for Action: A Practical Guide to Women's Safety*. Swindon: Crime Concern.

23. Genn, H. (1988) "Multiple Victimisation" in M. Maguire and J. Pointing (eds.) *Victims of Crime: a new deal?* Milton Keynes: OUP.

Hammer, J. and Stanko, E.A. (1985) "Stripping away the rhetoric of protection: violence to women, law and the state in Britain and the USA. *International Journal of the Sociology of Law*, 13: 357-74.

24. Sampson, A. and Farrell, G. (1991) *Victim Support and Crime Prevention in an Inner-City Setting*. Crime Prevention Unit Paper 21. London: Home Office.

-
- Sampson, A. (1991) *Lessons from a Victim Support Crime Prevention Project*. Crime Prevention Unit Paper 25. London: Home Office.
25. For further details, see Farrell, G. (1993) *Repeated Criminal Victimisation*. PhD submitted to the University of Manchester, October 1993.
26. Gesson, S. and Wilson, P.R. (1990) *Preventing Graffiti and Vandalism*. Canberra: Australian Institute of Criminology.
27. Lloyd, S., Farrell, G., and Pease, K. (1994) *Preventing Repeated Domestic Violence. A Demonstration Project on Merseyside*. Crime Prevention Unit Paper 49. London: Home Office.
28. Sampson, A. and Phillips, C. (1992) *Multiple Victimisation: Racial Attacks on an East London Estate*. Crime Prevention Unit Paper 36. London: Home Office.
29. Farrell, G. and Pease, K. (1993) *Once Bitten, Twice Bitten: Repeat Victimisation and its Implications for Crime Prevention*. Crime Prevention Unit Paper 46. London: Home Office.
30. Forrester, D., Chatterton, M. and Pease, K. (1988) *The Kirkholt Burglary Prevention Project, Rochdale*. Crime Prevention Unit Paper 13. London: Home Office.
31. Polvi, N., Looman, T., Humphries, C. and Pease, K. (1990) "Repeat Break and Enter Victimisation: Time Course and Crime Prevention Opportunity" *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 17, 8-11.
- Polvi, N., Looman, T., Humphries, C. and Pease, K. (1991) "The Time Course of Repeat Burglary Victimisation" *British Journal of Criminology*, 31, 411-414.
32. Burquest, R., Farrell, G. and Pease, K. (1992) "Lessons from Schools" in *Policing* vol 8. Summer 1992 p148-155.
33. Lloyd, S., Farrell, G. and Pease, K. (1994) *Preventing Repeated Domestic Violence: A Demonstration Project on Merseyside*. Crime Prevention Unit Paper 49. London: Home Office.
34. Sampson, A. and Phillips, C. (1992) *Multiple Victimisation. Racial Attacks on an East London Estate*. Crime Prevention Unit Paper 36. London: Home Office.
35. Tilley, N. (1993) *The Prevention of Crime Against Small Businesses: The Safer Cities Experience*. Crime Prevention Unit Paper 45. London: Home Office.
36. Farrell, G. and Pease, K. (1993) *Once Bitten, Twice Bitten: Repeat Victimisation and its Implications for Crime Prevention*. Crime Prevention Unit Paper 46. London: Home Office.
-

37. Sloan-Howitt, M. and Kelling, G.L. (1990) "Subway Graffiti in New York City: 'Gettin' Up' vs. 'Meanin' It and Cleanin' It" *Security Journal*, 1990, vol. 1, no. 3 pp. 131-136.

38. Lloyd, S., Farrell, G. and Pease, K. (1994) *Preventing Repeated Domestic Violence: A Demonstration Project on Merseyside*. Crime Prevention Unit Paper 49. London: Home Office.

39. Fieldsend, T., Jones, G. and Pease, K. (1992) "Cellular Phones: Yuppies' Friend, Intruders' Foe?" submitted to *Police Review*.

40. The London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham (1993) *Community Safety Strategy 1990-1994*, cited in *Crime Concern Inspirations for Action: A Practical Guide to Women's Safety*.

41. Forrester, D., Chatterton, M. and Pease, K. (1988) *The Kirkholt Burglary Prevention Project, Rochdale*. Crime Prevention Unit Paper 13. London: Home Office.
Forrester, D., Frenz, S., O'Connell, M. and Pease, K. (1990) *The Kirkholt Burglary Prevention Project: Phase II*. Crime Prevention Unit Paper 23. London: Home Office.

42. Sampson, A. and Phillips, C. (1992) *Multiple Victimisation: Racial Attacks on an East London Estate*. Crime Prevention Unit Paper 36. London: Home Office.
Sampson, A. (1993) "Action against perpetrators of racial attacks and harassment" *Housing Review* vol42 no3.

43. Victim Support (1994) *Annual Report 1993* London: Victim Support.

44. Paraskeva, J. (1992) "Keeping out of trouble" *Times Educational Supplement* 30/10/92.
Report from a National Board for Crime Prevention Seminar on Young People and Crime 20/12/93.

45. Stanko, E.A. (1990) *Everyday Violence*. London: Routledge.
Stanko, E.A. (1990) "When precaution is normal: a feminist critique of crime prevention." in L.Gelsthorpe and A. Morris (eds.) *Feminist Perspectives in Criminology*. pp173-183. England: Open University Press.

46. Ekblom, P. and Simon, F. (1988) *Crime Prevention and Racial Harassment in Asian-run Small Shops: the scope for prevention*. Crime Prevention Unit Paper 15. London: Home Office.

47. Clarke, R.V. (1992) *Situational Crime Prevention: successful case studies*. p4. New York: Albany and Heston.

-
48. Clarke, M. (1994) "Tyneside's Least Wanted" pp18-19 in *Police Review* 11/3/94.
49. Ross, N. (1994) unpublished paper presented to the National Board for Crime Prevention 23/2/94.
50. Home Office (1993) *A Practical Guide to Crime Prevention for Local Partnerships*. prepared for the Home Office by Crime Concern. London: HMSO.
51. Light, R., Nee, C. and Ingham, H. (1993) *Car Theft: The Offender's Perspective*. Home Office Research Study no. 130. London: HMSO.
52. Barker, M., Geraghty, J., Webb, B. and Key, T. (1993) *The Prevention of Street Robbery*. Crime Prevention Unit Paper 44. London: Home Office.
53. Tuck, M. (1993) "In my view..." in *Victim Support Annual Report 1993*. London: Victim Support.
54. Home Office (1993) *A Practical Guide to Crime for Local Partnerships*. prepared for the Home Office by Crime Concern. London: HMSO.
55. Neason, C. (1993) *Community Safety Training Issues Paper* unpublished working paper presented to the National Board for Crime Prevention.
56. Laycock, G. (1991) "Operation identification, or the power of publicity?" *Security Journal* 2: 67-72.
-