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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Preamble

This evaluation of the Scottish Executive’s national community warden programme was undertaken over a 30 month period by GEN Consulting. The evaluation draws upon a variety of sources of evidence, including case studies, analysis of crime and antisocial behaviour statistics and survey work in order to meet the objectives of the original brief.

This evidence was often incomplete, and at times contradictory. However, the various pieces of evidence complemented one another so that it was generally possible to verify findings from other sources.

The conclusion reached is that there is evidence, from a number of sources, that the community wardens are having a positive impact upon the quality of life in their patrol areas. This comes about as they have helped to reduce both the levels and perceptions of some crimes and antisocial behaviours. This is not a pattern that is consistent across all schemes and all types of antisocial behaviour. However, the conclusion has been reached by drawing upon a variety of complementary and reinforcing sources of evidence, which tend to point in similar directions.

Given this there is evidence that the wardens in Scotland are meeting the objectives set for them by the Scottish Executive and are improving living conditions within the areas they patrol.

Introduction

1. Community wardens were introduced across the United Kingdom progressively from the late 1990s. Their role was to act as a deterrent to antisocial behaviour and provide reassurance to those whose lives were affected by crime, fear of crime and antisocial behaviour. Whilst the majority of wardens do not have enforcement powers, they liaise closely with the police and local councils, acting as the “eyes and ears” of these agencies. It was hoped that their presence would provide reassurance to communities. Residents would then have greater confidence that action would be taken and would be more willing to report incidents to the enforcement agencies.

2. In Scotland a number of local authorities (such as Edinburgh and Renfrewshire) had seen the potential for wardens to improve the quality of life in disadvantaged areas and had set up schemes using such funding sources as the Better Neighbourhood Services Fund.

3. However, in March 2003 the Scottish Executive announced that, as part of the Building Strong, Safe, Attractive Communities (BSSAC) initiative, £20 million was to be made available to fund community warden schemes in all 32 Scottish local authorities. The amount of funding was based on such factors as population and deprivation levels and ranged from £80,000 a year in the smaller rural and islands authorities to £1 million for Glasgow. Guidance on funding submissions, and a
timetable, was issued by the Executive and in February 2004 the Minister for Communities formally announced the initial financial allocations for 2004/05 and 2005/06.

The Evaluation

4. In mid-2004 GEN Consulting was commissioned by the Executive to undertake an evaluation of the implementation and impact of the warden schemes across Scotland. The evaluation had 4 main objectives:-

- The identification of innovation and good practice;
- To support the analysis of monitoring information that was to be collected at 6, 12 and 24 monthly intervals using a standard template;
- To examine and explain the processes underpinning the schemes’ development and implementation; and
- Providing an overall assessment of the warden schemes, including making recommendations to improve future impact and effectiveness.

5. The methodology used a number of mutually reinforcing approaches, including:-

- Analysis of the monitoring templates;
- A survey of scheme managers targeted at all 32 schemes, undertaken on 3 occasions using email;
- An analysis of wardens’ activities largely based on the details provided in the 24 month reports; and
- Selection and analysis of the schemes’ development in 9 case study areas. The case studies were selected so that they covered the diversity of warden schemes across Scotland. They were in: Aberdeen, Dumfries and Galloway (North West Dumfries), Dundee, East Renfrewshire, Edinburgh, Inverclyde, Orkney, Perth and Kinross and South Lanarkshire.

6. The case study analysis involved the following approaches:-

- A base and endline survey of residents’ attitudes towards, and perceptions of, crime and antisocial behaviour. In addition to the case study areas the surveys were also carried out in 2 control areas, selected as they were similar in socio-economic terms to the case studies but were not subject to wardens (or other) types of antisocial behaviour interventions. The 2 controls were in Edinburgh and Perth and Kinross;
- A postal survey of wardens to gather information on their characteristics, views on their relationships with other agencies and perceptions of impact;
- Focus groups with young and older people resident in the areas;
- Regular visits and consultations with the scheme manager, wardens, police and fire and rescue services, council departments, elected members and community representatives in each of the case study areas;
- Analysis of written information produced by each scheme, covering such things as marketing material and protocols with the police, fire and rescue services and council departments; and
• Analysis of statistical data on reported crimes and incidents of antisocial behaviour.

The Warden Schemes – An Overview

7. The guidance provided by the Executive was that schemes could be of 2 broad types: crime prevention and/or environmental. Analysis of the original funding submissions found that 7 had crime prevention objectives, 3 environmental and the remaining 22 had both crime prevention and environmental objectives.

8. Given this, it is perhaps not surprising that the main aims identified in the submissions were to reduce the fear of crime, improve environmental quality, reduce antisocial behaviour and reduce levels of crime.

9. Analysis of the case study schemes found that some had evolved. Regardless of the original intentions, tackling antisocial behaviour was generally now the main aim. This evolution reflected a variety of inter-connected factors such as the nature of the areas the schemes operated in, management and community expectations.

10. The case study schemes varied in terms of the numbers of wardens employed. Orkney was the smallest with a full complement of 4 wardens. At the other extreme South Lanarkshire Council, whose scheme covers the whole of the local authority (although there is a focus upon the most deprived areas), employed 44, albeit that half of these are funded by the local authority through its Housing Revenue Account.

11. The sizes of the areas patrolled by the wardens in the case study schemes varied from around 10,000 (Perth and Kinross) to 306,000 in South Lanarkshire. The wardens to resident ratio varied from 1:1,000 (Dundee) to 1:7,000 (South Lanarkshire).

The Wardens

12. Analysis of the wardens’ job descriptions found that interpersonal skills predominated. Thus such things a having good communications skills, being motivated and able to motivate others and being able to work with the public and partner agencies were most often mentioned. Beyond having a current driving licence, technical skills were rarely mentioned.

13. The survey of wardens in the case study areas found that they were predominantly male, white and over 30, with 35% being aged between 41 and 50. This is also the picture that emerged from the analysis of the monitoring templates.

14. The majority of those surveyed had been employed before starting work as a warden. However, 18% had been out of work. Fourteen per cent had been recruited through New Deal or a similar work placement scheme. Over half of these were in Edinburgh, reflecting the difficulties experience by this scheme in recruiting wardens because of the buoyant local labour market.

15. When asked about their employment aspirations, 58% of survey respondents felt that their future was with the warden service, either in their current post or in a
promoted one. Of the 42% who saw their future elsewhere, most wanted to work in another council department. Ten per cent wanted to join the police or the fire and rescue service. This group tended to be younger, 90% being under 30.

The Wardens’ Role

16. The activities that the wardens were involved in were analysed, drawing on a number of data sources. What became clear was that the wardens undertook a variety of roles that varied according to the characteristics and pressures in particular areas.

17. Despite this variation, all schemes seemed to have a number of common elements, although the priority given to them varied according to local characteristics. The elements were:-

- Community liaison, which was central to all schemes and involved being visible, listening to concerns and taking appropriate action;
- Security and safety, covering such things as attending, investigating and reporting incidents of antisocial behaviour and providing support and reassurance to the more vulnerable members of the community; and
- Dealing with environmental issues such as litter, graffiti, fly tipping and abandoned vehicles.

18. Underpinning much of the analysis of activities was the idea of the wardens as the “eyes and ears” of the community: identifying community concerns and then either dealing with these or liaising with the appropriate agencies, be these the police fire and rescue or local authority departments.

19. Most schemes also undertook similar types of activities. These included:-

- Supporting vulnerable adults such as the victims of crime;
- Patrolling schools during school holidays to deter vandals;
- Visiting “pattern fire” spots to deter fire raisers; and
- Organising diversionary activities for young people such as football competitions.

20. However, comparison of wardens’ perceptions of what they do and what the analysis of their logs shows them doing, identified differences. The main one was the perception of the importance of youth disorder, which the analysis of activities showed to account for a relatively small number of incidents. These differences may reflect the fact that the analysis of logs is based on the numbers of incidents, rather than their duration or intensity. It may be that youth disorder accounts for a small number of incidents which have a considerable impact upon those involved.
Management and Partnership Working

21. Of the schemes all but 3 (Aberdeen City, Aberdeenshire and Moray) were managed by the relevant local authority. The other 3 were managed by Grampian Police.

22. With the exception of Aberdeen City, the case study schemes were managed by the local authorities. Generally the schemes were part of wider antisocial behaviour initiatives which enabled a more holistic and co-ordinated approach to be taken.

23. Within Aberdeen there were different views on how the police’s management of the scheme had worked. Local authority interviewees were generally happy, feeling that the arrangement was working well. The police, however, felt that there was a lack of focus and clarity to the wardens’ role. For example, were they to support the police, improve the environment or work with the community? Some wardens felt that their management by the police alienated them from the council and led to their being less effectively used by other partners.

24. Relationships and working arrangements with local authority departments had taken time to develop. Initially there was concern that the wardens’ activities would result in an increase in work loads, as indeed happened in a number of case study areas with additional demands, for example, to respond to incidents of vandalism. There were also problems in some areas, initially, as to who was responsible for dealing with some problems, especially environmental ones. Generally these have now been resolved.

25. Responses had been an issue in some areas, with wardens reporting incidents to the relevant council department only for either nothing to happen or for the response to be very slow. One reaction to this was the development of Service Level Agreements that placed the warden-departmental relationship on a formal footing. These detailed such things as the service that would be provided and response times. A number of authorities were considering using these and one already had such an agreement.

26. However, over time both the wardens and the scheme managers felt that relationships with council departments had improved. This reflected such factors as departments becoming aware of what the wardens could (and could not) do, improved co-operation and the development of personal relationships at an operational level.

27. Relationships with the police tended to be structured around formal protocols, which the analysis of the 24 month templates found to be in place for 22 of the 32 schemes, whilst a further 6 were pending. The protocols generally covered intelligence sharing (for example the police having access to the wardens’ logs) and the co-ordination of activities (as when the police will ask the wardens to focus their patrols on particular “hotspots”).

28. The protocols were seen as being useful in helping to clarify roles and responsibilities and providing a forum where information could be shared and resources better targeted.
29. The formal protocols were often underpinned by operational structures and processes that had developed over time to make joint working more effective. The development of informal contacts between the wardens and the police on the ground was also important in delivering a more effective service.

30. The wardens’ views on relationships with the police were less positive than their views on relationships with local authority departments, with a fifth of respondents feeling that their relationship with the police was “Poor” or “Very Poor”. However, a majority felt that relationships had improved over time. The case study work reflected these findings. There were initially difficulties with joint working, in part as there was misunderstanding as to the wardens’ role. However, these difficulties lessened once the wardens began to demonstrate the ways that they could complement the activities of the police.

31. The main benefit of the wardens, as perceived by the police in the case study areas, was their value in gathering intelligence. The role of the wardens as “professional witnesses” was also identified, with the wardens being able to monitor situations before the police arrived and take notes that could then be passed on and used as evidence in court. The initial opposition that existed in some areas from the police has generally been overcome. However, the case study work identified areas where improvements still needed to be made, especially in intelligence sharing.

32. The relationships with the fire and rescue service were generally seen as being more straightforward than those with the police. For the most part they were not subject to formal protocols. Generally these had only been drawn up for those areas where fire raising was a major problem.

33. In a number of areas there were examples of close working relationships between the wardens and the fire and rescue service. However, in most areas the majority of contact was at management level. It was felt that this would improve when there was greater participation in joint operational initiatives.

34. Relationships with local elected members had not always been good at the start. In some of the case study areas the view had been that the resources would have been better spent on additional policing. However, any such opposition now seems to have been overcome. If there are now demands these are for more wardens.

Community Engagement

35. The Executive’s intention was that engagement with the community was to be formalised through the drawing up of neighbourhood compacts. These were agreements that were to set out the services that the police and local authority were to provide to tackle antisocial behaviour and the reciprocal standards of behaviour expected from residents.

36. Analysis of the 24 month reports found that 32% of schemes had compacts in place. This was a slight increase from the 29% reported when the 12 month templates were analysed. The other schemes claimed to have other structures in place that meant there was no need for a compact (35%), to be working on their development (30%) or, in one instance, to have no plans to develop one.
37. Given this mixed progress, the value of compacts can be questioned. Whilst the process had been of some use, in making contact with the community and in developing credibility, most scheme managers consulted felt that the resultant documents were of limited value.

38. One reason for this view may be that there are now a large number of other plans and strategies, all of which feature community consultation. Many of these are more all-embracing than the neighbourhood compacts were intended to be. As such it may be that they have been overtaken by events.

39. At a more informal level, community relationships were generally felt, by managers, to be good. This reflects the variety of ways that the schemes had developed to engage with residents. Underpinning these was high visibility and prompt response times to incidents. Flexibility was also valued by community representatives, in that the wardens were willing to respond to incidents as, and when, they arose.

40. Despite these generally positive views, the scheme managers recognised that continuing efforts needed to be made, both to persuade older people to make use of the warden service and to engage in a positive way with young people. Young people were seen as the most difficult target group. Not only were they often perpetrators of antisocial behaviour but they saw the introduction of the wardens as being a deliberate attempt to control their behaviour.

**Monitoring**

41. The Guidance required each of the schemes to select at least 4 monitoring indicators against which progress was to be assessed. These were to be drawn from 2 groups: statistical (covering such things as the impact on reported crimes); and survey based. Schemes were, however, at liberty to select as many indicators as they wanted. Once the indicators had been selected progress on attaining them was to be reported to the Executive at 6, 12 and 24 month intervals, using a standardised monitoring template. Had this been done then assessing impact would have been relatively easy. Unfortunately this proved not to be the case.

42. Very few schemes provided adequate data to enable self monitoring to be undertaken. The main issues were:-

- A lack of congruence between the indicators and the schemes’ aims;
- A failure to set baselines for all indicators;
- A failure to set targets for all indicators; and
- A failure to provide full data sets for years 1 and 2 of operations in the 24 month templates.

43. A number of schemes were undertaking surveys of residents that were intended to look at impacts. Most of these had major methodological flaws making any results of dubious value.
44. The conclusions that GEN came to were that most schemes did not see monitoring and evaluation as being very important when set against the need to set up the schemes. This low priority was reinforced by the apparent reluctance of the Executive to take action when it became apparent early in the evaluation that monitoring systems were not being put in place.

Theories of Change

45. In order to develop some explanations for changes in levels of reported crime and antisocial behaviours that might be observed in the wardened areas, a number of theories were put forward. The main ones were:-

- The **Rise and Fall (Confidence)** theory when reported crime initially rises as confidence grows that action will be taken. After this initial rise there is a fall as the wardens’ activities impact upon crime and antisocial behaviour levels;
- **Rise Positive**, when the increase reflects increased confidence that action will be taken rather than an increase in the “real” levels of crime. That there has been no fall as yet reflects the time needed by the wardens to effect change;
- **No Impact** when the severity of problems within an area is such that the wardens’ interventions are unable to effect any change; and
- **Positive Intervention** when the wardens’ activities result in crimes and offences falling soon after they become operational;

46. In an ideal world it should be possible to assess the validity of each of these theories against observed changes in the levels of reported crime and antisocial behaviour. Ascribing cause and effect, however, is complicated for a number of reasons:-

- The wardens are not operating in isolation. In most local authority areas there are other initiatives, some of which impact upon the wardened areas;
- Reported crimes represent around half of the “true” level of offences so that there is considerable scope for statistical changes without there being any change in the actual number of offences; and
- The introduction of the Scottish Crime Reporting Standard in 2005 (when there was no longer a need for corroboration for an incident to be reported as a crime) is felt to have resulted in the numbers of minor crimes increasing. This again makes attribution to specific policy interventions harder.

47. What therefore emerges is a picture of considerable complexity when trying to assess the impact that the wardens’ interventions have upon crime and antisocial behaviour.

The Impacts of the Wardens on Crime in the Case Study Areas

48. Analysis of changes in the reported levels of crime and incidents of antisocial behaviour in the case study areas was complicated. Not only were the data often incomplete (especially a lack of comparators) but the pattern of change in individual scheme areas was often variable, with increases in some sub-areas being off-set by falls in others.
49. To try to analyse the changes attempts were made to explain the observed pattern of change over time in terms of the various impact theories. Of the 39 indicators\(^1\) that were analysed:

- Definitive conclusions as to impact could not be reached for 23, mainly as there was no comparator data;
- The observed change for 9 was interpreted negatively in that there had been an increase in crime and antisocial behaviours at a faster rate than in the comparator areas;
- Changes in 6 indicators were interpreted in terms of the wardens having had a positive impact upon the indicator; and
- There was judged to have been no impact upon the final indicator.

50. Superficially this looks as if the wardens have had little impact. However, the analysis was very cautious, with a positive interpretation only being made when there was clear supporting statistical evidence.

51. The analysis was then extended by considering change for the individual case study areas alongside some of the evidence from the residents’ survey. A more positive picture emerged:

- For one scheme there was clear statistical evidence that the wardens had had a differential impact upon crime and antisocial behaviour levels;
- For 3 schemes, although there was a lack of comparators, the surveys showed that there had been positive changes in attitudes and perceptions of crime. This, when combined with the statistical changes, would seem to indicate that the wardens were having an impact;
- For a further 2 schemes there was statistical evidence that there had been a differential impact upon some of the selected indicators; and
- For 2 schemes there was no statistical evidence of impact.

52. Given that so much of the analysis of the indicators in the case study areas was thwarted by lack of data, the researchers extended their analysis to the non-case study schemes and focused on the 7 indicators that had been used to monitor progress by more than one scheme and for which more data were therefore available. Encouragingly, they found that there had been a decline in the incidence of all 7 indicators and that most of these were falling at a faster rate than in the wider area. Indeed some of the indicators (breach of the peace and wilful fire-raising) were moving in the opposite direction to the comparators, with the incidence of the antisocial behaviour decreasing as the same time as there had been an increase in the wider area. When the case study and non-case study scheme indicators were combined there was evidence of positive differential change in the wardeden areas for 3 out of the 4 indicators examined. Aggregating the data, so that extremes are diluted, seems to make it possible to reach more positive conclusions. Further analysis examined those indicators that had been selected by more than one case study or non-case study scheme. There were 4 such indicators.

\(^1\) See Appendix Four for a list of these indicators and further detail.
Although the evidence is complicated, and is not always straightforward to interpret, the conclusion is that there is evidence, from a number of complementary sources (anecdotal, statistical and survey) that the wardens are having a positive impact upon levels and perceptions of some crimes and antisocial behaviour offences within their target areas. It needs to be stressed that this interpretation does not apply to all areas and all types of offences. This does not, however, mean that the wardens in these areas have been ineffective. It needs to be remembered that they have been operating for a relatively short time and that the introduction of other antisocial behaviour initiatives means that relating cause and effect in a simple way is rarely possible.

The Impacts upon Residents’ Perceptions

Perceptions of the likelihood of being a victim of crime, or of the levels of crime, may not always be directly related to the reality. To look at changes over time, base and endline surveys were undertaken in the case study areas and the 2 comparators.

As with the crime statistics, interpretation of changes was not always straightforward. When the case study areas were considered in isolation the quality of life (as measured by such things as ratings of the neighbourhood as a place to live, fear of crime and perceptions of the incidences of a range of antisocial behaviours) had improved. A minority of those surveyed attributed some of these changes to the interventions of the wardens.

A less positive picture emerged when case study change was compared to changes in the 2 control areas. However, population movements in the Edinburgh control area, as a result of housing demolition, mean that use of the controls to isolate the differential impact of the wardens was problematic.

An alternative approach was to compare changes in perceptions of incidents of antisocial behaviours in the case study areas with changes in the wider area of which they were a part. This showed that almost half of the indicators across the 9 areas had improved at a faster rate than in the comparators. When perceptions of safety (walking or being in the house alone after dark) were considered an even more positive picture of comparative improvements was seen.

Overall there seemed to be evidence that the wardens were having a positive impact on perceptions of incidents of crime and antisocial behaviours and on feelings of personal safety. This is supported by the fact that, of those residents in the wardened areas who indicated that at least one form of antisocial behaviour had become less common, 44% attributed this (at least in part) to the wardens.

Other Views on Impact

The wardens and scheme managers felt that the schemes were having an impact upon crime and antisocial behaviour. They also believed that residents were now more willing to report antisocial behaviour now that they knew there was a dedicated service to deal with these.
60. The wardens and managers have vested interests in making these claims. However, there was also evidence from the focus groups and community consultations that the wider community was generally positive about the wardens and their impacts.

61. Generally the wardens were more highly valued by older age groups in the community with whom good relationships had been established. The relationship with younger people tended to be more difficult. However, there were examples where wardens had been successful in developing good relationships with school age children. This might have the potential to result in longer term behaviour modification so that there is a permanent change in attitudes. However, if these long term impacts are to come about then it seems important that wardens do not behave in an authoritarian way and are consistent in their approach, especially when dealing with school age children. If this is not done then the danger is that they become alienated and antisocial behaviour increases.

62. When the individual case study areas were considered separately, there were differences in perceptions of impact. Generally the more severe the environmental and antisocial behaviour problems then the less impact the wardens were felt to have.

63. The views of the partner agencies were generally positive. It was felt that the wardens had impacted on low level crime and antisocial behaviours, although there was also evidence that, by passing on intelligence, there had also been an impact on higher level crimes such as drug dealing. The wardens were also felt to have had an impact upon environmental problems by improving the quality of neighbourhoods, both by direct action and through their liaison with other agencies.

64. Whilst the partners felt that it was inevitable that there had been a degree of displacement of antisocial behaviour, this was felt to be hard to prove. It was also felt that displacement had historically taken place, for example when the police targeted an area or particular types of behaviour.

65. Overall, the general view to emerge from the wardens, scheme managers, other partners such as the police and the wider community was that the wardens were having a positive impact. This had a variety of dimensions: reductions in crime and antisocial behaviour; improvements in residents’ perceptions; and changes to the working practices of partners.

Emerging Issues

66. Managers and the wardens identified a number of issues related to the development of the schemes to date. Most of these seemed to be relatively minor. Those that merit further attention were:-

- Staff retention that had been a particular problem in some areas, especially those where the labour market was buoyant. There seemed to be some evidence that good staff management practices could improve retention rates;
- Currently most wardens in Scotland do not have enforcement powers, although some were able to give out fixed penalty notices for such things as littering and dog fouling. Views on this were mixed. Some felt that giving the
wardens enforcement powers would impact upon their relationships with the communities in which they were based and result in their being closely identified with the police and/or regarded as ‘policing on the cheap’. There was also a view among some wardens (especially those in areas with highest levels of antisocial behaviour) that their impact on the behaviour of young people had declined as young people realised that they (the wardens) had little or no powers. (This said, most of the wardens who responded to the question about change in their impact believed that it had either increased (44%) or stayed the same (17%)). The overall view was that any move towards granting wardens powers generally needed to be carefully considered; and

- There was general concern as to what would happen once funding from the Executive came to an end in 2008. Although some schemes already receive part of their funding from their parent authority they were exceptional. Most had no future funding plans in place. There was therefore a general wish to see the Executive clarify its future funding plans for the warden schemes.

Conclusions

67. In recognition of the difficulties encountered in this, and similar evaluations, of assessing impact, use was made of 3 key complementary data sources:-

- Surveys of residents’ perceptions;
- A large amount of qualitative data collected through the case study visits; and
- Analysis of official statistics on crime and antisocial behaviours.

68. Trying to paint a consistent and coherent picture of impact was difficult, giving data inadequacies and a lack of a consistent pattern of change both within and across areas. However, despite these challenges, our conclusion was that there was evidence from a number of sources that the wardens were having a positive impact on the quality of life in their target areas. This comes about through reductions in crime and antisocial behaviour and changes in residents’ perceptions of the incidences of crime and antisocial behaviour and of personal safety. This is not a pattern that is consistent across all areas or all types of crimes and antisocial behaviours. Yet overall there is sufficient evidence to justify such a positive conclusion.

Economic Impact of Community Wardens

69. An economic evaluation of the community wardens schemes was being undertaken separately as part of the Scottish Executive commissioned Evaluation of Antisocial Behaviour Strategies at Neighbourhood Level. The evaluation was undertaken in 4 case study areas (Edinburgh; Fife; North Lanarkshire; and Scottish Borders) and adopts a cost consequences approach. Although the results of this work have not yet been published, in the first draft of her analysis the economist concludes that, given the relatively modest costs associated with the warden schemes and the high costs associated with many of the criminal and antisocial incidents that they are likely to have prevented (plus the less tangible benefits to quality of life), they represent good value for money. The full analysis is due to be published in the Evaluation of Antisocial Behaviour Strategies at Neighbourhood Level in summer 2007.
Recommendations

The main Recommendations coming from the analysis were that:

- If the Executive was to continue funding for the warden schemes then the future allocation of funds should be more closely linked to the severity of crime and antisocial behaviour;
- Future funding should be conditional on the submission of complete monitoring and evaluation data;
- Allied to this, the Executive should give advice on the selecting of appropriate (and meaningful) baselines, targets and comparators;
- Staff training needs to be based on a training needs assessment and should cover health and safety issues as well as interpersonal skills; and
- For national schemes, the Executive should consider providing guidance on such things as pay scales, shift working and duties for which there has been a demand from the schemes’ managers.
CHAPTER ONE THE BACKGROUND TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNITYWARDEN SCHEMES IN THE UNITED KINGDOM

Introduction

1.1 The purpose of this report is to outline the impact of the community wardens in Scotland, based on a 2 year evaluation undertaken by GEN Consulting on behalf of the Scottish Executive. This introductory Chapter looks at the background to the development of warden schemes within the United Kingdom.

1.2 In the late 1990’s the United Kingdom Government published 2 significant reports acknowledging the potential of Neighbourhood Wardens to contribute to regeneration (Northern Ireland Housing Executive, 2003). “Bringing Britain Together: A Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal”, published by The Social Exclusion Unit in 1998, highlighted the role of Neighbourhood Wardens in relation to the regeneration process, while the Report of the Policy and Action Team (PAT) 6, “Neighbourhood Wardens” (2000) focused on development, implementation and financing of successful schemes.

1.3 The report of PAT 6 highlighted a number of reasons why the police, local authorities and other agencies might be interested in neighbourhood wardens. These mainly related to the concentration of problems in specific areas that were exacerbated by reductions in the numbers of staff who could deal with these problems. Thus wardens were seen as being a response to:-

- Increased rates of crime and fear of crime particularly in deprived communities where the impact of crime was compounded by poverty;
- Areas of social housing that were proportionately more likely to be disadvantaged and more likely to suffer from higher rates of offending and reduced levels of informal social control; and
- The steady reductions in the numbers of neighbourhood staff over the previous 2 decades. These included caretakers, community workers and park-keepers who, in the past, would have undertaken a form of informal surveillance that was thought to enhance safety and deter crime.

1.4 Acting as a valuable link between the community and other agencies, wardens were intended to be a new generation of community officials who understood the problems faced by the community, engaged with residents and acted as the “eyes and ears” of the police and local authority on the ground.

1.5 Although the majority lack law enforcement powers, neighbourhood wardens are now an integral component of “high visibility policing” strategies advocated by the Home Office. Supporters of “high visibility policing” argue that, while resource intensive, it can act as an effective deterrent to deviant behaviour and provide reassurance to those whose lives are adversely affected by crime, fear of crime and antisocial behaviour. It is also felt that the presence of Neighbourhood Wardens within the community will foster positive relations and mutual trust thereby increasing the volume of people who are prepared to report incidents to the wardens, the council or the police (Home Office, 2006).
The Theoretical Background

1.6 Doran (2003, 2) cited in Payne (2003), discusses the theoretical underpinning of the wardens initiative. Four main theories to support the introduction of wardens are put forward:-

- **Dealing with minor incivilities and “broken windows”:** Wilson and Kelling (1982) theorised that “if the first broken window in a building is not repaired, then people who like breaking windows will assume that no one cares about the building and more widows will be broken. Soon the building will have no windows”. They were of the opinion that environmental degradation, disrespectful behaviour and low level offending, if left unchecked, would escalate into more serious crime as such neglect was illustrative of a community which no longer exercised social control. Community wardens are therefore to address low level offending and environmental problems, thereby preventing degradation of the area;

- **The presence of a “capable guardian”:** Routine activity theory assumes that, for a crime to occur, there must be a convergence of potential offenders and suitable targets in the absence of a “capable guardian”. If a component is missing, an offence is unlikely to occur. The presence of wardens, as “capable guardians”, is therefore presumed to reduce opportunities to offend;

- **Self discipline:** The principal of social control, through high visibility, has at its root, Bentham’s writings concerning the Panopticon (Bozovic and Bentham, 1995), an architectural design in which occupants could not see their observers but must assume they were being watched at all times and behave accordingly. Power is hence visible yet unverifiable. Foucault (1975) extends this discussion, asserting that surveillance, both real and imagined, has the effect of inducing self-discipline and self control. It is therefore assumed that the threat of surveillance by Neighbourhood Wardens can help deter criminal or antisocial behaviour; and

- **Building capacity and social capital:** Doran (2003) theorises that the creation of intermediaries, such as the community wardens (who provide a link between formal institutions, such as the police, the fire and rescue service, the local authority and informal community structures) may be a productive method of engaging with the community and enhancing social cohesion.

1.7 It is against this theoretical background, that ascribes a variety of benefits to the introduction of wardens, that they are now an integral part of the national strategy for neighbourhood renewal and provide a highly visible, semi-official presence in residential areas across England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland.

Neighbourhood Wardens in England

1.8 The country-wide Neighbourhood Wardens Programme for England and Wales was formally launched as a joint initiative by the former Department for the Environment, Transport and the Regions (DETR) and the Home Office in 2000. Initial funding of £18.5 million was made available by central government to support 84 schemes across England and Wales until March 2003. Funding was subsequently extended until March 2004. Funding is therefore now the responsibility of the
schemes themselves. In October 2001, the Department for Transport, Local Government and the Regions (DTLR) announced additional funds to support the National Street Wardens Programme consisting of 121 new schemes. The Street Wardens are charged with improving “livability” in deprived areas. Whilst similar to community wardens, they place greater emphasis upon improving the physical environment, by dealing with such problems as litter, graffiti and dog fouling.

**Neighbourhood Wardens in Northern Ireland**

1.9 Following consideration of the needs of the local area and scrutiny of pathfinder Neighbourhood Warden Services in England, the first Neighbourhood Warden Scheme in Northern Ireland was established in 1998 by the Bangor District Office of the Northern Ireland Housing Executive. At this time the job specification of the wardens was that of an enhanced caretaker, with a focus on estate management support. By April 2006 the Northern Ireland Housing Executive had appointed some 50 wardens. They provide a range of on-site services to residents in disadvantaged estates. Their responsibilities include environmental and housing management, community involvement and tenancy conditions.

**Community Wardens in Scotland**

1.10 In March 2003 the Scottish Executive announced £30 million of funding to tackle crime and antisocial behaviour, environmental degradation and to help Build Strong, Safe, Attractive Communities (BSSAC). Twenty million pounds of this funding was to be directed towards the establishment of community warden schemes in all 32 Scottish local authorities, from 2004 onwards. A number of Scottish local authorities, including Edinburgh and Renfrewshire, had however piloted community wardens in disadvantaged communities prior to the availability of Executive funding. Such schemes were supported through initiatives like the Better Neighbourhood Services Fund (BNSF) established to allow councils to improve services in deprived neighbourhoods.

1.11 The Edinburgh Community Concierge Pilot Scheme was introduced in the Broomhouse area of the City in November 2001. Its principal aims were to:-

- Act as the landlord’s eye and ears on the estate;
- Monitor empty houses and breaches of tenancy conditions;
- Reduce environmental nuisance;
- Provide a cleaner, safer neighbourhood;
- Promote community involvement and development; and
- Reduce minor crime.

Following an independent evaluation (which revealed increased feelings of safety in patrol areas, improved perceptions of the neighbourhood as a place to live and some progress in tackling issues related to antisocial behaviour) (cited in Payne, 2003) the City Council took the decision to establish similar schemes in other parts of the city.

1.12 Renfrewshire Council’s Community Warden Scheme was launched in July 2002 as one of a number of initiatives funded by the BNSF. The Council established 4 teams of mobile wardens to work in various estates in Paisley and West Johnstone.
Provision was subsequently expanded to include 2 further teams funded through the Housing Revenue Account.

1.13 The Renfrewshire wardens were intended to:-

- Act as a visible, active presence in the community;
- Improve community confidence;
- Improve communications between residents and service providers;
- Undertake a variety of environmental tasks such as coordination of graffiti removal;
- Pass on information about the state, safety or security of the neighbourhood to relevant agencies; and
- Support police investigations by acting as professional witnesses when necessary.

The Renfrewshire Wardens Scheme was hailed a success by local officials with the initial evaluation identifying reductions in the incidence of vandalism, vehicle crimes, disorder crimes, housebreaking and antisocial behaviour complaints (Shiel et al, 2005).

1.14 The examples of Edinburgh and Renfrewshire are illustrative of the 2 main broad types of scheme that the Scottish Executive has been willing to fund. These are environmental schemes (such as that initially set up in Edinburgh) that are designed primarily to improve the environment and “look” of an area, and crime prevention schemes, in line with the Renfrewshire model. In these the prime function of the wardens is to act as a deterrent to crime and antisocial behaviour and provide a reassuring presence to residents. However, as can be seen from the descriptions of both schemes, there is a degree of overlap, with the Edinburgh scheme containing an element of crime prevention and the Renfrewshire an environmental enhancement component.

1.15 Following consultation, and a review of schemes in England and Wales, the Executive elected to support schemes which conformed to what can be described as the non-enforcement model. This is the model followed by the majority of schemes across the United Kingdom, the overarching aim of which is to build community capacity and liaise with the community and other agencies. While some schemes are closely aligned with the enforcement of byelaws models (described by Doran (2003) as ones in which wardens can enforce existing local byelaws, collect evidence for antisocial behaviour orders and act a professional witnesses) there has, in the past, been little popular support to extend the enforcement powers of neighbourhood wardens (Payne, 2003). However, the situation may be changing in Scotland. For example, the wardens in Aberdeen are to have powers to serve fixed penalty notices for such things as littering and dog fouling. Similar developments are underway in Stirling.

Setting up Community warden schemes in Scotland

1.16 At the same time as funding was announced, in March 2003 the Scottish Executive published a consultation document (Scottish Executive, 2003a) which set out its proposals for establishing community wardens and other community based
initiatives for tackling antisocial behaviour. Following on from this, each of the 32 local councils within Scotland was asked to submit outline proposals for a community warden scheme and associated measures for tackling antisocial behaviour. To help them do this the Executive prepared guidance (Scottish Executive, 2003b).

1.17 Amongst other things the guidance outlined a timetable. This requested that outline proposals be submitted by 31st August 2003, with full proposals being required by 30th November 2003 so that the schemes could become operational in April 2004. Following submission of these outlines, the Executive appraised each, using a standard pro-forma, and gave each council written feedback. This feedback was then used in the preparation of each council’s final proposal. These were appraised again and councils were asked for clarification of particular aspects of their submissions. In February 2004 the then Minister for Communities formally announced the financial allocations for community wardens and related antisocial behaviour initiatives.

1.18 The initial allocations were for 2004/05 and 2005/06, with the £20 million being paid through each council’s Revenue Support Grant. Table 1.1 summarises the allocations. Their sizes were based on such factors as deprivation and population levels. However, 8 authorities were given additional resources (second round funding) because of the severity of their antisocial behaviour problems2. Of the 32 awards, 24 (75%) were for £400,000 or less. The most common award was for £165,000. The smallest awards made were for £80,000 in each of the 2 years. Four councils received awards of this size: Argyll and Bute; Eileen Siar; Orkney and Shetland. Of the larger awards, Dundee City, Edinburgh City and North Lanarkshire all received funding of £650,000. Glasgow City Council received the largest award of £1 million. Many of the schemes covered a number of discrete sub-areas, that were often geographically dispersed. Despite this, with one exception, single unified management structures were in place. The exception was Dumfries and Galloway, where the 2 schemes in Stranraer (Dicks Hill and Belmont) and Dumfries (North West Dumfries) were separately managed. This reflects the geography of the area, with Stranraer and Dumfries being some 70 miles apart.

---

2 These authorities were: Aberdeen City, Dundee, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Inverclyde, North Lanarkshire, Renfrewshire and West Dunbartonshire.
**TABLE 1.1**  
Community Wardens Grant Awards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant amount (for each year)</th>
<th>Number of authorities</th>
<th>Councils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£80,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Argyll and Bute, Eilean Siar, Orkney Islands, Shetland Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£105,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Aberdeenshire, East Lothian, Moray, Scottish Borders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£165,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Angus, Clackmannanshire, East Dunbartonshire, East Renfrewshire, Highland, Midlothian, Perth and Kinross, Stirling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£300,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dumfries and Galloway, Falkirk, South Ayrshire, West Lothian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£400,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>East Ayrshire, Fife, North Ayrshire, South Lanarkshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£500,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Aberdeen City, Inverclyde, Renfrewshire, West Dunbartonshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£650,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dundee City, Edinburgh City, North Lanarkshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£1,000,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Glasgow City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Origins**

1.19 The Executive’s funding for community wardens allowed all councils to set up schemes within their areas. However, in a number of councils existing warden schemes had been operational prior to the Executive providing national funding. At least 8 had their roots in either a pilot scheme or some sort of council funded estate warden scheme. These were:

- Aberdeen City where wardens were in operation, managed by Grampian Police;
- Edinburgh where a warden scheme had operated since 2001 (Paragraph 1.11);
- North Lanarkshire where the scheme had its roots in an earlier BNSF initiative;
- Orkney which had run a 3 month pilot using Quality of Life funding;
- Renfrewshire where a BNSF Neighbourhood Warden Scheme had been in operation since 2002 (Paragraphs 1.12-1.13);
- South Lanarkshire, where 16 wardens were funded through the Executive’s Quality of Life Fund;
- Stirling, where estate wardens had been established in Cultenhove and Cornton as part of the “Top of the Town” initiative; and
- West Dunbartonshire, where a warden scheme was already funded by the Council.

1.20 In the analysis of the applications for the 2004/06 funding it was apparent that the experiences of the earlier schemes had informed the development of the new ones,
as with the identification of “hotspots” where wardens should be deployed and in choosing how many wardens to deploy in certain areas.

The Characteristics of the Wardens’ Areas

1.21 The information given on the areas of operation in the original application forms varied greatly from bid to bid. Some applications contained detailed information on population, population age breakdowns, police statistics on crime and incidents reported to the police, housing tenure, levels of unemployment and employment by sector. Other bids were much less specific and only contained high level information on the characteristics of the local authority area as a whole.

1.22 Due to this variation and inconsistency in the information given, it is not possible to present a detailed picture of the typical types of areas to be covered by the warden schemes. It is possible to say, however, that where local authorities aimed to focus wardens on specific areas, these areas were generally characterised by levels of deprivation higher than the average for the local authority area and higher incidences of crime and antisocial behaviour. Many authorities used the Scottish Indices of Deprivation (SIMD) as a way of measuring and ranking deprivation and used these rankings, along with other factors such as crime and antisocial behaviour, to determine where to focus efforts.

1.23 Table 1.2 looks at the justifications put forward for targeting the wardens at particular areas. It should be noted that in many cases, although information was given on some of the indicators, it was not always put in context. For example, Midlothian Council chose its areas on the basis of crime, antisocial behaviour and environmental reasons but only provided antisocial behaviour statistics for the entire authority, not the 6 areas chosen for warden patrols. Some councils, however, did indicate that the areas chosen were selected on the basis of high incidences of crime and antisocial behaviour. For example, East Dunbartonshire used a Geographical Information System to map the number of incidents and used this as justification for the choice of areas. Dundee City ranked the wards in the local authority using SIMD scoring and incidences of antisocial behaviour, vandalism, disorder and crime and used this as the basis for the choice of areas.
TABLE 1.2  Justifications for Choice of Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Number of schemes¹</th>
<th>Percentage of schemes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High incidences of crime based on crime statistics including “hotspots” identified by Police²</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of disturbances including incidents of antisocial behaviour, disorder, vandalism</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMD information/deprivation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing tenure- high levels of social housing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey data covering such things as fear of crime, satisfaction with area and the census</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental problems including housing stock issues</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment¹</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas being within Objective 2 or regeneration areas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher levels of complaints from neighbours</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher number of housing voids</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher levels of unauthorised absences from school⁴</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Life data</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information from existing schemes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback from the local community/businesses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
<td><strong>N/A</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

1. Only 22 schemes provided a justification for the selection of the warded areas, with some providing more than one justification.
2. In some cases actual statistics were not given, but selection was based on perceptions as in Shetland and Midlothian.
3. Although Employment Deprivation is one of the SIMD indicators, this has been given separately as the schemes which mention this as an indicator do not specifically make reference to SIMD or deprivation more generally.

The Size of the Warden schemes

1.24 Information on the number of wardens employed was available for 31 schemes as at June/July 2006 from the 24 month templates. This showed that 504 wardens were employed throughout Scotland, excluding vacancies. A small number of schemes indicated that some of their wardens were funded from sources other than BSSAC. For example:-

- In 2006 North Ayrshire had employed an additional 8 wardens (2 seniors and 6 wardens) from Converted Better Neighbourhoods and an additional 5 through mainstream funding. When added to the original 20 funded by the Scottish Executive their total number of wardens was 33 (6 seniors and 27 wardens); and
- Renfrewshire originally employed 40 wardens through BNSF, Housing Revenue Account and BSSAC funding. They have subsequently recruited a further 10 wardens supported through BSSAC, bringing the total to 50.

1.25 The schemes can be grouped into 2 main categories:-
• Small schemes with 12 or fewer wardens. Twenty one schemes fell into this category, ranging from 3 in Orkney3 to 12 in West Lothian and Falkirk; and
• Large schemes with 25 or more wardens. There are 11 schemes within this group ranging from 25 wardens in East Ayrshire and 50 in Renfrewshire.

Report Structure

1.26 Having outlined the background to the development of community warden schemes the remainder of this report is structured as follows:-

• Chapter Two outlines the evaluation methodology;
• Chapter Three looks at schemes’ aims and objectives;
• Chapter Four looks at the characteristics of the wardens and their activities
• Chapter Five considers the wardens’ roles;
• Chapter Six examines management and partnership working;
• Chapter Seven looks at community engagement in the case study areas;
• Chapter Eight examines the structures and processes put in place to allow the warden schemes to undertake self-monitoring;
• Chapters Nine, Ten and Eleven look at the impact of the wardens on reported incidents of crime and antisocial behaviour, with Chapter Nine setting out the theoretical context for this;
• Chapter Twelve draws upon community surveys to examine the impact upon perceptions in the case study areas;
• Chapters Thirteen, Fourteen and Fifteen look at perceptions of impact from the points of view of the wardens and managers, the community and the partner agencies;
• Chapter Sixteen considers the issues that emerged in the course of the evaluation;
• Chapters Seventeen and Eighteen draw conclusions, make a number of recommendations and outline the main good practices that the evaluation has uncovered; and
• A number of Appendices give details of the case study areas and survey results.

3 The number of wardens in Orkney subsequently increased to 4. This figure is used in later Chapters of the report.
CHAPTER TWO  THE EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

Introduction

2.1 This chapter has 2 main aims, to:-

• Outline the objectives of the evaluation; and
• Look in some detail at the methodology used to attain these.

We start by looking at the Executive’s objectives, as set out in the original research brief.

Research Objectives

2.2 This evaluation of the implementation and impact of community wardens was commissioned by the Scottish Executive in mid-2004 from GEN Consulting. It was intended that the work should be both formative and summative, with 4 main objectives, to:-

• Identify innovations and good practices that could influence and inform the development and implementation of warden schemes at national and local levels;
• Support the collection of monitoring information so that the impact of the schemes at the local and national levels could be determined;
• Examine, and explain, the processes underpinning the development and implementation of the schemes; and
• Provide an overall assessment of the warden programme, including value for money.

The details of each of these objectives were outlined further in the brief.

2.3 In terms of good practices the evaluation was to look at such factors as:-

• Recruitment and training;
• Scheme management;
• Relationships with partners; and
• Relationships with the community.

2.4 The brief identified a key aim as being to ensure that robust baselines and ongoing monitoring information was available so that the impact of the schemes could be assessed. This formative element had 2 main components:-

• Reviewing the existing arrangements for monitoring and evaluation and providing advice; and
• The production of summary monitoring reports at 6, 12 and 24 month intervals. These reports were to be compiled from templates submitted to the Executive by the 32 councils, that were to collect information under the guidance of the Executive’s research staff.
2.5 There was also to be a **summative** element to the work, the information for which was primarily to be collected by undertaking a number of case studies. It was hoped that these would provide answers, amongst other things, to the following:-

- The impact of the community warden schemes on reducing crime, the fear of crime and antisocial behaviour and improving environmental quality;
- The extent to which the schemes in different authorities had achieved their specific aims and objectives;
- Views of local communities on the wardens’ roles and the benefits of having the schemes; and
- The extent to which there was evidence of problems being displaced, as a result of the wardens’ interventions, to other areas.

2.6 In terms of the **processes** underpinning the development and implementation of the schemes the following were tentatively identified:-

- Partnership working with other council services and external agencies;
- The impact of Neighbourhood Compacts upon the involvement of the local community;
- Interactions and relationships with the police;
- The development of relationships between the wardens and different groups in the local community, such as young people;
- The effectiveness of Environmental Audit Tool Kits as a means of monitoring the wardens’ activities and ensuring community engagement;
- The factors that were felt to have facilitated and hindered the wardens from achieving their aims and objectives; and
- Views on the support offered by the Executive.

2.7 The outcomes of the work on impact and process were then to feed into **recommendations**, intended to improve the schemes’ future effectiveness and impact.

2.8 **Value for Money** was recognised as being difficult to assess. Accordingly the brief proposed that a fairly basic assessment be undertaken.

**Changes and Amendments to the Brief**

2.9 In the course of the evaluation a number of changes were made to the brief. The main ones were that:-

- Glasgow was not to be included within the case studies as it was to be the subject of a separate formative evaluation of the Glasgow Taskforce, the results of which are expected to be published in the Summer of 2007;
- Value for Money considerations were not to be covered as they were to be included within a wider, separate evaluation of antisocial initiatives being undertaken for the Executive\(^4\); and

\(^4\) An evaluation of the cost-effectiveness of the warden schemes is being undertaken as part of the Evaluation of Antisocial Behaviour Strategies at Neighbourhood Level.
• The effectiveness of Environmental Audit Tool Kits was not considered as, at an early stage in the Evaluation, the Executive found that no schemes intended to use them. As far as we are aware this has remained the case.

Given these changes the main focus of the evaluation has been upon identifying impact and looking at process issues. How this was undertaken will be covered in the next Section.

The Method

2.10 The brief identified 2 mandatory elements of the methodology:-

• Analysis of the 6, 12 and 24 month monitoring templates submitted by the councils; and
• Selection and then analysis over time of 6 to 8 case studies.

Additional elements were left to the discretion of the contractor.

2.11 Building on these mandatory elements, GEN proceeded to implement a number of complementary approaches intended to ensure that the objectives of the brief were attained. Each of these will now be outlined.

The Methodology – Impact Assessment – The Monitoring Reports

2.12 The initial guidance issued to the councils covered monitoring and evaluation, which was to be built in at the start of the implementation process (Scottish Executive, 2003b). To monitor progress each council was to select a number of monitoring indicators from a menu. The indicators fell into 2 categories:-

• Statistical ones of which 3 broad types were outlined in the Guidance:-
  • Impact on crime: based on the levels of recorded crime and focusing on crimes such as vandalism, littering, house breaking and harassment;
  • The impact on the recorded incidents of antisocial behaviour; and
  • The impact on empty properties and rental income generated; and
• Survey based ones, of which 6 broad types were suggested. Of these 4 were based on questions included in the Scottish Household Survey (SHS), meaning that comparisons could be drawn with changes in the wider area.

2.13 All schemes were requested to select at least 4 indicators against which their progress was to be assessed. These were to be a mixture of statistical and survey based ones. In addition, schemes were allowed to select discretionary indicators that might more accurately reflect the focus of the activities of the wardens in their areas. A number were suggested in the guidance, covering such things as the costs of vandalism and numbers of neighbourhood disputes solved through mediation.

2.14 The selected mandatory indicators were then to be used to monitor implementation progress. Monitoring templates were to be submitted to the Executive according to the following timetable:-
Six months from the scheme’s start a template was to be submitted that looked at initial outputs such as the numbers of wardens; after 12 months, in addition to outputs, schemes were to report on their progress against the baseline for selected mandatory indicators; and at 24 months similar information was again requested. The information at 6, 12 and 24 months was collected using a standard template.

2.15 The basic form of the templates remained constant over the evaluation period, although additional questions were added when the analysis identified data deficiencies. The main impact data collected in the templates covered:

- The aims of each scheme;
- The indicator, or indicators, selected to measure attainment of these aims;
- The source of the indicators;
- The baseline value of the indicators;
- Targets for each indicator;
- Attainment progress at the end of years 1 and 2; and
- Comparator information.

Essentially what was being set up was an outcome agreement (although these words were not used), against which progress could be measured.

2.16 Had the templates been populated as requested then monitoring and impact assessment would have been relatively easily done. In the event this proved not to be the case as is outlined in more detail in Chapter 8.

2.17 In addition to the quantitative data, the templates contained a variety of qualitative information. This covered such things as:

- Details of the activities undertaken by the wardens;
- Self assessments of progress in setting up Neighbourhood Compacts and protocols with the police;
- Residents’ views; and
- Publicity strategies.

2.18 As part of the templates analysis, all of this information was collated and reports submitted to the Executive. The 6 and 12 month reports also contained a number of recommendations intended to improve the schemes’ impacts.

The Methodology – Impact Assessment – Independent Evaluations

2.19 In addition to the provision of this ongoing monitoring information, those councils that received financial allocations for wardens and other antisocial behaviour initiatives of more than £500,000 a year were expected to commission independent
evaluations. The costs of these were to be met out of the Executive’s total funding allocation\(^5\). Some of these have been drawn on to inform this evaluation.

**Methodology – Impact Assessment - Base and Endline Surveys**

2.20 The original intention was that data from the survey indicators would be taken from the councils’ monitoring templates and analysed. However, when the 6 month templates were analysed, questions were raised about the methodology that the councils were using and therefore about the validity of any data they were likely to produce. Following discussion with the Executive, it was agreed that GEN would undertake its own base and endline surveys in each of the case study areas and that the impact analysis would not make use of the councils’ own surveys.

2.21 Accordingly a baseline attitudinal survey was undertaken within each of the 9 case study and 2 control areas in April/May 2005. This looked at the impact of the warden schemes on residents’ perceptions and explored the schemes’ additionality. To make the main body of the report more readable the majority of the Tables on which the analysis is based are presented in Appendix 2, which is cross referenced as appropriate\(^6\).

2.22 Many of the warden schemes are covering a number of sub-areas. In most cases the wardens began to operate in these areas gradually. Accordingly, when selecting the areas in which the baseline surveys were to be undertaken, attempts were made to target sub-areas where the wardens were either not yet operating or (if this was not possible) had only recently become operational. In this way GEN was trying to ensure that the baseline results were, as far as possible, reflecting respondents’ views prior to the wardens becoming operational.

2.23 The survey was then repeated, with some additional questions and modifications to others, in May/June 2006.

2.24 In each of the 11 areas some 100 face-to face interviews were undertaken in 2005 and 2006. The interviews were to be with named individuals using address lists generated from the electoral registers. The same addresses were targeted in 2006. If the occupiers had changed they were still interviewed, albeit that their responses were not analysed. From Table 2.1 it can be seen that, overall, 81% of those contacted in 2006 had been interviewed in 2005. The repeat interview rate was higher for the 2 control areas and also varied considerably across the 9 case study areas, from a low of 53% in Larkfield in Inverclyde to a high of 100% in Torry in Aberdeen City\(^7\). These variations reflect the relative stability of the populations in the different areas.

---

\(^5\) Twelve schemes fell into this category: Aberdeen, Dundee, East Ayrshire, Edinburgh, Fife, Glasgow, Inverclyde, North Ayrshire, North Lanarkshire, Renfrewshire, South Lanarkshire, and West Dunbartonshire.

\(^6\) The Appendix 1Tables are denoted with the prefix A1.

\(^7\) The repeat interview rates for the 9 case study areas were: Aberdeen, 100%; Dumfries and Galloway, 83%; Dundee, 64%; Edinburgh, 86%; East Renfrewshire, 85%; Inverclyde, 53%; Orkney, 87%; Perth and Kinross, 73%; and South Lanarkshire, 79%. For the 2 control areas the rates were: Edinburgh, 84% and Perth and Kinross, 96%.
TABLE 2.1  Survey Respondents 2005 and 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Case Studies</th>
<th>Control Areas</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number (and percentage) of baseline interviewees reinterviewed for endline</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>710 (79%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>889 (*1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.25 The subsequent analysis in Chapter 12 of this Report are based on those who were interviewed in 2005 and reinterviewed in 2006, that is the 710 respondents in the case study areas and the 179 in the control areas.

2.26 The 2 control areas (Oxgangs and Firrhill in Edinburgh and Rattray in Perth and Kinross) were selected with advice from the wardens’ managers in these council areas. As far as possible, the intention was to have control areas that were similar in socio-economic terms to the areas in which the warden schemes were based and where no additional crime or antisocial behaviour initiatives were in place. Table 2.2 compares the case study and control areas on selected respondent profile characteristics. It can be seen that:-

- On most of the indicators the 2 types of area are reasonably similar, with the deviations being of the order of 10%;
- The control areas have fewer unemployed residents, 5% as against 6% in the case study areas; and
- The control areas have a higher percentage of retired residents (39% as against 29%).

The full profile data are contained in Appendix One.

8. The extent to which there were specific factors operational in the control areas that may have impacted upon perceptions is looked at in greater detail in Paragraph 12.26.
TABLE 2.2  Comparisons of Survey Respondents’ Profile Characteristics for Case Study and Control Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected characteristic</th>
<th>Case study areas (percentages)</th>
<th>Control Areas (percentages)</th>
<th>Column 3/Column 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender - male</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure- Owner occupied</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure- Local authority</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic status- working full time</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic status- unemployed</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic status- Retired</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic status- Permanently sick/disabled</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent children</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:-
1. The percentages are derived from Tables A1.1, A1.2, A1.3 and A1.5 in Appendix 1.

2.27 The attitudinal survey data for the control areas are presented in Appendix 2, alongside the data for the case study areas. What emerges when comparing the baseline data is that residents’ perceptions in both types of area were broadly similar in 2005:-

- The control areas were generally similar to the case study areas on most (8) of the perception variables\(^9\), and
- The 2 variables where there seemed to be differences were the perceived prevalence of Drug Misuse/Dealing (Table A2.14) and Rubbish/Litter (Table A2.17). With regard to Drug Misuse/Dealing the case study areas had a greater perceived incidence than had the control areas. For example, 34% of case study area residents perceived this was “Very” or “Fairly” common compared to 28% of those living in the control areas. For Rubbish/Litter the controls had a greater incidence than the case studies with 42% rating this as “Very” or “Fairly” common compared to 37% in the case study areas.

However, despite some differences it was felt that the general similarities justified the selection of the control areas.

\(^9\) There were similarities on the following variables: Neighbourhood Rating (Table A2.1); Community Involvement (Table A2.2); Safety (Tables A2.3 and A2.4); Noisy Neighbours (Table A2.5); Vandalism (A2.8); Groups or individuals intimidating and harassing others (A2.11); and Rowdy Behaviour (Table A2.20). For each of these variables respondents were asked to give a rating on a 4 point scale. For the Neighbourhood Rating this ranged from the neighbourhood being seen as a “Very Good” place to live to a “Very Poor” place. The variables relating to the incidence of antisocial behaviour asked respondents to indicate how common each was on a scale ranging from “Very Common” to “Not at all Common”. Full details are given in the Appendix.
Although similar in socio-economic terms the control areas were not subject to interventions by wardens. The theory is that, by comparing the changes in the control areas to those in the warded case study areas, it will be possible to isolate the impact of the wardens’ interventions. However, this needs to be done with caution as the increased policy and political interest in tackling antisocial behaviour means that wardens are now only one of a number of interventions and few areas have not seen some type of antisocial behaviour initiative established in recent years (see Paragraph 9.19).

Methodology – Impact Assessment - Base and Endline Surveys - The Scottish Household Survey

To enable comparisons to be made with the wider area within which the case studies are based, a number of questions in the surveys were worded so that comparisons could be drawn with similar questions included in the Scottish Household Survey (SHS). However, although comparisons are possible for specific questions, this is not the case for the survey dates, as information for 2006 from the Household Survey will not become available until mid-2007. Accordingly we have used the 2003/04 Survey results to draw comparisons with the baseline data and the 2005 results (published in August 2006) for comparisons with the 2006 endline. This is not ideal but no other option seems possible.

The situation is further complicated by the fact that local authority level data, for the smaller authorities, is only collated every other year in the SHS, as it takes 2 years of data collection to achieve the required sample size for these smaller areas. Thus the 2003/04 SHS results are classified according to local authority boundaries, whereas those from the 2005 Survey are available, in some instances, only for wider geographical areas.

These problems need to be borne in mind when looking at the comparisons between perceptions in the case study areas and the wider local authority areas in Chapter 12.

The Methodology - Case Study Selection

The brief for the study specified that between 6 and 8 case studies should be undertaken over the course of the evaluation. Chapter 3 looks at the characteristics of the warden schemes based on analysis of the applications for funding submitted to the Executive. This analysis resulted in 9 classification criteria being identified. These were then used to group the schemes so that the case studies could be selected. The key criteria are outlined in Table 2.3. It was felt that they had a degree of permanency, reflecting fundamental factors about the schemes that were unlikely to change, such as their objectives, scale (financial and numbers of wardens) and management structures.
### TABLE 2.3  Wardens Schemes Classification Criteria Derived from Scheme Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Sub-Criterion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Type of scheme</td>
<td>1) Crime; 2) Environmental; 3) Crime and Environmental.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Origins</td>
<td>1) New; 2) Based on an Existing Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Aims</td>
<td>1) Few (1 to 3); 2) Several (4 to 6); Many (7 or more).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Activities</td>
<td>1) Few (4 to 7); 2) Several (8 to 11); 3) Many (13 or more).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Areas targeted</td>
<td>1) Few (1 to 3); 2) Several (4 to 6); 3) many (7 or more).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Financial scale</td>
<td>1) Small (£80,000 to £105,000); 2) Medium (£165,000 to £400,000); 3) Large (£500,000 or more).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3. Numbers of Wardens</td>
<td>1) Small (1 to 10); Medium (11 to 25); Large (26 or more).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Focus1</td>
<td>1) Thematic; 2) Generic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:-
1. Most schemes had a generic focus, in that they were attempting to tackle all types of antisocial behaviour in their target areas. The few that were thematic intended to concentrate upon particular target groups. For example, the focus of the East Lothian scheme was originally to be young people.

#### 2.33 The Executive, in its original study brief, outlined 2 additional case study selection criteria. These were:

- That there should be a mix of schemes covering urban and rural areas; and
- At least one scheme should have received second round funding.

#### 2.34 These 11 selection criteria were then used to select 9 case studies. The intention was to select at least one case study that met each of the criteria and the various sub-criteria. Following an initial selection of schemes, these were discussed with the Executive and some changes made, in particular adding more large urban schemes which were felt to be underrepresented. The final selection of schemes was:

- Aberdeen;
- Dumfries and Galloway (the Dumfries scheme as the 2 schemes in the council area were separately managed (see Paragraph 1.18));
- Dundee;
- East Renfrewshire;
- Edinburgh;
- Inverclyde;
- Orkney;
- Perth and Kinross; and
- South Lanarkshire.

The fact that 9, rather than 6 to 8, case studies were selected reflects a feeling that the schemes seemed to be so different that any less than 9 would not capture their diversity.
Table 2.4 summarises the characteristics of the case study schemes in terms of the selection sub-criteria. Only 3 are not represented:

- Schemes that solely have a focus upon crime;
- Schemes employing between 11 and 25 wardens (Medium); and
- Schemes having a thematic Focus.

The main reasons why schemes were not selected that met these criteria were varied. In one instance (Glasgow) other evaluation arrangements were in place whilst the Executive felt that some of the schemes that met the other criteria were not sufficiently advanced to justify selection.

Of the schemes selected, 3 were required, as a condition of funding, to undertake independent evaluations: Dundee, Edinburgh, Inverclyde and South Lanarkshire (see Paragraph 2.19).

The Methodology - Case Study Analysis

Having selected case studies then, over the duration of the evaluation, each was visited 4 times by the consultant team. The exception to this was Orkney which, because of its remoteness, was visited once, although there were additional telephone contacts. The case study fieldwork visits involved consultations with:

- Community warden scheme managers at strategic and operational levels;
- Community wardens;
- Police, fire and rescue and council departments;
- Elected members; and
- Community representatives.

The case study analysis also involved a review of the information produced and recorded by the warden schemes. This included:

- Literature produced by individual schemes for distribution to the public. This was generally information on the role of the wardens and how to use the service;
- Protocols (where they existed) with the police, fire and rescue service and other council departments;
- Neighbourhood compacts (where they existed);
- Community Warden handbooks and standard operating procedures; and
- Induction and training materials.
### TABLE 2.4 Case Study Selection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case study</th>
<th>Type of scheme&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Origins&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Aims&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Activities&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Areas targeted&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Financial scale&lt;sup&gt;6&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Numbers of wardens&lt;sup&gt;7&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Management&lt;sup&gt;8&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Focus&lt;sup&gt;9&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Type of area&lt;sup&gt;10&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Funding round&lt;sup&gt;11&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C/E</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumfries and Galloway (Dumfries)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Renfrewshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverclyde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orkney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth and Kinross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lanarkshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes (see Table 2.3 for full definitions):
1. Sub-criteria are: C = Crime; E = Environmental; C/E = Crime and Environmental;
2. Sub-criteria are: N = New; E = Based on an existing scheme;
3. Sub-criteria are: F = Few; S = Several; M = Many;
4. Sub-criteria are: F = Few; S = Several; M = Many;
5. Sub-criteria are: F = Few; S = Several; M = Many;
6. Sub-criteria are: S = Small; M = Medium; L = Large;
7. Sub-criteria are: S = Small; M = Medium; L = Large;
8. Sub-criteria are: P = Police; C = Council; MA = Multi-Agency;
9. Sub-criteria are: T = Thematic; G = Generic;
10. Sub-criteria are: RR = Remote Rural; M = Mixed; U = Urban; and
11. Sub-criteria are: 1<sup>st</sup> = First Funding round; 2<sup>nd</sup> = Second Funding round.
2.39 Each of the rounds of case study visits was to follow the implementation progress of the schemes in the 9 areas. In particular, the development of the schemes, community involvement, partnership working, relationships with other services and impacts were examined. The consultants also looked across the schemes to identify common issues and examples of good practice.

2.40 Appendix 3 gives details of each of the case study schemes and highlights the key findings from each, based on the research undertaken.

The Methodology - Case Study Analysis – Focus Groups

2.41 A series of focus groups were also undertaken in the case study areas. In most areas an initial approach was made to the scheme manager to identify suitable bodies that could be approached to help to organise a group. These bodies included youth clubs, schools, sheltered housing complexes and senior citizens clubs. In some instances the scheme managers themselves pulled groups together when there was limited local community infrastructure. The focus groups were targeted at those resident in the case study areas who were:

- Young people, covering a range of ages; and
- Older people, with again a range of ages being covered.

The groups for young and older people were run separately, in mid to late 2006, towards the end of the evaluation.

2.42 The rationale for including young people and older people within the consultations was two-fold. Firstly, the early fieldwork found that young people were perceived to be the main perpetrators of antisocial behaviour by the community representatives in the case study areas. Secondly, there was a perception amongst community representatives that older people were the least tolerant of antisocial behaviour and therefore were more likely to use a service such as the wardens. Through exploring how community wardens were perceived in both the younger and older age groups these assumptions could be tested. These groups were also highlighted by the Executive in the evaluation brief.

2.43 Those present at the focus groups covered a range of ages, from primary school age to late teens and from the recently retired to the elderly living in sheltered housing. The extent to which participants had first hand experience of antisocial behaviour varied. Some of the young people were perpetrators and thus gave an interesting insight into the wardens’ role and effectiveness. Others, especially the very young, had good relationships with the wardens. Some of the older people regularly experienced antisocial behaviour, for example intimidation from large groups of young people congregating near their homes. However, others did not have this first hand experience. The groups were therefore covering the spectrum of ages and experiences.

2.44 Each group was asked a number of standard questions, regarding their awareness and opinions of community wardens. These were designed to provoke discussion and debate amongst participants. The sessions were structured to ensure a degree of consistency in questioning across the areas, whilst allowing discussion to be
tailored to the experiences and concerns of individual localities. It was, however, necessary to adapt, add or omit some questions depending on the characteristics of the focus group participants and their experiences.

The Methodology – Scheme Managers’ Survey

2.45 In order to gain an insight into the views of the schemes’ managers in areas other than the case studies, 3 email surveys of managers were undertaken over the duration of the evaluation. These were timed to coincide with the submission of the 6, 12 and 24 month templates to the Executive.

2.46 The first and second surveys were similar, covering such things as views on partnership working, good practices, relationships with the police, other local authority departments and the community, development problems and views on the support given by the Executive.

2.47 The final survey (which achieved a 66% response rate) was different in that, although some of the questions were the same, the majority were more reflective, for example asking managers if, in the light of experience, they thought that the original objectives of the scheme had been appropriate.

The Methodology – Community Wardens’ Survey

2.48 Towards the end of the evaluation a postal survey of the wardens working in each of the case study areas was undertaken, with the co-operation of the scheme managers. The survey covered; the profile characteristics of the wardens, employment history, career aspirations, views on their role, relationships with various agencies and groups, the time spent on various tasks and perceptions of impact.

2.49 The survey was sent out to 195 wardens and 103 were returned, a response rate of 53%. Response rates varied across the schemes (Table 2.5). Perth and Kinross had a 100% response rate, South Lanarkshire 90% and Orkney 75%. At the other extreme, East Renfrewshire had a 13% response.
TABLE 2.5  Wardens Survey Responses from the Case Study Schemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case study</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Response Rate From Each Scheme (percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundee</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumfries and Galloway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Renfrewshire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverclyde</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orkney</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth and Kinross</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lanarkshire</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL/OVERALL</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Methodology – Wardens’ Activity Analysis

2.50 The analysis of wardens’ activities was largely taken from the 24 month templates. The templates provided 2 main sources of information:-

- Written descriptions of the activities that the wardens were involved in; and
- Nine also provided detailed breakdowns of the numbers of incidents that the wardens dealt with over varying periods\(^\text{10}\), although the way these were classified tended to vary.

2.51 There were also variations in the timescales over which data was collected. The majority of schemes collected data for a 12 month period, although some, for example, North Ayrshire had data for 24 months. In the case of Inverclyde, the wardens’ logs covered a 3 week period, by far the shortest timescale in the analysis.

2.52 In addition the wardens’ surveys asked for perceptions of the activities on which the most and the least amounts of time were spent.

Other Activities

2.53 Over the course of the evaluation a number of other activities were undertaken, some planned and others ad hoc in response to requests from the Executive. The main ones were:-

- The establishment of a Help Desk in the first year of the evaluation. This was to provide advice and support to councils with their monitoring data. Although this was publicised by the Executive, and by GEN, uptake was limited, there being only 8 queries. Further details are given elsewhere (Hayton and Percy, 2005b, Appendix 3);

\(^{10}\) These were Dumfries and Galloway, East Renfrewshire, Edinburgh, Inverclyde, North Ayrshire, North Lanarkshire, Shetland, South Lanarkshire and Stirling
• A telephone survey of all schemes undertaken for the Executive in late 2004 (Hayton, Gray and Stirling, 2004). This looked at implementation progress and identified any problems that the schemes were experiencing;

• At various stages over the evaluation’s life, telephone contacts were made with those schemes where the 6, 12 or 24 month templates’ analysis had identified problems. These telephone calls were to offer and provide support as needed; and

• A short paper produced for the Executive in 2006, looking at the flexible deployment of wardens (Hayton, Percy and Doyle. 2006)\textsuperscript{11}. This was based on research undertaken in those schemes that either deployed their wardens flexibly or were thinking of doing so.

2.54 We now turn, in Chapter Three, to look at the aims and objectives of the schemes.

\textsuperscript{11} Flexible deployment of wardens refers to wardens being deployed throughout a local authority area, and at times, when there is need. This contrasts with the deployment of wardens within defined, small areas, working set shifts, as is currently the case in most schemes.
CHAPTER THREE  THE INTENDED AIMS, OBJECTIVES AND COVERAGE OF THEWARDEN SCHEMES

Introduction

3.1 This Chapter draws on the analysis undertaken, at the start of the evaluation, of the application forms. It looks at the original schemes’ aims and then, drawing on the case study work, considers how these have changed. It finishes by looking at the size of the schemes.

Project Type

3.2 The Executive made it clear in its guidance that it would support 2 broad models of community warden schemes (Scottish Executive, 2003b, pp. 13-14), those focused on:-

- Crime prevention; and
- Environmental improvements.

These did not have to be mutually exclusive, so that a scheme could contain elements of both. Analysis of the submissions identified which model each of the schemes was to be based upon. Of the 32:

- Seven had a crime prevention focus;
- Three had an environmental focus; and
- The remaining 22 had both crime prevention and environmental objectives.

Schemes’ Aims

3.3 Analysis of the aims and objectives of the schemes, based on the funding submissions, identified the most commonly mentioned aims, outcomes or desired benefits from having a community warden scheme (Table 3.1). Reducing the fear of crime and increasing public confidence was the most commonly stated aim, followed by improving environmental quality, reducing the occurrence of antisocial behaviour and reducing and preventing crime.

3.4 Other outputs, or desired benefits, included a reduction in violent behaviour, improving visitor experiences, increasing the confidence of businesses in the area, improving services and the use of services, reducing homelessness, empowering communities and addressing the concerns of communities.

3.5 Submissions varied in terms of the number of aims stated. The most frequent number of aims was 3. Half of all schemes (16) had between 2 and 4. This would probably be higher if all schemes had stated aims in their submission. As it is, 6 did not.

3.6 The Inverclyde scheme had 8 aims, well above the average, whilst Aberdeenshire, Dumfries and Galloway and Eileen Siar all had 6 aims or outcomes.
### TABLE 3.1  Aims and Outcomes of the Schemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aim/outcome/desired or perceived benefit</th>
<th>Number of schemes mentioning the aim/outcome&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Percentage of schemes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce fear of crime and increase public confidence</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve environmental quality</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce antisocial behaviour</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce crime and crime prevention</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce youth crime</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase community safety</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deter vandalism</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve quality of life</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve communication between partners and community</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce fire raising</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribute to best value</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage community engagement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve housing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase use of mediation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce litter and fly tipping</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce the number of void properties</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support victims of crime and anti social behaviour</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
1. Schemes mentioned more than one aim, outcome or benefit.

#### Development of the Wardens’ Role

3.7 The wardens’ role differed across schemes and was very much linked to the scheme’s focus. However, the development process across all schemes can be distilled down to 3 key elements:-

- The establishment of a multi-agency working group made up of the main services involved in delivery, such as police, fire and rescue and other council departments (for example cleansing and housing);
- Identification of, and visits to, similar warden schemes in other areas. This element helped to provide a framework on which to base the duties and responsibilities; and
- Consultations with local community groups in order to refine the role of the wardens in line with public concerns.

3.8 Each of the above elements happened to varying degrees across the case studies. However, consultation with community representatives was found to be the least undertaken element, with several groups stating their input in the development phase had been minimal.

3.9 Several of the managers had previous experience of working with warden schemes in other areas. This knowledge was seen as important in helping to establish their own schemes and implement improvements.
The Schemes’ Development

3.10 By the end of the evaluation (late 2006) all of the case study areas had been running wardens schemes for a minimum of 8 months, ranging from Edinburgh where the scheme had been operational since August 2005, to areas such as Aberdeen and South Lanarkshire where wardens had existed in some form for a number of years. It is interesting to look at how they have developed and how the focus has changed.

3.11 Although all the schemes had a dual focus (antisocial behaviour and environmental issues) the tackling of antisocial behaviour now predominates in the majority of case study areas. This represents a shift for the Edinburgh South area scheme (the focus of the case study) where it is claimed that the wardens now spend the majority of their time on antisocial behaviour activities\(^\text{12}\). Previously they undertook a predominantly environmental role, undertaking clean-ups themselves rather than referring these to environmental services. This function is still performed. However, antisocial behaviour has gradually asserted itself alongside these original duties.

3.12 The main exception to this is East Renfrewshire where the environmental role remains the primary function. This environmental message was continually reinforced to the wardens and analysis of their logs highlighted the prominence of environmental issues in their day-to-day duties (Table 5.4). However, duties related to antisocial behaviour, such as dispersing groups of youths, were also undertaken by East Renfrewshire’s wardens.

3.13 The diversity of duties undertaken by the wardens in Orkney meant that defining the scheme’s focus was more difficult than in the other case study areas. The main explanation for this appears to be the smaller scale of antisocial behaviour and environmental problems in Orkney. As such, the wardens take on a broader range of duties than they do in other areas. The result is that they devote small amounts of time to many discrete activities as opposed to considerable time to one or two big issues as in some other areas.

3.14 The balance between dealing with antisocial behaviour and environmental duties appears to be shaped by 3 inter-related factors:-

- The nature of the area the wardens operate in;
- The management of the scheme; and
- The expectations of the community the wardens serve.

3.15 Community expectations were identified through consultations with the key partners involved in the delivery of the schemes and with the communities themselves. What emerged strongly was that community expectations were a “fluid” concept that varied across scheme areas. The clearest indicator of this was said to be the nature of telephone calls to the wardens’ service. For example, in Dundee it was estimated that over 60% of calls to the wardens were related to antisocial behaviour. The expectation of the community was that wardens would tackle and resolve these problems. By contrast in Orkney, where there was not the same level of antisocial

\(^{12}\) This changed focus is not, however, reflected in the analysis of wardens’ incidents (see Table 5.4).
behaviour, environmental concerns, such as dog fouling, were a primary concern of the community. As such the Orkney wardens were expected by their community to take steps to address this.

3.16 In light of this, all scheme managers displayed a willingness to accommodate the needs of the local community. The view of the wardens as the “eyes and ears” of the community strongly influenced this approach. The main reason why antisocial behaviour had become the primary focus in the majority of case study areas was that this issue tends to cause more distress to residents than environmental issues. Accordingly the schemes had changed in order to respond to these concerns.

3.17 An example of this willingness to respond to community concerns can be seen in Inverclyde, where school children from 2 nearby secondary schools were repeatedly engaging in gang fights at lunchtime. Accordingly the scheme’s manager arranged for 2 wardens to start their shift early so that they covered the volatile school lunchtime period. The result was an almost instantaneous reduction in the activity.

3.18 However, this view of a reactive service, that is now placing greater stress upon dealing with antisocial behaviour, is somewhat at odds with the analysis of wardens’ activities in Chapter 5. This shows that, overall, an environmental focus still predominates. Whilst there may be methodological reasons for these differences, the extent to which the schemes say they are becoming more responsive to antisocial behaviour problems may need to be treated with a degree of caution.

The Size of the Warden schemes

3.19 The schemes vary considerably in size (Table 3.2). The following figures relate to the case study schemes when they are fully staffed, thus:-

- Aberdeen has 30 wardens in total, 20 from the initial allocation and a further 10 through second round funding. In addition, they have 10 neighbourhood wardens (formerly traffic wardens), funded by the police, who operate throughout the city and can be deployed flexibly to assist the community wardens;
- Dumfries and Galloway operates with a full complement of 5 wardens: 1 senior and 4 wardens;
- Dundee has a total of 41 wardens: 7 senior wardens, 24 wardens, 4 support team (deployed as required to cover sickness and absence) and 6 mobile wardens;
- East Renfrewshire operates with a relatively flat structure, with 8 wardens, no seniors and no team leaders. However, a recent decision has been taken to employ 2 senior wardens. Currently one senior is in post whilst the other is in the process of being recruited;
- Edinburgh has total of 5 schemes, employing 49 community safety concierges (CSCs). The South area (the case study focus) has 5 CSCs and a team leader;
- Inverclyde started with an initial complement of 16 wardens. This has now increased to 24 wardens and 4 seniors. This scheme also employs an additional 4 wardens on 9 month contracts through New Deal;
- The Orkney scheme is the smallest case study, with 4 wardens;
- Perth and Kinross has a total of 5 wardens; and
South Lanarkshire has a full complement of 36 wardens. Of these 4 are supervisors and 2 team leaders. Half are funded directly by the local authority through the Housing Revenue Account.

### TABLE 3.2  Key Features of the Case Study Schemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Number of Wardens</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Population of the warded areas</th>
<th>Warden: Resident ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Grampian Police</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td>1:1,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumfries and Galloway</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Combined Services</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>1: 2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundee</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Community Learning &amp; Development</td>
<td>39,500</td>
<td>1: 963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Renfrewshire</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>1: 3,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh (South)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>1: 3,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverclyde</td>
<td>28 + 4(^1)</td>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>1: 1,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orkney</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>10,000(^2)</td>
<td>1: 2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth &amp; Kinross</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Housing and Community Care</td>
<td>10,800</td>
<td>1: 2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lanarkshire</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Housing and Technical Resources</td>
<td>306,300(^3)</td>
<td>1: 8,508</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:-**

1. Inverclyde employs 4 wardens through the New Deal programme.
2. Although the Orkney scheme theoretically covers the whole of the council area (population 20,000) in practice it is focussed on the main centres of population. Accordingly the 10,000 population figure has been used here.
3. The wardens cover the whole of South Lanarkshire, although they tend to concentrate on the more deprived areas.

**3.20** The distinction between community wardens, CSCs and neighbourhood wardens was explored in the fieldwork. In 7 of the 9 case study areas wardens were called community wardens whilst in Edinburgh they were called CSCs and in Aberdeen, as well as community wardens, there are also 10 neighbourhood wardens.

**3.21** In Edinburgh, the decision to call the wardens community safety concierges was taken following consultation with the local community. This found a proportion of the community who did not like the connotations that the word “wardens” had with prison wardens. The association with the custodial duties of prison wardens was seen as a potential barrier to building up relations with local communities. Accordingly, the term community safety concierges was coined. However, there are no significant differences between the duties, powers and responsibilities of CSCs in Edinburgh and those undertaken by community wardens in other areas.

**3.22** The 10 neighbourhood wardens in Aberdeen are distinct from the community wardens in a number of ways. The differences are:-
• The neighbourhood wardens have been in place longer than the community wardens, having originally grown out of an initiative to extend the duties of a selected group of traffic wardens;
• Neighbourhood wardens can issue fixed penalty notices for offences such as parking, dog fouling and littering. Community wardens in Aberdeen do not yet have such powers, although they are in the process of being granted them;
• Neighbourhood wardens are funded through the mainstream Grampian policing budget rather than the Antisocial Behaviour budget from the Scottish Executive; and
• Neighbourhood wardens earn around £10,000 more per annum than Community Wardens.

3.23 The relatively high financial cost of the neighbourhood wardens in Aberdeen has led some of the partners to question their value for money in comparison to funding extra police officers. For example, it was said that a newly qualified police officer in Grampian started on a salary of £17,000 a year whilst a neighbourhood warden could earn up to £30,000, including shift allowances and overtime.

3.24 Given the different sizes and geographies of the warden schemes, it is useful to look at the wardens-resident ratio. This allows comparison of coverage to be made across different sized schemes. Table 3.2 presents this information. The population of areas covered are the estimates of the schemes’ managers based on their knowledge of the patrolled areas. From the Table it can be seen that:-

• Dundee has the lowest ratio with one warden to every 963 residents of its patrol areas;
• Aberdeen, Dumfries and Galloway, Inverclyde, Orkney and Perth and Kinross have between 1,400 and 3,000 residents for every warden;
• East Renfrewshire and Edinburgh have slightly higher ratios with one warden for every 3,125 residents and one warden for every 3,756 residents respectively; and
• South Lanarkshire has the highest ratio: one warden for every 8,508 residents. This reflects the fact that the scheme covers the whole of the local authority area, although the wardens tend to focus on the areas of deprivation within the authority.

3.25 It should be noted that the ratios are based on each scheme having a full complement of staff. Depending on staff turnover, warden-resident ratios can be higher than the above figures. An example of this is East Renfrewshire which has operated consistently below its full complement of 8 wardens. The average number has been 4, which in reality doubles the ratio to one warden for every 6,250 residents. Recruitment and retention is covered in more detail below.

3.26 Having looked at the aims of the schemes, and how these have changed over time, Chapter 4 now turns to consider the characteristics of wardens who have to attain these aims.
CHAPTER FOUR A PROFILE OF THE COMMUNITY WARDENS

Introduction

4.1 This Chapter again draws upon the initial analysis of the schemes’ funding applications, the survey of wardens and the analysis of the information provided in the templates to look at the characteristics of the wardens.

Recruitment Specification for the Wardens

4.2 Table 4.1 looks at the people specifications for the wardens as outlined in the recruitment specification for 12 of the 32 schemes\(^\text{13}\). Although this is not based on responses from all schemes it does give some information on the wardens’ person profile. What emerges strongly is the importance of interpersonal skills. For example, good communications skills are mentioned by 10 of the 12 schemes for which information is available. Working with the public is another requirement mentioned by many of the submissions. Partnership working is clearly also important given the cross-cutting nature of the community wardens’ work in terms of the different council services and other agencies with an interest in antisocial behaviour. Other than having a driving license, technical skills rarely figured in the people specifications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements for wardens</th>
<th>Number of schemes</th>
<th>Percentage of schemes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good communication skills including influencing and negotiation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving license</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivated/able to motivate others</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to work on own initiative/unsupervised/plan workload</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience of working with the public</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience of partnership working/liaising with different agencies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good general education/literacy and numeracy skills</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to establish and maintain links with the community, groups, schools etc</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamworking</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good level of fitness</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic IT skills</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good writing skills</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of community safety/neighbourhood security issues</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of antisocial behaviour issues/policies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of environmental issues/policies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to handle situations calmly</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of services/resources</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem solving ability</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>71</strong></td>
<td><strong>N/A</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{13}\) Of the 32 schemes only 12 provided details of the people specifications looked for when recruiting wardens.
Demographic Characteristics of the Wardens

4.3 To explore the characteristics of the wardens in the case study areas, and to gain their views on their work, a survey was undertaken in late 2006. Details of the methodology are given in Chapter 2 (Paragraphs 2.48 to 2.49). In summary questionnaires were sent to the 195 wardens in the 9 case study schemes and responses were received from 103, a 53% response rate.

4.4 The vast majority of the wardens who responded were over 30 (80%). Of these, 35% were aged between 41 and 50, whilst 29% were 31 to 40. Only 14% of respondents were under 25 (Table 4.2).

**TABLE 4.2**  
Wardens’ Ages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5 The wardens were overwhelmingly male (86%). This confirms the information provided by the scheme managers in the 24 month template analysis. This found that 78% of wardens were male. However, the template analysis also found that there were variations from this “norm” within individual schemes. For example, East Lothian, Orkney and Stirling employed more females than males, whilst in Aberdeenshire, Ayrshire, Falkirk and Orkney the gender split was 50:50. Perth and Kinross on the other hand employed only males.

4.6 In addition, the managers were asked about the ethnic status of the wardens. Again, a very clear picture emerges in which:-

- 91% were Scottish;
- 7% were other British; and
- 2% were categorised as being Irish, other White, Asian or Other.

This is confirmed by the wardens’ survey in which 99% classed themselves as White. Only 3 described themselves as non-white. Of these, 2 were Asian and 1 was from another (unspecified) ethnic group. This lack of ethnic diversity may make it harder for Wardens to build relationships with Black and Minority Ethnic Communities (BME) within the areas where they operate. This could be an issue in some of the cities where, not only are there significant BME communities in some localities, but there are also large numbers of refugees and asylum seekers. However, this was not an issue that emerged in any of the consultations.
Employment History

4.7 Eighty-seven per cent of the wardens had been working in their current job for more than one year and 56% had been wardens for over 2 years. Of the 9 respondents who had been wardens for 6 months or less, 33% came from Dundee, 33% from Inverclyde, 22% from South Lanarkshire and 11% from Orkney. However, the analysis of the monitoring templates, containing data from most schemes, shows that high staff turnover seems to be a general issue (Paragraph 15.3).

4.8 Most respondents had heard about the wardens’ service through an advertisement in a newspaper (63%). Fifteen per cent heard about it through word of mouth, whilst a further 14% heard about it from other sources, of which the most commonly cited was Job CentrePlus.

4.9 The majority of respondents (78%) were already in a job before they started work as a warden. However, a significant minority (19%) had been unemployed. Only 4% were in education or training before becoming a warden (Table 4.3).

4.10 Fourteen percent of respondents (14) had become a warden through New Deal or a similar work placement scheme. Of these, 57% were in the Edinburgh scheme. This reflects the difficulties that the Edinburgh scheme had in recruiting wardens, largely as the labour market has been particularly buoyant in recent years.

TABLE 4.3  Status Prior to Becoming a Community Warden

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed for longer than 6 months</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed for less than 6 months</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In work</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On a training scheme</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Equal Opportunities

4.11 In terms of equal opportunities, Dundee’s funding submission stated that the wardens’ training would include inputs on diversity including equalities issues. Clackmannanshire’s mentioned that recruitment processes and procedures complied with equal opportunities legislation and that training would be in accordance with the Council’s equal opportunities policies. In the Stirling submission, it was said that an inclusive approach to recruitment of wardens would be followed, for example through the EQUAL programme or the Employment Connections partnership, both initiatives intended to get the unemployed into work. Perth and Kinross Council made the general observation that equalities were integral to all of the Council’s activities. East Renfrewshire, West Dunbartonshire and South Ayrshire, Dumfries and Galloway and Aberdeen City all made some reference to either equal opportunities policies and/or
equalities issues being built into wardens’ training. Despite these examples, 22 submissions did not make any reference to equalities or equal opportunities.

**Employment Aspirations**

4.12 Most of the respondents to the wardens’ survey (58%) saw their future career as being part of the warden service at either their current level or in a more senior position (Table 4.4). Indeed, around a third of all respondents (29%) wanted to advance to a senior position. A further 23% wanted to join another council department. Only 10% wanted to join either the police or fire service, although they were mainly younger than the average age of total respondents: 90% of this group being under 30. Although the absolute number of respondents was relatively small, it would suggest that younger people see the warden service as a “stepping-stone” to either the fire service or the police, whereas those of middle age are more likely to remain in the warden service and try and progress to a more senior level. That a large minority of respondents (42%) see their future as being elsewhere may be one of the reasons for some wardens schemes having what seemed to be high staff turnover rates (the analysis of the 24 month templates found an annual staff turnover rate of 27%, see Paragraph 15.3).

**TABLE 4.4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future Career</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warden/concierge service</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warden/concierge service at senior level</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire and Rescue Service</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>112</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 102

Note:-
1. Some respondents gave more than one response.

4.13 Having looked at the characteristics of the wardens, Chapter Five now turns to consider their role.
CHAPTER FIVE  THE WARDENS’ ROLE

Introduction

5.1 The purpose of this Chapter is to look at the wardens’ role by analysing the various activities that they are involved in. To do this, a number of data sources have been drawn on, including:

- The 24 month monitoring template returns submitted to the Executive (see Paragraphs 2.12 to 2.18);
- The wardens’ survey; and
- The analysis of detailed activity logs that 9 schemes had submitted as annexes to their 24 month returns (see Paragraph 2.50-2.51).

Using these different sources enables the evidence to be triangulated and uncovers some interesting discrepancies, in particular between the wardens’ perceptions of what they do and what they actually seem to do.

The Wardens’ Activities

5.2 The 24 month templates give detailed information on the activities that the wardens have been involved in across Scotland. To make sense of these they have been structured under a number of themes:

- Crime and antisocial behaviour;
- Community safety;
- Community engagement;
- Vulnerable groups (including youths and elderly residents);
- Information point;
- Environmental services; and
- Mediation services.

5.3 **Crime and antisocial behaviour** was the most obvious activity associated with the warden schemes. Key activities included:

- High visibility patrols designed to act as a deterrent;
- Reporting suspicious incidents;
- Acting as professional witnesses; and
- Attending minor antisocial behaviour incidents.

5.4 A closely linked theme was that of **community safety**. This largely involved wardens working with other services (in particular fire and rescue and police) on key safety messages and personal safety issues. For example:

- In Aberdeen the wardens distributed leaflets on behalf of the fire and rescue service dealing with home safety;
- Participation in joint antisocial behaviour initiatives (with antisocial behaviour teams and the police). For example both Dundee and South Lanarkshire have Bonfire Initiatives which involve the wardens working with
the council’s environmental department, the fire and rescue service and police to identify and remove potentially dangerous bonfires; and
- Monitoring empty homes when residents are on holiday.

5.5 Community engagement is a particularly significant area given that building strong links with the community may make it easier to deal effectively with crime, antisocial behaviour and other neighbourhood issues. Key activities included:

- Developing and maintaining strong links with the community;
- Acting as a communications link between the community and other agencies, in particular other council departments;
- Giving talks on the warden service to groups, including tenants’ and residents’ groups, community councils, schools, and sheltered housing residents;
- Working with community groups to address key areas of concern;
- Helping to set up and run resident events;
- Building relationships with young people on the street and through visiting youth clubs and events;
- Attending gala days and other community events;
- Becoming members of School Boards; and
- Setting up neighbourhood watches (and similar schemes).

5.6 Working with vulnerable groups (such as youths, the elderly and others identified as vulnerable) was another key theme. This fits with the community engagement theme, but focuses more on tailored individual interventions. This can include youth diversionary activities, liaison with the elderly and home visits to vulnerable residents. In rural areas wardens also visit those who were isolated to provide reassurance and support. Specific activities mentioned included:

- Organising and managing “midnight” or “twilight” football leagues;
- Working with young people on the redevelopment of a play park;
- Visiting elderly residents in their homes to carry out odd jobs;
- In rural areas, providing transport to elderly residents for essential journeys;
- Providing elderly residents with litter pickers to keep their immediate environment clean; and
- Delivering advice as part of a bogus caller initiative.

5.7 Wardens are also frequently used as an information point, being seen as a non-threatening point of access for information and advice on council services. This can cover the broad range of local authority provision such as housing services, welfare, environmental issues and social work. They also provide information on crime prevention.

5.8 Given their presence in certain localities, the wardens also make a contribution to improving the physical appearance of areas by tackling environmental issues. This, again, covered a wide range of individual activities, such as:

- Identifying graffiti, vandalism, abandoned vehicles and fly tipping and informing the relevant council service;
- Organising clean ups of certain areas;
- Checking on void properties;
- Identifying road and lighting faults and referring these to the appropriate service; and
- Carrying out estate management inspections.

5.9 Wardens also played a mediation role. This was largely focused on the resolution of low level disputes and was undertaken in collaboration with the relevant council departments (such as housing). Given the wardens’ presence and profile in certain localities, they also acted as independent facilitators or unofficial brokers who were less threatening to residents than a council official. An example comes from East Dunbartonshire where informal family conferences were held with identified repeat offenders and their parents. Here wardens outline the nature of the complaints received, the subject’s involvement, and elicited a response from the subject in the presence of their parents. Parents were often unaware of their child’s involvement and were generally appreciative of the opportunity to remedy the situation before it might reach the judicial system.

5.10 It was clear from the analysis that wardens undertook a wide range of activities and appear to be willing to respond to the demands of the area in which they operated. As one scheme manager puts it the “responsive nature of the wardens’ remit means the community sees them as a resource that is available to them to deal with issues that matter locally.”

Relative Importance of These Activities

5.11 In order to gauge the extent to which wardens spend their time on different duties, respondents to the wardens’ survey were asked to rank the amount of time they spent on 11 specified activities, with a 1 being given to the activity on which they spent the least time and 11 to the activity on which they spent the most. Table 5.1 shows the activities on which they indicated that the least and most time was spent.

5.12 As can be seen from the Table:-

- Over a third of respondents felt that they spent most of their time dealing with youth disorder;
- 15% of respondents indicated that they spent most of their time dealing with fly tipping;
- 13% and 12% respectively indicated that they spent most of their time dealing with other instances of antisocial behaviour and graffiti; and
- Less than 10% of respondents indicated that they spent most of their time dealing with other activities such as neighbourhood disputes.

5.13 In terms of what wardens said they spent the least amount of time on:-

- Twenty seven per cent said they spent the least of their time dealing with Assaults;
- Crimes of dishonesty and fire raising were the activities that took up the next smallest amounts of time; and
- The balance was spread across the remaining 8 activities.
That assaults and crimes of dishonesty account for a small amount of time may be as these are criminal offences that the wardens lack the powers to respond to.

TABLE 5.1 Activities that Reportedly Took Up the Most and the Least Amount of the Wardens’ Time in an Average Week

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percentage of survey respondents who claimed they spent most time on the activity in an average week</th>
<th>Percentage of survey respondents who claimed they spent least time on the activity in an average week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with youth disorder</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with fly tipping</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with other instances of antisocial behaviour</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning up graffiti</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with instances of on-street drinking</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with instances of drug abuse</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with neighbourhood disputes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with assaults</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with abandoned vehicles</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with crimes of dishonesty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with fire raising</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TABLE</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=101

5.14 Table 5.2 analyses the data by case study area, looking at the activities that the respondents said they spent most time dealing with. Given the low response rates from some schemes (in particular, Dumfries and Galloway and East Renfrewshire) the results need to be interpreted with a degree of caution. Overall what emerges is that:-

- Dealing with youth disorder was the single most important category in 7 of the 9 schemes;
- The 2 schemes where youth disorder was not significant (Dumfries and Galloway and East Renfrewshire) were both schemes from which only 1 response was received. As such they may not be representative; and
- On-street drinking and dealing with fly tipping also featured as activities that reportedly took up a reasonable amount of time.

5.15 However, the main message was that dealing with antisocial behaviour by young people seemed to be one of the main activities of the wardens, both across Scotland and in individual schemes. This would seem to back up the views of those who felt that young people were the perpetrators of most antisocial behaviour (see, for example, Paragraph 2.42).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percentage of wardens who indicated that they spent MOST of their time on the indicated activity (column percentages)</th>
<th>Aberdeen</th>
<th>Dumfries and Galloway</th>
<th>Dundee</th>
<th>East Renfrew-shire</th>
<th>Edinburgh</th>
<th>Inverclyde</th>
<th>Orkney</th>
<th>Perth and Kinross</th>
<th>South Lanarkshire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with fly tipping</td>
<td></td>
<td>14 (1)</td>
<td>100 (1)</td>
<td>13 (2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20 (5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20 (1)</td>
<td>24 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with abandoned vehicles</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20 (2)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with fire raising</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning up graffiti</td>
<td></td>
<td>14 (1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11 (3)</td>
<td>8 (1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with youth disorder</td>
<td></td>
<td>58 (5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60 (10)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22 (6)</td>
<td>48 (7)</td>
<td>100 (3)</td>
<td>40 (2)</td>
<td>26 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with instances of drug abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7 (1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 (2)</td>
<td>4 (1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with instances of on-street drinking</td>
<td></td>
<td>14 (1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7 (1)</td>
<td>100 (1)</td>
<td>3 (1)</td>
<td>24 (4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with crimes of dishonesty</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20 (1)</td>
<td>4 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with neighbourhood disputes</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 (2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with assaults</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with other instances of antisocial behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13 (2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20 (5)</td>
<td>16 (2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=101
The Wardens’ Log Analysis

5.16 The earlier analysis of activities is based upon reporting by the wardens themselves. To triangulate this information, and add depth, a cross-section of wardens’ activity logs were analysed. These had been submitted with the 24 month reports by the 9 schemes listed in Table 5.3. It will be seen that, fortuitously some of these are case study schemes. Further details of the methodology are given in Chapter 2 (Paragraphs 2.50-2.51).

5.17 Table 5.3 shows the Primary and Secondary activities that the wardens in each of the 9 schemes had been involved in according to their logs. As can be seen, many were involved primarily in environmental duties such as dealing with rubbish and fly tipping. Indeed, environmental issues were the primary activity in 3 of the 9 schemes, and the secondary activity in a further 5.

5.18 In 2 schemes the primary activity was completely different to any of the others. In Shetland the main activity was promoting the warden service to the community by generating positive publicity. In East Renfrewshire, the wardens’ main activity was given as “General Patrolling and Observation”, which would indicate that the wardens play a more passive role than in other schemes. However there were also variations within the sub-areas of individual schemes, and these are explored later in this Chapter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Primary Activity</th>
<th>Secondary Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dumfries and Galloway</td>
<td>Uplift of Syringes</td>
<td>Fly Tipping and Rubbish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Renfrewshire</td>
<td>General Patrolling</td>
<td>Checking Void Properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Fly Tipping</td>
<td>Environmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverclyde</td>
<td>Youth Problems</td>
<td>Other antisocial behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Ayrshire</td>
<td>Assisting Residents</td>
<td>Youth Trouble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lanarkshire</td>
<td>Street Cleaning</td>
<td>Cleansing (Bins, Special Uplifts, Streets and Public Areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shetland</td>
<td>Promotion of Wardens’ Activities to the Public</td>
<td>Rubbish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lanarkshire</td>
<td>Estate Management</td>
<td>Fly Tipping and Rubbish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>Youth Problems</td>
<td>Reporting Incidents to the Police</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.19 Table 5.4 shows the number of incidents recorded by wardens in each of the areas. Although it is not a like-for-like comparison (in that the timescales for which incidents have been recorded varied across the schemes) it is useful for building up a picture of the activities which appear most often in the reports. What emerges is that:-

- Estate management accounts for over a third of incidents overall and up to two thirds in some schemes;
### TABLE 5.4
Numbers of Incidents Recorded By Community Wardens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Total Incidents</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Incidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dumfries and Galloway</strong>&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth annoyance</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire raising</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fly tipping</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other antisocial behaviour</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East Renfrewshire</strong>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2,039</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth annoyance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire raising</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental management</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fly tipping</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other antisocial behaviour</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Edinburgh</strong></td>
<td>4,627</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth annoyance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire raising</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fly tipping</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other antisocial behaviour</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inverclyde</strong></td>
<td>178</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth annoyance</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire raising</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fly tipping</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other antisocial behaviour</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Ayrshire</strong></td>
<td>12,474</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth annoyance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire raising</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental management</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fly tipping</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other antisocial behaviour</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Lanarkshire</strong></td>
<td>13,320</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth annoyance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire raising</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fly tipping</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other antisocial behaviour</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shetland</strong></td>
<td>1,648</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth annoyance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire raising</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental management</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fly tipping</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other antisocial behaviour</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stirling</strong></td>
<td>796</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth annoyance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire raising</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental management</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fly tipping</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other antisocial behaviour</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Lanarkshire</strong></td>
<td>31,851</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth annoyance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire raising</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental management</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fly tipping</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other antisocial behaviour</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL INCIDENTS</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Environmental issues account for 16% of incidents overall. However, this is highly skewed by North Lanarkshire, where environment accounts for three quarters of reported incidents;
• Fly tipping accounts for 10% of incidents overall. Again there is variation across schemes, with fly tipping in some accounting for a fifth to a quarter of their incidents;
• Community relations accounts for 10% of incidents overall, although North Ayrshire and Shetland highly skews the figures; and
• Surprisingly youth annoyance accounted for only 4% of total incidents that were recorded, although this varied from a high of 43% of the incidents logged in Inverclyde, through 30% in Stirling to none in 5 of the schemes.

5.20 The relatively small number of incidents involving youths in all but one scheme is surprising, given the perception (mentioned earlier, Paragraph 2.42 that young people were responsible for much of the antisocial behaviour and the views of survey respondents, 38% of whom claimed that youth disorder was the activity on which they spent most of their time in the average week (Table 5.1). Given that few schemes have an explicit environmental focus (Paragraph 3.2) the importance of environmental incidents is also surprising. These discrepancies may reflect the fact that Table 5.4 is showing the number of reported incidents, rather than their duration or intensity. One also needs to bear in mind that different sub-sets of schemes are being compared. However, it may also be indicating that there are differences between what the wardens think they do and what they actually do. To explore this, the analysis of the logs will now be looked at in greater detail.

Environmental Issues

5.21 Wardens in 5 of the 9 schemes shown in Table 5.4 spent much of their time dealing with environmental issues. In Dumfries and Galloway, wardens had to remove a large number of used syringes and needles from the local area between January and December 2005. This problem was particularly pronounced in the Stakeford area, which accounted for 52% of all these incidents.

5.22 The logs that wardens keep of their patrols in Dumfries and Galloway give a flavour of the incidents they responded to:-

- “Syringe outside plant trolley at front door of Homebase;”
- “Two syringes on road reported by tenant of Osborne Crescent;”
- “Evidence of drug misuse and syringes in river;” and
- “Rubbish in bin area outside empty flat overflowing from bins. Approximately 5 black bags.”

5.23 In North Lanarkshire, the activity report for the period November 2004 to June 2006 shows that the vast majority of incidents (74%) involved responding to environmental problems. For example, 43% of incidents were recorded as Street Cleaning, whilst a further 30% were recorded as Cleansing (that is Special Uplifts and cleaning public areas).
**Antisocial Behaviour**

5.24 Other warden schemes are more focused on dealing with antisocial behaviour and issues surrounding crime, particularly with regard to young people. In Inverclyde, North Ayrshire and Stirling wardens had to deal with many incidents where young people were causing trouble or annoyance in the area (Table 5.4).

5.25 From the 1\textsuperscript{st} July to the 18\textsuperscript{th} July 2006 in Inverclyde, 43\% of incidents specifically concerned young people who were loitering, playing games in inappropriate areas, or causing other kinds of trouble. A further 15\% of incidents were other kinds of antisocial behaviour not specifically confined to young people, such as people drinking in public places.

5.26 However, there are differences in the volume of antisocial activity in the sub-areas of some schemes. In South Lanarkshire, vandalism, graffiti, and other types of antisocial behaviour accounted for 20\% of wardens’ incidents between 1\textsuperscript{st} July 2004 and 30\textsuperscript{th} June 2006. However these 3 categories accounted for 41\% of incidents in both Hamilton and Cambuslang, but just 7\% in Clydesdale.

5.27 There are also differences in the volume of antisocial behaviour related incidents in the sub-areas of the Inverclyde scheme. For example, youth problems accounted for 25\% of the total number of incidents that wardens were called to in the Fancy Farm and Bow Road areas, but 67\% of incidents in Port Glasgow West.

5.28 The logs from the wardens in Inverclyde give an indication of the types of activity that they were engaged in. Examples of entries included:-

- “Three boys opened up a glass recycling bin and took bottles out to smash—they smashed one, before we pulled up and took the rest off them;”
- “On arriving at Cumberland Road to patrol we spoke to an out-of-hours joiner who informed us that whilst he had been boarding up a window someone had thrown bottles at him;” and
- “We walked up the stairs of the Bow Road shops and saw 3 youths standing in a doorway. One had a baseball bat. We asked them to move away from shops, and they refused…one moved away from the doorway and swung the baseball bat at us and verbally abused us…we walked away and rang the police.”

**Schemes with a Mixed Focus**

5.29 Other schemes in Table 5.4 dealt with a more varied mix of incidents. In Edinburgh, fly-tipping accounted for a quarter of incidents between July 2005 and June 2006, whilst environmental incidents, such as cleaning up gardens and common areas, accounted for a further 19\%. However, dealing with other types of antisocial behaviour accounted for 19\% of recorded incidents. Despite this, the scheme manager suggested that the focus of activity has moved away from environmental issues towards dealing with antisocial behaviour, although this does not, as yet, show up in the incident logs (Paragraph 3.11).
The logs for the Edinburgh East team show that wardens in this area have a variety of environmental and antisocial behaviour issues to deal with, as the following quotations show:-

- “Whilst on patrol visited a tenant to ask about rubbish that’s being dumped at the side of the building. Got no answer so carded the tenant and asked if they could remove it ASAP as it was a fire hazard;”
- “Received call from tenant to say that noise coming from the flat above was intolerable. When we arrived we found that there was a party at the flat above;”
- “A tenant stopped us for advice. She is having a lot of problems with kids going over her fence to get into the back of the business centre. We gave her an incident sheet to collect back next week;” and
- “On patrol we came across a pile of builder’s rubble and tyres on waste ground at Niddrie Mains Terrace. We could find no evidence of who fly-tipped the load.”

Schemes with a Unique Focus

Two of the schemes in Table 5.4 appeared to have a primary activity that was unique in its scale when compared to the other schemes. In East Renfrewshire between the 1st July 2005 and 30th June 2006, 59% of incidents were classed as “General Patrolling and Observational Duties” (these have been placed under Estate Management in Table 5.4). The next most reported activity was “Checking on Void Properties” (8% of incidents). This mix is, however, broadly in line with the aims of the scheme which include:-

“Providing a visible patrolling deterrent to certain forms of lower level nuisance and antisocial behaviour and pro-actively responding to certain environmental issues. Generally to build relationships with the local communities”

In Shetland, the wardens were mostly engaged in promoting their own service to members of the community by generating positive publicity. This accounted for 42% of incidents (they talked to 688 people). Twenty two per cent of their activity was dealing with rubbish, whilst 4% was dealing with graffiti.

Wardens’ Activities and their “Fit” with Schemes’ Aims

The information given above shows that in many of the schemes, community wardens have been engaged in a wide variety of activities. However, it is important to compare the activities to the original aims of the respective schemes, to identify whether wardens were doing jobs that they were not in their original remit. This has been done for the 9 schemes in Table 5.4.

It would appear that, in the majority of schemes, the activities the wardens were engaged in were compatible with the schemes’ aims. This largely reflected the fact that most schemes had aims that can encompass a whole range of activities. For example:-
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• In Edinburgh, one stated aim is to “Impact on Crime”;
• In East Renfrewshire, the stated aims include “to provide a visible patrolling deterrent to certain forms of lower level nuisance and antisocial behaviour and pro-actively responding to certain environmental issues”; and
• In Inverclyde, the stated aims include “Reduce crime; reduce fear of crime; reduce antisocial behaviour; improve environmental quality.”

5.35 However, in 2 of the schemes this does not seem to be the case. In North Lanarkshire, 74% of incidents logged related to environmental improvements such as clean ups and street cleaning. This would seem not necessarily to fit with the aims of the scheme which are to:-

• Ease the fear of crime within the areas in which community wardens are working;
• Be a high profile presence within the community and be a visual deterrent to crime; and
• Be the eyes and ears of the community, looking for and reporting issues that need attention during patrols.

Given this focus it is unclear why the North Lanarkshire wardens should be engaged in so much clean up activity.

5.36 In Shetland, over a third (42%) of recorded incidents were classed as Education, that is promoting the warden service to the community (placed under Community Relations in Table 5.4). This does not figure directly in the aims of the scheme, which are to:-

• Prevent crime; and
• Improve the environment.

Although 29% of incidents could be classed as “improving the environment”, for example dealing with rubbish (22%), graffiti (4%) and vandalism (3%), it is not clear why informing people of the wardens’ role should be categorised separately. Indeed, it could be argued that this is something that should be normal practice for every warden’s scheme.

Changing Roles

5.37 Although the above analysis has produced some contradictory results, what it clearly shows is that the duties of wardens were extensive and subject to change at short notice. Indeed, the wardens’ job descriptions for each of the case study areas highlighted the need for a flexible approach in the discharge of duties. A good example of this was found in Orkney where wardens were involved in a wide range of duties including catching stray dogs and operating the “smiley face”14 traffic control system.

14 The “smiley face” traffic management system is a speed camera which is set up at the side of the road. The device measures the speed of approaching cars and displays a “smiley face” if motorists are below the speed limit and a “frowny face” if above the limit. There are no fixed penalty powers associated with the wardens’ use of this system.
5.38 The consultations found that duties can alter depending on the time of year and the initiatives being undertaken in a particular area. For example, in the summer wardens can have a particular focus on reducing malicious fires in grassy or wooded areas and protecting schools against vandalism over the holiday period. In the winter, when there are fewer young people on the streets, wardens’ duties can involve visiting local youth clubs and checking closes and blocks of flats where individuals may congregate. Around Guy Fawkes Night a number of schemes have targeted the removal of materials that could be used for fire raising, and report a reduction in damage caused by fires due to this.

Conclusions

5.39 What is clear from the various sources that have been analysed in this Chapter is that the wardens undertake a variety of roles and that these vary according to the characteristics and pressures in specific areas. Despite this variation, all of the schemes had the following elements, although the extent to which these were present in the day-to-day duties of the wardens was dependent on the scheme’s focus and the nature of the operational area:-

- **Community Liaison** – This was the central tenet of all the schemes and was developed by wardens being visible in the patrol areas, listening to residents’ concerns and, crucially, being seen to take appropriate action;
- **Security and Safety** – Attending and investigating any reports of antisocial behaviour. This included liaison with police and acting as professional witnesses\(^ {15} \) in relation to such incidents as well as providing reassurance to more vulnerable members of the community; and
- **Environmental** – This function is extensive and can include the monitoring and reporting of issues such as:-
  - Graffiti and vandalism;
  - Litter;
  - Void properties;
  - Fly-tipping;
  - Road and lighting faults; and
  - Abandoned vehicles.

5.40 The concept of the wardens as the “eyes and ears” of the community permeated strongly throughout the analysis, in the various consultations and interviews with the managers. Wardens were seen as being a conduit for community concerns, through which remedial action could be taken quickly and effectively.

5.41 Various initiatives were common across the warden scheme areas. These were often devised in response to concerns from the community or other services. Examples included:-

- Vulnerable adults initiatives, which involved wardens visiting recent victims of crime or antisocial behaviour to provide reassurance, as in Perth;

\(^ {15} \) Although acting as a professional witness was included in the job descriptions of wardens in all areas, this duty had not yet been required in a number of areas.
• Patrolling schools during school holiday periods in order to reduce the incidence of vandalism, as in Dundee, Inverclyde and South Lanarkshire;
• Visiting “pattern fire” spots\textsuperscript{16} on behalf of the fire and rescue service in order to deter potential fire-raising as in Aberdeen and Inverclyde; and
• Delivering activities such as football competitions, Christmas card competitions and cycling proficiency tests to local children, which were common activities in a number of areas.

5.42 However, the ability to draw on a variety of sources of evidence has shown that there were differences between the wardens’ perceptions of what they did and what records indicated they spent their time on. The main differences seemed to be between the perceived importance of youth disorder and the relatively small number of incidents that this accounted for in the 9 schemes. Although this may be explained, to some extent, by differing samples and the intensity and durations of incidents, the analysis of logs shows that environmental incidents predominate. This may reflect local management priorities and it is to this that we turn in the next Chapter.

\textsuperscript{16} Pattern fire spots refer to the situation when fires break out at regular times in the same places.
CHAPTER SIX  MANAGEMENT AND PARTNERSHIP WORKING

Introduction

6.1 As with the previous Chapter, this one draws evidence from a number of sources to explore issues around scheme management and partnership working. The sources used include the initial analysis of the funding applications, the case study visits and the wardens’ and managers’ surveys. These sources are indicated throughout the text.

Management

6.2 At a strategic level, 29 of the 32 schemes were managed by the local authority. The majority of the schemes come under the Community Services or Combined Services directorates, as generally these sections of the council have the responsibility for community safety. Three schemes are managed by Grampian Police: Aberdeen City, Aberdeenshire and Moray. Here the warden service sits within the Neighbourhood and Partnerships division of the Police. The wardens are employed, and line managed, by the police and are intended to complement the community policing approach. This gives the schemes a clear crime and antisocial behaviour focus.

6.3 All of the wardens’ case study schemes, with the exception of Aberdeen, are managed and delivered by local authorities (Table 3.2 gives details of management for the case study schemes). Generally, the schemes are based within wider antisocial behaviour initiatives which take a holistic and co-ordinated approach to resolving antisocial behaviour problems. These include:

- The Antisocial Investigation Teams (ASIT) in South Lanarkshire;
- The Social Protection Team (SPT) in Perth; and
- The Problem Solving Unit (PSU) in Inverclyde.

In most schemes, line management came through an antisocial behaviour co-ordinator or antisocial behaviour manager. The person in this role would generally also be in charge of other antisocial behaviour initiatives.

6.4 The relationship between police and the wardens in Aberdeen is unique in terms of our case study areas, in that this scheme is the only one to be situated within a police force. Not only are wardens line managed by Grampian Police but they are also based within police stations. It was felt this proximity allowed the activities of the wardens to be better co-ordinated with the “total community policing”\textsuperscript{17} approach adopted by Grampian.

\textsuperscript{17} The Total Community Policing approach was a pilot scheme introduced in the Torry area of Aberdeen. This is a multi-agency partnership approach designed to identify and meet community needs and shift the police force’s emphasis from being reactive to having a greater community focus. This is expected to form the template for future policing operations in Grampian.
6.5 From the local authority scheme manager’s point of view things have worked well with this arrangement, whilst the local authority is broadly happy with its relationship with the police and the performance of the wardens. By contrast, the police were less satisfied with managing the wardens. They suggested that there was a lack of focus on what the wardens should be doing. For example, were they another tier of policing, with powers, or the “eyes and ears” of the community? This seems to need clarification. In addition, some wardens felt their management by the police alienated them from the council and led to their not being utilised effectively by other partners. Given this, it would seem that the benefits of police management are mixed and there are still issues in Aberdeen that need to be resolved.

Key Partners

6.6 The range of partners engaged with was not uniform across all case study schemes, reflecting different priorities and local needs. The most common partners were:

- Other council departments such as housing, environment and youth services;
- The police;
- Fire and rescue services;
- Elected members; and
- Community and voluntary organisations.

The issues involved in partnership working with these key players will now be explored, starting with other departments within the local authority.¹⁸

Relationships with Other Local Authority Departments

6.7 The evidence from the case studies is that the relationship between the warden schemes and other council departments is largely informal. In the main, partnership working is based on verbal agreements rather than written protocols, although this may be changing (Paragraph 6.12). As with the relationships elsewhere, the establishment of joint working has taken time to develop.

6.8 At the outset, the main concern from other council departments was that there would be increased pressure on resources. This was something highlighted in the case studies and in the scheme managers’ surveys. Many departments felt they would be unable to cope with the increase in demand for services brought on by the upsurge in referrals by wardens. Indeed, the cleansing department in Aberdeen City Council used up its entire budget for repairing vandalism in the first few months of the wardens’ scheme and had to become more selective about the calls it responded to. This has also been an issue in East Renfrewshire where the environmental team has not been able to deal with the increased demands for their service since the warden scheme began. Here attempts have been made to appease local residents through a number of joint clean up initiatives.

6.9 However, several scheme managers felt that other council departments were now beginning to understand how the wardens could help in managing resources

¹⁸ Relationships with the community are dealt with in Chapter Seven.
more effectively. In Perth, for example, wardens stated that by early identification of environmental issues they helped to save costs. This realisation was said to have improved working between local authority departments and the wardens.

6.10 Confusion existed in some schemes around responsibilities, particularly in relation to environmental issues. For example, in Edinburgh it was unclear whether the Community Safety Concierges or environmental services had responsibility for the monitoring of back courts. However, discussions with the wardens across the case study areas identified a flexible and willing attitude in dealing with environmental problems. Where they had the power to do so, and where health and safety regulations would allow, wardens would address environmental problems on their own, for example clearing up rubbish.

6.11 Utilisation of wardens by council departments generally appeared to be improving over time. Examples included:-

- Housing officers taking wardens along when visiting tenants. This was not only in relation to problem tenants. Wardens would also accompany officers on visits to the elderly or other vulnerable people;
- In East Renfrewshire, wardens worked on the “Clean Close Initiative” in conjunction with the cleansing department;
- Building services in Inverclyde request the wardens’ assistance when attending high risk call-outs in problem areas;
- Social workers in Dundee used the wardens to establish relations with young people referred to them. Where wardens had a good relationship with a young person, social workers would use them to help “break the ice” between themselves and the new referral; and
- Joint initiatives between youth workers and community wardens were common in several case study areas, with wardens attending youth clubs and accompanying youngsters on trips.

6.12 Slow response times from council departments in addressing reported issues were cited as a source of frustration by some wardens, an issue identified in the wardens’ survey. However, it was agreed that overall response times had improved since the schemes’ inception. Service Level Agreements (SLAs) were being considered as a solution to this problem by several councils, in effect placing the wardens-departmental relationship on a more formal footing. This was most developed in East Renfrewshire where SLAs exist with some departments, including housing, and are currently being developed with others. Despite this, there was limited evidence to suggest the response times outlined in the SLAs were being met.

6.13 Co-location of Antisocial Behaviour units (of which wardens are generally a part) alongside relevant council departments was seen as a way of improving partnership working. An example of this occurred in Perth, where the scheme’s manager and administration have recently moved into the same office as the antisocial noise team. This was seen as important in offering a more integrated service to the public. Co-location was also felt to encourage informal links between the wardens and partners. As the majority of wardens referrals go through the scheme manager, this was seen as an important component in promoting partnership working. Several other
schemes also have plans to co-locate their community warden schemes alongside partner services, subject to continuing funding.

The Wardens’ Views of the Relationships with Council Departments

6.14 Respondents to the wardens’ survey were asked to comment on their relationships with other council departments and state how these had changed over time. Generally relationships were viewed positively, with only 19% of respondents indicating that they were “Poor” or “Very Poor” (Table 6.1). The majority (42%) said that their relationship with the council was “Good”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.15 This positive picture of relationships was reinforced when the wardens were asked how relationships had changed over their time as a warden. Half said that these relationships had “Improved” with only 5% stating that they had become “Worse” (Table 6.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayed the same</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Become worse</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Scheme Managers’ Views of the Relationships with Council Departments

6.16 Although the managers had initial concerns, all who responded to the survey now described their relationships with other council departments as “Good” or “Excellent”. The main factors that had led to improvements were:

- Council departments becoming more adept at handling the incoming reports from wardens;
- Awareness of wardens improving in council departments, so that requests for action are now seen as the norm as opposed to the exception;
- Staff in departments, and in the warden schemes, becoming more familiar with each other and therefore more willing to respond to each others requests; and
- Better co-operation on initiatives, with agreement between warden schemes and council departments on which is going to take the lead on new initiatives.

6.17 Despite the overall improvement in internal council relationships, managers still reported some tensions between themselves and other departments. For example, in Inverclyde there was said to be a tension between the warden scheme and Social Work. This was based on social workers feeling that wardens were stigmatising young people by helping to place them on Acceptable Behaviour Contracts (ABC) as part of the use of restorative warnings (see Paragraph 10.52 for further details). The scheme manager, however, argues that this is a preventative measure, designed to halt a young person’s possible move into the criminal justice system.

6.18 The warden scheme in Orkney was unique in terms of the case study areas in that wardens were employed by the Environmental Health (EH) department, but were line managed by the Community Safety team. This was as EH ran the first year long pilot warden scheme prior to the full funding for wardens becoming available from the Executive. Although this arrangement was reported to cause some minor day-to-day management difficulties it also resulted in better co-ordination of activities and communications between EH and the wardens.

6.19 Overall the picture that emerges from the various sources of evidence is that relationships between the wardens and other council departments are good and have improved since the warden schemes were set up. It remains to be seen if the move towards formalisation, as seen in the use of SLAs, will change these relationships.

Links with the Police

6.20 Table 6.3 categorises police involvement based on the original funding applications. In terms of day-to-day operations, just about all schemes had either developed, or were in the process of developing, protocols between the council and the police on how the wardens and police would interface and how information would be shared. In some cases, agreements had been reached that calls from community wardens to the police would be treated as a priority.

6.21 Virtually all schemes claimed to have strong links with the police in their area. For example, in Tayside the police were responsible for the development and delivery of the some of the training for the community warden schemes within the force’s area: Dundee City, Angus and Perth and Kinross. Similarly, in Orkney the police were involved in the recruitment and training of wardens.

6.22 In Tayside, and many other areas, the police were also involved in the development of the warden schemes. This involved such things as identifying areas with high incidences of crime and/or anti social behaviour and, in some cases, identifying beats for the wardens to patrol based on local knowledge.
TABLE 6.3 Police Involvement in Warden Schemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of involvement</th>
<th>Number of schemes</th>
<th>Percentage of schemes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day-to-day communications with wardens including specified protocols</td>
<td>27†</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting with formulation of schemes including provision of information relating to crimes and incidences of vandalism</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training development and possibly delivery</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police involvement on other groups for example Community Safety Partnerships and Antisocial Behaviour Working Groups</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of schemes</td>
<td>5†</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police secondment to related antisocial behaviour measures for example Antisocial Behaviour Co-ordinator or Antisocial Behaviour Team</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting with recruitment process</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing strategic involvement once schemes are operational</td>
<td>3‡</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>73</strong></td>
<td><strong>N/A</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Of these only East Lothian had not mentioned a specific protocol though the submission did mention day-to-day communications/relationships with the police.
2. Of these 5, 3 are to be managed directly by the Police (Aberdeen, Aberdeenshire and Moray) whilst the police are on the management group of the other 2: Scottish Borders and Shetland.
3. Although only 3 applications specifically referred to this, it is to be assumed that the number will be significantly higher in practice.

6.23 The police are also generally involved in steering groups or management groups of various schemes as well as on community safety groups and partnerships. In the case of the Grampian schemes, which are managed by the police, officers from the relevant council departments attend police tasking meetings so that they have an involvement in management of the wardens. At a more detailed level, some schemes have gone as far as specifying modes and frequency of contact between police and wardens.

Police-Warden Protocols

6.24 Based on the analysis of the 24 month templates it seems that, of the 32 schemes:-

- Twenty two (69%) had produced a police-warden protocol;
- A further 6 (19%) have either produced a protocol that is awaiting sign off, or were expecting their protocols to be completed by September 2006†;
- Of the remaining 4 schemes, 2 had informal protocols in place (Dumfries and Galloway (North West) and South Ayrshire), whilst the remaining 2 had made good progress. One of these schemes, Shetland Isles, expects its protocol to be completed by 1 December 2007. West Dunbartonshire does not give an expected completion date.

However, several of these protocols were with the antisocial behaviour unit of the council rather than specifically with the community wardens.

6.25 In the main, protocols with the police covered 2 main aspects:-

† The templates were submitted in June/July 2006.
• Intelligence sharing; and
• Co-ordination of activities.

6.26 Protocols on intelligence sharing constituted an agreement between police and wardens to share relevant information with each other. Examples of this included:

• Police having full access to the wardens’ nightly logs;
• Regular meetings between the police and the wardens to exchange intelligence on developments in the patrol areas; and
• Informal contact between the police and the wardens on nightly patrols.

6.27 Co-ordination of activities between police and wardens was something that happened in all of the case study areas. For example, if a particular antisocial behaviour “hotspot” had been identified by police, they would often ask the wardens to target this on their nightly patrols as a preventative measure. Likewise, if wardens noticed regular criminal activity, which they do not have the powers to deal with (such as drug dealing), they would inform the police who would then initiate surveillance. For example, in South Lanarkshire information provided by the wardens proved to be the final piece of evidence needed by the police to get a warrant to search premises for drugs. The search was ultimately successful and a number of arrests were made.

6.28 Although protocols had been written to provide a framework for joint working, it was found that several schemes had well developed operational structures which went beyond the terms of the protocol. Examples of these were:

• In South Lanarkshire, wardens’ activities were based on tactical assessments, which identified crime “hotspots”, prepared by the police. This resulted in the wardens taking a pro-active, rather than a reactive, approach to issue prevention;
• Perth and Kinross held fortnightly multi-agency tasking meetings which involved the police, the Antisocial Behaviour team (of which wardens are part), and other council departments. These meetings allowed activities to be co-ordinated for the next 2 weeks;
• Similarly, in Dundee police, wardens and a range of other partners attended monthly Community Intelligence Unit (CIU) liaison meetings. On a daily basis the police held an internal briefing session, which senior wardens often attended. Uncensored copies of the reports of these meetings are made available to the wardens;
• Police held weekly intelligence briefings with wardens in Inverclyde. In addition, joint police and wardens’ surgeries were held in one of the scheme areas; and
• In East Renfrewshire, the police were regularly involved in the wardens’ daily briefings.

6.29 The police-warden protocols appeared to have been of benefit in 2 main ways:
• Formalising the relationship had helped to ease any tensions and clarify roles and responsibilities; and
• The protocol established a forum whereby the police and wardens could share information and target resources on areas of concern.

6.30 However, although formal protocols were important, informal contact between police and community wardens was felt to be as useful as the formal structures. Informal contact between police and wardens in Orkney, for example, was described as particularly good due to wardens taking their shift breaks in Kirkwall police station. Regular contact and sharing of information was viewed as building up trust on a personal level, which meant that police were more likely to respond to requests from wardens. Despite this, it was recognised by several police representatives that further work was needed in educating the wider police force as to the benefits of wardens, particularly with those officers who had limited contact with the warden service. This is something that the wardens’ survey reinforces.

The Wardens’ Views of the Relationships with the Police

6.31 Relationships with the police were viewed less positively by the wardens surveyed than were relationships with council departments (Table 6.4). A fifth of respondents said that they had a “Poor” or “Very Poor” relationship with the police. However 78% said that their relationship was “Good”, “Very Good” or “Excellent”. To some extent the views of the wardens contrast with the views of their managers as expressed in the 24 month templates, who all made positive comments about their relationships with the police.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.32 Although a greater percentage of respondents felt that relationships with the Police were not “Good” (compared to relationships with other council departments) 56% felt that they had “Improved” over their time as a warden (Table 6.5).
### TABLE 6.5  In Your Time as a Warden/Concierge How Have These How Relationships Changed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayed the same</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Become worse</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>103</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.33 These problems were reflected in the case study work, where the majority of schemes reported some initial difficulties in their relationships with the police. These were mainly centred on a misunderstanding as to the wardens’ roles and some scepticism about what contribution they could make. However, these concerns quickly dissipated when wardens started to demonstrate the ways in which they could complement police activities.

**The Benefits of the Warden-Police Relationship**

6.34 The key benefit of the wardens, cited in discussions with the police during the case study visits, was their value in gathering intelligence. The nightly presence of wardens on the streets, and their regular interaction with local youths and residents, meant that wardens often picked up information which the police did not. Furthermore, it was felt that, as wardens did not have any enforcement powers, individuals were more willing to share information with them. This information could then be logged by wardens and passed on to the police. This may need to be considered, given the move to give the wardens enforcement powers in some areas (see Paragraph 15.33).

6.35 What is clear, however, is that the wardens’ main impact was upon community policing rather than on the wider force. Regular contact and sharing of intelligence had contributed to the forging of close bonds at the local level. This had led to wardens being used as an effective extra resource in several areas.

6.36 The value of wardens as “professional witnesses” came up consistently in the fieldwork. Numerous examples were given where wardens had arrived at the scene of a serious disturbance before the police, largely as they were based within the area. The wardens were then able to monitor the situation and take notes, which could then be passed onto the police and used as evidence in court. Wardens could also attend court and provide oral evidence if required. In general, the police valued this assistance as often the incident could be over before they arrive on the scene.

6.37 On the whole, the relationship between police and community wardens was said to have improved over time and had followed the same trend as that of other services, namely initial scepticism progressing to a positive working relationship. This reflected:-

- The wardens demonstrating capability; and
- The police understanding how they could use wardens more effectively.
This understanding, and appreciation, of the wardens’ capabilities can be seen from the increasing use, in some areas, of the wardens at times of high demand for police services, such as Friday and Saturday nights. In the past, police resource constraints, and prioritisation of calls, meant that they were often unable to attend low level antisocial behaviour incidents. Now they can refer these to wardens and have the confidence they will be handled effectively.

6.38 However, in some areas, relationships with the police were good from the start. In Dundee, for example, the scheme manager felt that the relationship with the police had started well and had continued to strengthen. The strength of the strategic community safety partnership that existed in Dundee prior to the warden scheme was said to be central to this.

6.39 Overall the initial opposition to wardens, which had existed in some areas, appears to have subsided as wardens have demonstrated their value to police officers. Those consulted during the case study visits agreed that there were still improvements to be made, particularly in the area of intelligence sharing. However, the general feeling from both sides was that things were moving in the right direction, with both parties gradually appreciating the roles, responsibilities and limitations of the other.

Fire and Rescue

6.40 Relationships with the fire and rescue service were generally felt to be more straightforward than those with the police. On the whole, scheme managers felt they had not been subject to the same initial scepticism from fire and rescue as they were from the police and other council departments. Accordingly, in the scheme areas where fire was a problem, wardens and fire and rescue had worked in partnership from the start.

6.41 Fire raising was, unlike antisocial behaviour, not prevalent in all of the case study areas. It was, therefore, unsurprising that relationships were less developed than with the police with only 3 areas (Dundee, East Renfrewshire and Edinburgh) having formal protocols in place.

6.42 Fire and rescue input tended to be strategic rather than operational, with representatives participating in multi-agency tasking groups. This allowed the service to keep abreast of new developments and communicate new safety initiatives to the schemes’ managers. Recently, however, Dundee has secured a closer working relationship with the fire service following the secondment of a Community Fire Safety Officer to the Community Safety Team for one day a week.

6.43 Where fire raising was an issue, the main incidents reported were secondary fires, for example wheelie bins, and attacks on fire crews. The wardens in East Renfrewshire were sometimes called upon by their local fire crew to keep watch over their equipment whilst fighting a fire and to deter attacks on the crew. Inverclyde wardens had helped the fire and rescue service to set-up a system to reduce attacks in problem areas. In addition, the service in Inverclyde was also using wardens to help tackle “pattern fires”, with the wardens now patrolling specific fire “hotspot” areas to deter potential arsonists.
6.44 Discussions with fire and rescue representatives highlighted the changing focus of the service. In the past the fire service was primarily reactive. Education on fire safety is now a priority and it was recognised that wardens have a role to play in this. In Aberdeen, for example, the wardens had carried out leaflet drops for the service to disseminate information on fire safety. In Edinburgh the fire service engaged with young people through an initiative known as the “Cool Down Crew”. This involved young people learning more about fire safety through participation in community based projects or activities. The support of the wardens in engaging young people had been crucial to getting this initiative off the ground, according to the fire service, with the relationships the wardens had built with local youngsters being used as leverage in this type of initiative.

6.45 Although functional relationships between fire and rescue and the warden schemes were in place in all case study areas, some were more advanced than others. For example:-

- The wardens in Aberdeen work with the fire and rescue service on the Gramps area initiative. This is part of the Torry Total Communities approach, where the wardens and fire service work with other local partners to reduce the incidence of “pattern fires” in the Tullos Hill and Kincorth Nature Reserve. The outcome was that the cost of fire raising at the Gramps had been reduced from £37,000 for two weeks in 2005 to £200 for the same period in 2006; and
- In Dundee and South Lanarkshire the wardens worked with the fire service in the lead up to Bonfire Night, to identify and remove bonfires from potentially dangerous locations (such as against flats). This had resulted in less call outs for the service on Bonfire Night and was judged by both partners to be a success. This is now likely to be repeated on an annual basis.

6.46 Across the other case study areas the vast majority of contact with the fire service was at management level, and in most areas wardens and fire crews were not well known to each other. The view was that this would change as there were more visits to fire stations and greater participation in joint initiatives.

Political Relationships

6.47 All scheme managers surveyed felt that local politicians now saw the wardens as “a good thing”. This assertion is supported by our own consultations with elected members during the case study visits. These found that all elected members consulted were very much in favour of community wardens, to the point where councillors who did not have wardens in their own wards were lobbying to have them introduced.

6.48 However, the support of local politicians was not always there at the start. This was the case in Dundee, East Renfrewshire and Inverclyde. Politicians in these areas initially felt that the money spent on wardens would be better spent on extra police. However, they have now been won over as the wardens continually demonstrate their value to the community. The schemes’ managers in these areas feel the early negativity was based on a lack of knowledge about the service. Good communication with politicians was seen as key to changing these perceptions.
6.49 Wardens schemes in each of the case study areas are now using local politicians to their advantage. This ranges from using them to lobby for changes to the shift patterns in Aberdeen, to councillors inviting wardens along to their monthly surgeries in Inverclyde.

**Conclusions**

6.50 The overall picture that emerges is that relationships with the various partner agencies have improved over time. Evidence from a variety of sources, interviews and surveys, tells the same story. These improvements reflect developing understanding of the role of the wardens and a realisation that they can add value to other services. This is not to suggest that there are no problems. However, these seem to be relatively insignificant when set alongside of the generally positive views expressed.
CHAPTER SEVEN COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Introduction

7.1 Engagement with the community by the wardens has again been assessed using a variety of sources of evidence, including the initial analysis of funding applications, the case study visits, focus groups and the wardens’ survey. These sources ensure that any conclusions drawn are based on a variety of data and therefore are likely to have a degree of validity.

Community Involvement in the Development of the Schemes

7.2 As outlined in the 2005 case study report (GEN Consulting, 2005), consultation with communities during the early planning stages of the schemes was limited. This was due to a combination of the short time available to local authorities to design and implement their schemes, along with the pre-determined scheme design guidelines set out by the Executive.

7.3 Limited input into the development of the schemes was, however, not seen as an issue by the majority of community representatives consulted. It was felt that most people who had wanted to express an opinion on development had an opportunity to do so at the public meetings held in the target areas when the schemes started. The intention was also that neighbourhood compacts would specify the role of the wardens to the community.

Neighbourhood Compacts

7.4 The Executive’s guidance indicated that neighbourhood compacts should be drawn up to provide the strategic context for the warden schemes (Scottish Executive, 2003b, p. 6-7). The compacts were defined as agreements between the Community Planning Partnerships and the local community which were to set out-

- The support and services that agencies such as the police and the local authority were to provide to tackle antisocial behaviour; and
- The standards of behaviour expected from residents.

7.5 Analysis of the 12 month templates found that just 29% of the schemes had completed neighbourhood compacts (Hayton, et al, 2005b). The 24 month reports show that this figure has increased slightly, with 32% now having compacts in place (GEN Consulting, 2006). A further 35% reported that they either had other structures in place that negated the need for compacts or else were very close to completing their compacts. The remaining 33% were either working on developing compacts, or, in one case, had no plans to develop them.

---

20 For example, Dumfries and Galloway (both schemes), South Lanarkshire and Shetland Isles expect to have completed their compacts by early 200A3. Renfrewshire on the other hand does not expect its 14 Estate Management Agreements (in effect compacts) to be in place until 2013.
7.6 Falkirk and North Lanarkshire are examples of schemes that had taken a different approach. Falkirk had decided to incorporate the information about wardens into the community planning process. As such there was no intention to set up specific community consultation procedures for wardens. Likewise North Lanarkshire intended to create Local Area Partnerships in which liaison with tenants and residents about wardens (amongst other things) would be part of the structure.

7.7 Two Authorities had not begun to produce compacts:-

- Orkney had no plans to produce neighbourhood compacts; whilst
- East Renfrewshire was discussing the development of compacts with the Housing department.

The Case Study Compacts

7.8 Across the case study areas the priority given to the development of compacts was mixed. The majority of areas either had one in place or were in the process of developing one. Crucially, there was some ambiguity over compacts, depending on whether council or community representatives were consulted. For example, community representatives were often unsure as to what a compact actually was and whether one was in place.

7.9 The case study areas with a compact in place were:-

- Aberdeen;
- Dundee;
- Edinburgh; and
- Perth.

7.10 These were wide ranging in scope and aimed to communicate the key priorities of the council in interrelated areas such as:-

- Community safety;
- Environment;
- Education and learning;
- Employment and enterprise; and
- Health and wellbeing.

7.11 Despite the involvement of the local community in the early development of compacts, there was recognition that the initial momentum of the process had now slowed. There were 2 main reasons for this:-

- Involving residents at the start of the process was relatively easy due to the “novelty” effect of a new initiative. After this wears off, it is more difficult to engage people. It was recognised that this phenomenon was common to all council led initiatives, not solely community wardens; and
- The community representatives involved in the development of the compacts tended to be those who engaged with the council on a wide range of issues. As one scheme manager put it “the same crowd always step forward for these
sorts of things”. For this reason, it was recognised that there was some work to do in spreading the compact message to the wider community.

7.12 In order to address this slowdown, 2 of the schemes had taken initiatives:-

- In Dundee, the compact had been distilled to a 1 page document which was displayed in public buildings such as community centres and schools. Despite this, the scheme manager had heard little back from the community to convince her that the compact was having an impact. Her view was that only people with a particular interest in the content of compacts were likely to take the time to read them; and
- In Perth and Kinross, the compact had been distributed door-to-door.

7.13 Despite these initiatives, the overwhelming view of scheme managers, in the 4 areas where compacts existed, was that they had been of limited value. Indeed, the results were generally considered not to be worth the time and effort invested in the process. For example:-

- The Aberdeen scheme developed neighbourhood compacts for the areas receiving first round BSSAC funding. After this, the process was abandoned as the compacts were felt to conflict with the neighbourhood and community plans in place in the city. Despite this, compacts were considered to have brought some benefits in providing an entry point into the first target communities. However, consultees felt that the process was flawed from the start, with the Executive expecting the documents to be produced in 2 months, even though guidance on the subject suggested that a year was a more appropriate timescale. The view now was that the compacts contributed little to the operation of the warden service and that, once produced, they “sat on the shelf”; and
- In Perth and Kinross, establishment of the compact was felt to be one of the least successful aspects of the scheme. This was due to low attendance at compact meetings and a lack of volunteers willing to get involved in the process. This led the manager to comment that the compact had been one of the initiatives least embraced by the community in the warden scheme.

7.14 Elsewhere progress had been slow and the perceived results mixed. For example:-

- Development of the compacts had been a slow process in East Renfrewshire. The consultations found that there had been no progress since the first case study visits and it did not now seem to be a priority;
- A written compact was in the process of being developed in Inverclyde. Ironically, given the views of scheme managers (Paragraph 7.13), the delay in this process was of concern to some community representatives who felt there was reluctance on the part of senior council members to formulate a written document. The council are currently working with the Safety Partnership to address these concerns; and
- South Lanarkshire had opted not to develop a compact and was in the process of developing Neighbourhood Management Plans that were felt to have a better “fit” with the local authority’s approach to community planning.
Community wardens were one aspect of this process, with the wider aim being to provide a framework for interactions between the council and the general public. The idea was to include wardens as part of the existing community planning structures. Currently (2006) 2 Neighbourhood Management Plans had been drafted whilst several more were in preparation.

Compacts – An Assessment

7.15 The formulation of neighbourhood compacts in the case study areas had been a slow and time consuming process. Consultation with council representatives found that they saw them as being bureaucratic and onerous, whereas consultation with community representatives found limited understanding, both of what they were and of their purpose. Relationships between the wardens and the community were found to be influenced more by the structured and unstructured interaction which takes place rather than by compacts.

7.16 The fact that the majority of case study schemes had not developed compacts indicates that the process was not seen as a priority by the key stakeholders. In addition, all scheme managers, regardless of whether their scheme had a compact in place, felt that practical, day-to-day engagement with the community was crucial to the scheme’s credibility. Whether this engagement was formalised by the existence of a written document was felt to be less important.

7.17 These rather negative conclusions reinforce the analysis of the 24 month templates (GEN Consulting, 2006). It seems doubtful if, given the time that the warden schemes have been running, it is now worthwhile developing compacts for those schemes that do not currently have them.

The Wardens’ Relationships with the Local Community

7.18 Regardless of the existence and impact of compacts, the majority of wardens surveyed felt that their relationships with the local community were positive (Table 7.1). Indeed, 69% said they were either “Very Good” or “Excellent”. Only 1 person felt there was a “Poor” relationship. Again the 24 month templates would back up this positive view (GEN Consulting, 2006).

TABLE 7.1  Wardens Descriptions of Their Relationships with the Local Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.19 Relationships with the community were said to have improved over time, with 82% of the surveyed wardens sharing this view. No-one said that their relationships with the community had become worse (Table 7.2). One reason for this may be the way most schemes interact with the community.

**TABLE 7.2 In Your Time as a Warden/Concierge How Have These Relationships Changed?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayed the same</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Become worse</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>103</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Structured Interactions with the Community

7.20 Structured interaction refers to the interaction wardens have with the community at scheduled meetings or events such as: tenants and residents meetings, community meetings, youth clubs, schools, councillors’ surgeries, joint police and wardens’ surgeries, fetes and local sports competitions.

7.21 Regular attendance at tenants and residents meetings was seen as important by wardens and members of the community. From the wardens’ point of view it was seen as a way to demonstrate commitment and a willingness to address concerns. Community representatives liked the regular and formal link this gave them to the wardens, particularly when the schemes’ managers attended. Members of the community also expressed their satisfaction when action was taken after an issue had been raised with the wardens.

7.22 Tenants and residents meetings were seen by some community members as a conduit to the wider community. For example, those who were less active in the community, and were less confident about raising issues, had the opportunity to raise concerns through their representatives. This gave them the reassurance that their concerns were known about and were being addressed by the wardens.

7.23 There were mixed views on the value of joint police-community warden interactions with the community. The Larkfield scheme in Inverclyde regularly held joint surgeries and had reported positive community feedback. However, other schemes’ managers were more cautious about too close an association with the police. The view was that this could send out the wrong message to the community when the wardens were trying hard to establish their own identity, separate from the police. Doing this was felt to be important if they were to develop good relationships with their communities, especially young people for whom an apparent close relationship with the police would be counterproductive.

7.24 Of particular merit, in terms of formal structures for interacting with the community, is Dundee’s Community Safety Wardens Advisory Group. This has 2 community representatives from each of the areas covered by the warden scheme.
They have a role in determining the wardens’ priorities in that they can air community concerns to the scheme manager and other partners. They also have a role in communicating to their local area about the activities that the wardens are involved in.

**Unstructured Interactions with the Community**

7.25 There was clear agreement across the range of consultees in the case study areas that the success or failure of community warden schemes was determined through interaction with people on a day-to-day basis. Wardens and schemes’ managers both agreed that the level of service offered to local residents was central in defining their relationship with the community.

7.26 A common theme running through the consultations with community representatives was praise for the wardens’ prompt response times. Residents’ groups commended the fact that, when a call was logged, wardens were on the scene quickly. This was seen as a major advantage of the warden service over the police, with lengthy police response times being criticised in a number of scheme areas.

7.27 Prompt response times were viewed as bringing a number of benefits:

- Immediate reassurance to the person reporting the incident that the complaint was being addressed;
- Better identification of the perpetrator(s) of the incident through quick arrival on the scene; and
- Ongoing deterrence as the perpetrator(s) came to understand that community wardens responded quickly.

7.28 The high visibility of wardens was also rated favourably by community representatives. Residents stated they felt safer in the knowledge that the wardens were patrolling the streets. Some examples of this were:

- In Dundee, the wardens were regularly present when local bingo halls were coming out. This was seen as providing peace of mind to the customers. Similarly, wardens would often be around when local youth clubs were finishing. This not only ensured that the youths dispersed and did not create a disturbance, but reassured the young people, who were themselves often the victims of antisocial behaviour; and
- In Inverclyde, some residents reported waiting on the regular wardens’ patrol passing before they would go out at night, for example to visit the local shop or take the dog for a walk. Community wardens were seen as providing the peace of mind needed to carry out these everyday tasks.

7.29 Consultations with the local police, scheme managers and community representatives found that they felt that fear of crime was often worse than crime itself. The nightly presence of wardens in problem areas was seen as central to

---

21 The representatives were members of tenants’ and residents’ groups and community councillors. They were identified through the wardens’ managers who generally had regular contact with them through attendance at meetings.
alleviating this fear amongst residents. Wardens were therefore seen as helping to make residents feel safer in their own areas.

7.30 The high degree of flexibility shown by the wardens’ management was recognised by community representatives in several areas. The willingness of wardens to adapt their patrols and duties in line with community concerns was felt to be important in demonstrating their value to the community. Where recurrent environmental or antisocial behaviour issues were raised with the wardens, residents were confident that wardens would take steps to try and address these.

7.31 Positive media coverage of warden schemes was felt to have been of benefit in cementing community relationships. For example, in Aberdeen, Inverclyde, Dundee and South Lanarkshire “good news” stories had been printed in the local press. These often detailed new initiatives undertaken to improve community safety or reported on situations where wardens had helped the local community. This was seen as an important element in communicating the benefits of the wardens to the public and providing general reassurance.

7.32 The role of the wardens as professional witnesses was rated highly in discussions with community representatives. Anonymity was closely related to this. The practical example was given where a local resident called the warden hotline to report an issue. From this point on, the wardens take over responsibility: the caller does not even have to give a name if he or she does not want to. The wardens will then attend to the incident and log the appropriate details. If the police are required, and the incident escalates to the courts, the wardens will also act as witnesses if required. This function was viewed as very important by residents’ groups. Prior to the introduction of the wardens, many residents would have been reluctant to report incidents as they feared reprisals if they had to go to court to give evidence. Community wardens now shouldered this responsibility, something that was recognised as a key benefit of the schemes.

Relationships with Young People

7.33 The experience from the case study areas is that developing relationships with young people was difficult and complex, far more so than with other groups such as the elderly. Within the schemes the relationships with young people varied from patrol area to patrol area, with youths in one area being positive towards the wardens whilst those in others could be very hostile. In contrast older people tended to be more of a homogenous group.

7.34 None of the schemes’ managers expected to be welcomed by young people when the schemes were first introduced, and none were proved wrong. Hostility was said to characterise early engagements with youths. To a certain extent, the schemes’ managers understood this. From the young person’s position, wardens were “parachuted” into local communities with the express aim of monitoring their behaviour and stopping them doing certain things. Managers felt that wardens had worked hard to try and change opinions and attitudes by concentrating on working with youths, rather than against them, and developing personal relationships. This had worked better in some areas than others.
7.35 The managers agreed that there was no “magic formula” for engaging with young people. Time and presence appeared to be the main factors in getting closer to them. The longer the schemes have been in place, the more time young people had to get used to the idea of the wardens being in their areas. Similarly, the more often they saw the wardens patrolling their neighbourhoods then the more they came to recognise them as part of the “local landscape”. Visits to schools and youth clubs were also felt to have helped in familiarising young people with the wardens and promoting the message that they were there to help young people, not to make their lives more difficult. The wardens had generally put a lot of effort into building up personal relationships with the youths in their areas. The rationale was that they were more likely to respond to requests from the wardens if they liked and respected them. The police were said to recognise this and often used the wardens to resolve low level issues. Many, therefore, viewed the wardens as forming a bridge between the police and local young people.

7.36 Attendance at local youth clubs was a key part of this “bridge building” strategy in the majority of case study areas. Several wardens stated that their interaction with young people could often be in a quasi-enforcement capacity, for example moving youths on or telling them to keep noise down. Interaction with young people at youth clubs by playing games or accompanying them on trips, allowed them to see the wardens as “real people”, as one warden put it. This was felt to be important in establishing mutual respect and understanding.

7.37 The wardens’ extensive knowledge of the local youths was commented on in a number of areas. The ability of wardens to recognise perpetrators of antisocial behaviour immediately, or to recognise descriptions from local residents, meant that those responsible could often be tackled immediately. This was seen as a major advantage that the wardens had over the police, and had only come about as a result of their regular presence and interaction with the community.

7.38 Some of the warden schemes worked closely with community mediation teams. Community mediators engaged with local youths and identified the activities they would like to see in their local community. For example, in Inverclyde community mediators had recently set up a youth club in one area and break dancing classes in another in response to demand. This stems from the view that, in order to change antisocial behaviour, authorities must get to the root of the problem. Many of the wardens reported that, when they asked local youths why they engaged in antisocial behaviour, boredom was the main reason given. Joint working with the community mediation team was seen as a way of tackling this through the setting up of diversionary activities.

7.39 In the longer term many case studies saw the development of links with primary school children as important, as was happening in Dundee. The idea was that these children would grow up knowing nothing but the presence of the wardens which, it was hoped, would lead to greater respect for them and a fundamental change in behaviours over time. Given this, scheme managers felt that the true impact of the wardens’ interventions in achieving behavioural change would not be known for 5 to 10 years.
As part of this longer term “hearts and minds” approach a number of warden schemes had staged events and competitions for local children. For example, in East Renfrewshire children’s Christmas parties were seen as a good opportunity to make links with the community, with some wardens playing the role of Santa Claus. In Inverclyde the wardens hold annual Christmas card contests, Easter egg races and local football competitions.

Relationships with Older People

There was a general consensus amongst managers that relationships with older people had been positive from the start. Whilst there had been a number of dissenting voices, who wanted more police as opposed to wardens (particularly in Dundee), most managers felt this was to be expected given that little was known about the wardens and what they could do.

Developing relationships with older people was characterised by “bridge building” at the start. In Inverclyde and Perth, for example, the wardens handed out promotional material on their visits to sheltered housing complexes or older people’s houses. The Perth wardens had also developed their relationships with older people through the Vulnerable Adults Initiative (see Paragraph 17.41 for further details).

Looking across the schemes, gaining and holding on to the support of older people in the community appeared to be based on several factors. The key ones were:

- Maintaining high visibility and regular patrols in parts of the community where there were concentrations of older people;
- The wardens taking the time to talk to older people and encouraging them to use the service; and
- Prompt responses to calls for assistance from older members of the community.

From a slow start, older people were now considered to be the main beneficiaries of the warden service. Scheme managers were convinced that their fear of crime had reduced. This was backed up by the feedback they had received from older residents who commented, for example, that before the introduction of wardens, they were too afraid to go out after dark. Now, when they see wardens patrolling the area, older people were said to feel reassured and safe enough to leave their homes. Managers considered this to be one of the biggest successes of their warden schemes.

Community Involvement Issues

Despite the increased momentum of the schemes in all areas, there was recognition that more work needed to be done to publicise the wardens in the local community. Overall, the schemes’ managers felt that, although there were large sections of the community using the warden schemes effectively, there were many residents who were not and who were unaware of the wardens and their functions. The feeling was that a number of residents were still “putting up” with antisocial behaviour and environmental problems, unaware that there was a service that could help them. Although the message was felt to be getting through slowly it was felt it
might take several years for it to penetrate the entire community. Working to develop a greater understanding of wardens was cited as a top priority in the case study areas. In addition to the range of community engagement initiatives outlined above, other steps being taken to increase the wardens’ profile included:

- The Dundee scheme producing a television advert to be shown in the Dundee area to influence awareness;
- Community Wardens’ vans clearly displaying the service telephone number on the side;
- Write-ups in the local press highlighting positive stories;
- Advertising in local community centres and halls; and
- The use of friendly slogans such as “You talk. We listen” in scheme branding.

7.46 However, the analysis of the 24 month templates found that most schemes engaged in extensive publicity campaigns, doing such things as placing articles in the local press and magazines, talking to groups about the wardens’ work, organising (and undertaking) leaflet drops and attending events such as gala days. Given this range and intensity of activity, it may be that there was now little more that could be done to make residents aware of the wardens. As such the additional efforts that many managers were to make may have little impact.

7.47 Confusion around what wardens can and cannot do was raised as the main issue in community relations. An example, given in Inverclyde, illustrates this point. An assault was taking place in the street. The community wardens arrived on the scene and attempted to diffuse the situation but were unable to do so within the limits of their powers. At this point, the wardens called the police and retreated to a safe distance to monitor and record details until the police arrived. Several onlookers were dismayed by the lack of action from the wardens. They expected them to become physically involved and restrain the individuals concerned. This lack of action led them to question what the wardens’ role was, if they were unable to resolve this type of incident. The confusion demonstrated by this example highlights some of the difficulties still to be overcome.

7.48 This uncertainty, over which agencies were responsible for addressing antisocial behaviour, also emerged in other areas. In East Renfrewshire, where the wardens had an environmental remit, there were reports of members of the public asking for wardens to attend antisocial behaviour incidents, only to be told that the wardens did not deal with them. There were also issues around the point at which an incident ceased to be a warden matter and became one for the police. Communities were still getting to grips with the distinction and it was agreed it would take time for it to firmly take root in people’s minds.

7.49 The perception of wardens as “policing on the cheap” was also held by certain members of the community. Within each of the case study areas, there was a strong view, in some quarters, that the money spent on the warden schemes would be better spent on police officers. Various methods had been employed to try and change these perceptions, including the distribution of literature on the role of the wardens and

---

22 These views contrast with the findings of the base and endline surveys that found a high level of recognition and little change between the 2 survey dates (see Paragraph 14.2).
continual reinforcement of the differences at public meetings. The message was said to be slowly getting through but scheme managers still recognised that there was work to be done.

7.50 However, consultations found that those members of the community who had first hand experience of using the warden service were less likely to view them as “policing on the cheap”. The main reasons for this appeared to be:-

- A greater understanding of the role of wardens by those who had used the service. They then realised that the wardens were not the police;
- An understanding of the different approaches used by wardens and the police with the wardens lack of enforcement powers meaning that they must handle situations differently from police; and
- The responsiveness of wardens. Those who had used the service commented on how quickly the wardens dealt with their concerns.

In addition, analysis of the feedback forms, from those case study areas that used them, found a high degree of satisfaction with the warden service, with most areas reporting satisfaction levels in excess of 80%.

Conclusions

7.51 Community consultation and liaison permeates the warden schemes, as without the co-operation and consent of local residents the wardens are likely to achieve little.

7.52 Progress has been mixed. At a formal level the evidence shows that there must be a large question mark over the usefulness of compacts. Whilst in some areas the process was useful in establishing initial contacts and developing credibility, most managers felt that the resultant documents were of little value. Given this, there would seem to be little point in those schemes that do not have compacts now starting to prepare them.

7.53 One reason for the compacts being seen as of limited value may be the plethora of other plans and strategies that have emerged in recent years, many of which stress the need to involve the community. Many of these are far more all-embracing than are the compacts. As such the compacts have tended to become subsumed in them. To this extent it can be argued that the compacts have been overtaken by events.

7.54 However, at an informal level, community relationships are generally good. This no doubt reflects the many ways that the wardens interact with local residents, with particular methods being selected according to the target group.

7.55 Overall, scheme managers were satisfied with the progress they had made in engaging with young and old people but felt there was still some distance to go: firstly, in encouraging greater numbers of older people to use the service; and secondly in engaging with greater numbers of young people. The latter was considered to be the more difficult of the two.
8.1 As has been indicated in Chapter 2 (Paragraph 2.15), the monitoring frameworks had the potential to be used as outcome agreements in that all schemes were to select indicators that related to their aims. These were then to have baselines and targets set for them and were to be monitored at regular intervals. Had this been done, then impact assessment would have been relatively easy. However, few schemes did this in a systematic way.

8.2 The purpose of this Chapter is to outline some of the issues that have emerged with monitoring and to look at the lessons that might usefully be taken account of by the Executive when setting up other initiatives. Tables 8.1 and 8.2 give an overview of the key monitoring indicators for the 30 schemes that submitted their 24 month reports in time to be included in this analysis.

8.3 The guidance issued by the Executive stated that at least 4 indicators were to be selected to assess progress, 2 statistical and 2 survey based (Scottish Executive, 2003b). The indicators could then be measured at regular intervals and progress towards attaining the schemes’ objectives assessed.

8.4 The number of indicators selected varied considerably as Table 8.1 shows. For example:

• Some schemes, such as East Ayrshire, had selected 2 survey and 2 statistical indicators as specified in the guidance;
• Some schemes had not followed the guidance, and had only selected either survey or statistical indicators. This was the case in the Aberdeenshire scheme, which selected 3 statistical indicators only, whilst the Highland scheme only selected survey based indicators; and
• At the other extreme some had selected large numbers. Thus Renfrewshire had selected 25 indicators, 23 of which were statistical.

8.5 It seems unlikely that monitoring progress by collecting large numbers of indicators is necessary. It is unlikely that all will change independently of one another, so that changes in one may be paralleled by changes in others. Given this, it seems likely that there will be a substantial degree of redundancy. Not only is this a waste of resources, given the time and effort that has to go into collecting this information, but it also may give the wrong impression as to the wardens’ ability to micro-manage change.

8.6 These data collection problems were compounded in that, in some areas where the wardens operate in a number of discrete localities, data was collected separately for each one. For example, Aberdeen, Dundee and South Lanarkshire all collected data for distinct sub-areas.
### TABLE 8.1 Summary of Monitoring and Evaluation Indicators (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Warden Scheme</th>
<th>Number of statistical indicators</th>
<th>Do the indicators all match the scheme’s aims?</th>
<th>Have complete baselines been set?</th>
<th>Have complete targets been set?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeenshire</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argyll and Bute</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borders</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumfries and Galloway (Stranraer)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumfries and Galloway (Dumfries)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundee</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Ayrshire</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Dunbartonshire</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Lothian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Renfrewshire</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falkirk</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fife</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverclyde</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlothian</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moray</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Ayrshire</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lanarkshire</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orkney</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth and Kinross</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renfrewshire</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shetland</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lanarkshire</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Dunbartonshire</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lothian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Isles</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>181</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 8.2  Summary of Monitoring and Evaluation Indicators (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Warden Scheme</th>
<th>Have comparators been selected?</th>
<th>Is a full Year 1 data set included in the 24 month report?</th>
<th>Is a full Year 2 data set included in the 24 month report?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeenshire</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angus</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argyll and Bute</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borders</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumfries and Galloway</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Stranraer)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumfries and Galloway</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dumfries)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundee</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Ayrshire</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Dunbartonshire</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Lothian</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Renfrewshire</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falkirk</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fife</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverclyde</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlothian</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moray</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Ayrshire</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lanarkshire</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orkney</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth and Kinross</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renfrewshire</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shetland</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lanarkshire</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Dunbartonshire</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lothian</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Isles</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Appropriateness of the Selected Indicators to the Scheme’s Aims

8.7  There are also issues about the appropriateness of the indicators selected, given the schemes’ aims. Our assessment, based on the 24 month monitoring submissions, is that of the 30 schemes for which we had data, 12 (40%) had at least one indicator that we judged not to be appropriate given the schemes’ stated aims (Table 8.1). This was an issue identified in earlier work undertaken as part of the evaluation (Hayton and Percy, 2005a and 2005b).

8.8  The diversity of schemes, and the freedom they were given in selecting indicators, also means that there is no single indicator that is common across all schemes. For example, of the 9 case studies, the single indicator that was selected by most schemes was vandalism. Yet even this had only been selected by 5 of the 9. This means that it is impossible to find a single measure that can be used to assess overall progress. It could be argued that this is as it should be, given the diversity of
the schemes. Yet, at a strategic level, all schemes are trying to overcome antisocial behaviour problems, which, by their nature, are interrelated and reinforce one another. As such it could be argued that a single indicator should have been imposed by the Executive that all schemes had to monitor.

The Appropriateness of the Selected Indicators as the Schemes Develop

8.9 Whilst incorporating indicators at the start of the process seems commendable it needs to be remembered that most of the schemes were new (Paragraph 1.19 shows that only 8 schemes were based on earlier initiatives). As such there was limited experience as to how the wardens would operate and even less as to what impact they could have. As such there was always a possibility that the selected indicators would be found to be of limited use for measuring the impact of the wardens’ activities.

8.10 When the relevance of the indicators was discussed with the scheme managers, as part of the final round of case study interviews, a number now felt that the indicators originally selected were no longer relevant. For example:-

- In Aberdeen the indicators related to rental income and void properties were felt to be irrelevant as experience had shown that the wardens were only one of many factors that impacted upon estate management;
- In Dumfries, although there were no plans to change the indicators, there was a degree of unhappiness with them, in part as they had been selected by someone else (due to staff changes);
- In Dundee the indicators originally selected in relation to car crime were not felt to be relevant as most of these crimes took place outwith the hours that the wardens were patrolling. Accordingly discussions were ongoing about replacing these with indicators related to the illegal use of motor cycles and removal of abandoned vehicles within 21 days. In addition, the scheme manager was reviewing the use of fire statistics as a means of monitoring the warden service. However, no changes were to be made until the scheme’s future funding was secured;
- In East Renfrewshire the warden scheme was originally based in the housing department and some indicators related to such things as the numbers of void properties and rental income. The move of the wardens to the Community Safety Team, along with the demolition of large numbers of properties, meant that the manager now felt that these indicators were no longer relevant. However, they were still being used as it was not felt to be worthwhile making changes half way through the scheme’s life; and
- Orkney felt that selecting indicators relevant to the unique characteristics of the island was difficult. It was also felt that occurrences of most crimes and antisocial behaviours were so few that any changes could appear to be very dramatic in relative terms. One implication might be that greater thought needs to be given to selecting indicators for initiatives in remote areas.

8.11 There was also a view, amongst some managers, that some indicators had been selected as they were measuring issues of considerable importance to the community, even though the wardens might have limited impact on the underlying causes. The

23 The indicators measured reported theft of motor vehicles and reported break-ins to motor vehicles.
best example of this was needle collections in Dumfries. The wardens might not be able to have much impact upon drug misuse but they could deal with one of the symptoms that caused considerable community unhappiness.

8.12 What, therefore, emerged was that some schemes were being evaluated against indicators that the schemes’ managers now felt were no longer relevant. To some extent this may be inevitable as all initiatives evolve over time as experience is gained and new problems are encountered. However, some managers also felt that, with hindsight, more time should have been given to select indicators prior to the schemes becoming operational.

Setting Baselines

8.13 Once indicators had been selected then, if they were to be used, baselines needed to be set: that is the value of the indicator at the start of the wardens’ intervention had to be measured. Again, even by the time the 24 month reports were submitted, progress in setting baselines was far from complete. For example, GEN’s assessment was that, for the statistical variables, complete baselines had not been set by 13 (43%) of the 30 schemes for which we had information (Table 8.1).

8.14 Even where baselines had been set there were concerns about their validity. Some baselines that had been set covered different time periods from the year 1 and 2 data (or vice versa). For example, the Aberdeenshire scheme set a baseline for one indicator using data covering the 10 am to 10 pm period. However, the year 2 data covered 24 hours. Other schemes, such as Aberdeen, had set baselines using police geographies that subsequently changed.

Targets

8.15 Implementation progress was then to be assessed by setting targets for the ends of Years 1 and 2. The extent to which these were attained could then be used to monitor progress and make changes to activities and processes as necessary. As recently as the 24 month report, half of the 30 schemes had not set targets (Table 8.1).

8.16 Even when targets had been set there were often issues with them. For example:-

- Some were statistically meaningless, for example when targets were set to reduce incidences by 1% or when targets were set to reduce an indicator by 10% when there had only been 4 actual incidents. The most extreme example of this was the scheme that wanted to reduce 0 recorded instances of littering by 10%;
- Some schemes had set targets but had not set any baselines;
- Some had not set numerical targets but talked in general terms about “increases” or “decreases”; and
- At least one scheme had set a target for a service output, rather than an outcome.
Comparators

8.17 To be able to assess changes in the warded areas there is a need to be able to benchmark the schemes against some wider area. Comparisons of relative changes in indicators will then allow assumptions to be made about the impact of the wardens.

8.18 Table 8.2 shows that only 4 schemes had selected comparators for all indicators, although more had selected comparators for some. The comparators selected fell into 3 main groups:

- Those that were to use the wider council area to assess progress. This was helped by the fact that SHS data was available for the local authority areas every other year, thereby giving an authoritative comparator;
- The schemes that proposed to benchmark themselves against similar areas, as with Orkney that intended to compare itself to Shetland and the Western Isles; and
- Those schemes that would benchmark the warded areas against the wider urban area in which the scheme operated. For example, Angus intended to compare its scheme, that operated in parts of Arbroath, with the whole of the town.

8.19 Despite some progress there was cause for concern given that, at least 24 months into the implementation of the warden schemes, most had not selected comparators and begun to gather appropriate data.

The Ability to Use the Data to Assess Progress

8.20 Table 8.2 shows which authorities submitted full year 1 and year 2 data sets thereby enabling progress to be assessed. It can be seen that:

- 60% had submitted full year 1 data sets; and
- 53% had submitted full year 2 data.

Only 13 schemes (43%) had submitted full data sets for both years. Again the failure of more schemes to supply complete data is disappointing.

Survey Issues

8.21 The Executive’s guidance asked authorities to select 2 survey based indicators. The analysis undertaken for the 6 month report found that, to collect these, the schemes were:

- Commissioning consultants to undertake warden-specific surveys (as in Dundee and East Dunbartonshire);
- Doing surveys themselves (Midlothian and West Dunbartonshire); or
- Including questions relevant to the wardens in council-wide tenants’ surveys (Edinburgh).

8.22 Details of the response rates were given for some of these surveys in the 6 month reports. In some instances, they were very low. For example, West Lothian had
a 7% response rate whilst West Dunbartonshire’s was 13.6%. Others had better responses. For example, Angus had a 32% rate, Orkney between 35% to 40% and Perth and Kinross 50%. Many of the other reports gave no details of the survey methodology or response rates. From the questionnaires seen, low response rates often seemed to reflect inadequate methodologies such as sending out questionnaires at holiday times, failing to offer incentives or giving lengthy return times.

8.23 As far as can be judged, few of the schemes made any attempts to see how representative of the demographic characteristics of the areas the responses were. Indeed, often this was impossible as respondent profile information was not requested on the survey forms.

8.24 The intention, in most authorities, was to repeat the surveys at a later date and compare the 2 sets of results. Any changes would then be ascribed to the wardens’ interventions. However, we felt that there was a danger that, if no attempt was made to repeat the surveys using the same sample, then the 2 sets of results would not be comparable. Any comparisons over time, therefore, would be of limited use as those being sampled would be totally different. Only Stirling commented upon this in its 6 month return when it stated that it would repeat its community survey using the same respondent base.

8.25 It was also felt that the responses were unlikely to be representative, being largely drawn from those who were “professional complainers”. This was hinted at in North Ayrshire’s 6 month report which commented on the attitudes of elderly people within the warded areas towards the young, whom they blamed for everything. Without a robust survey methodology we felt that there was a danger that such unrepresentative views would come to dominate the survey results.

8.26 As far as can be judged, very few of the schemes attempted to interpret survey results in the light of these deficiencies. Indeed many of the concerns identified in the 6 month report were repeated in the 12 month report (Hayton and Percy, 2005b). GEN, therefore, felt that there was a strong risk of widespread misattribution if reliance was to be placed on such surveys to evaluate the impact of the warden schemes.

8.27 Given these problems, our view, based on the analysis of the 6 month reports, was that many of the surveys that the schemes were undertaking were of dubious value and would be of limited use for assessing the impact of wardens’ interventions. Given this, it was agreed that the evaluation would not draw on the survey data. Instead base and endline surveys would be undertaken as part of this evaluation in the case study and 2 control areas. These would then be used to look at changes in residents’ perceptions. Full details of these surveys are given in Chapter 2 (Paragraphs 2.20 to 2.28).

Boundary Problems

8.28 The 6 month reports identified a range of problems related to the different geographies for which data was collected. The main one was a lack of correspondence between the areas patrolled by the wardens and police beats, which tended to be the
lowest spatial units for which crime statistics were generated. This was identified as an issue by 9 councils when the 6 month reports were submitted.

8.29 However, generally most councils seemed to feel that boundary problems were relatively minor. Indeed these did not figure as an issue in the 12 month reports. As such they are probably best seen as teething problems.

Conclusions

8.30 Despite having built in systems for monitoring and evaluation of the wardens schemes at their inception, the results have been disappointing, with a widespread failure by many schemes to gather the data needed to populate the monitoring templates. A number of reasons can be put forward to explain this:-

- The schemes did not see monitoring and evaluation as being important alongside of the need to set up and establish the schemes. It had, therefore, always been given a low priority. This was an impression reinforced through the interviews with managers and by the difficulties experienced in getting schemes to submit their monitoring reports on time; and
- A seeming reluctance by the Executive to act when there was widespread evidence that monitoring was not been undertaken. Some of the Executive’s actions, no doubt, sent the wrong messages to the schemes. For example, despite the schemes being asked to select 4 indicators, those who failed to do this were not challenged, likewise when the reports on the monitoring templates highlighted widespread data gaps little action was taken to remedy this.

8.31 In the light of this we would suggest that, should similar schemes be rolled out by the Executive, monitoring needs to be treated far more seriously. How this should be done is outlined in Chapter Seventeen.
CHAPTER NINE THEORIES OF CHANGE – THE WARDENS’ IMPACT ON CRIME STATISTICS

Introduction

9.1 Community wardens have now been operating across the United Kingdom for a number of years. Whilst working towards broadly similar sets of objectives, they perform different functions depending on the legislative framework under which they operate and the specific needs of the communities which they serve. They also often operate as part of a wider set of community initiatives. Given this, attempting to evaluate the impact of community wardens is difficult. It is, however, possible to develop a number of theories as to the impact that the wardens might have upon the incidence of recorded crime and antisocial behaviour. These can then be tested in subsequent Chapters when changes in key statistics are analysed.

Impact Theories

9.2 We start by outlining 4 broad changes that might be observed in the statistics for recorded crime and antisocial behaviours. These are:-

- **Rise and Fall**, when the recorded incidence of crime initially rises and then begins to fall;
- **Fall**, when recorded crime falls steadily until there is no differential between the areas in which the wardens are based and the wider region;
- **Neutral**, when recorded crime levels change in parallel with changes in the wider region with no noticeable change being attributable to the wardens; and
- **Rise**, when the recorded incidents of crimes increase over time.

9.3 Each of these statistical changes can be explained in terms of a number of theories. Thus:-

- Three theories can be put forward to explain **Rise and Fall** change:-
  - The first (the **Rise and Fall (Confidence)** theory) is positive in that reported crime rises as residents become confident that the wardens will ensure that something is done about crime. After this initial rise, recorded crime levels begin to fall, reflecting a drop in the “real” levels of crime as a result of the wardens’ activities;
  - The second is relatively negative (**Rise and Fall (Misplaced Confidence)**) in that recorded crime levels rise as confidence in the wardens increases. However, over time it becomes clear that the wardens are incapable of influencing crime levels. Accordingly residents stop reporting crimes and the statistics fall, although the real crime levels remain as high as before; and
• The third is **Displacement** in that the eventual fall in reported crime is a reflection of crime being displaced to adjacent areas where the perpetrators feel that there is less chance of being apprehended;

• The theory underpinning **Fall** changes is that the wardens immediately start to influence crime levels so that the numbers of reported crimes begin to fall very soon after the wardens start operating. Eventually the situation stabilises when crime levels in the wardened areas match those in the wider region. This can be described as the **Positive Intervention** theory;

• A number of theories can be put forward to explain **Neutral** change:-
  - The first (**No Impact**) is that the severity of problems within the area is such that the wardens are unable to have any impact upon them so that there is no change in reported crime levels;
  - The second is the **Spillover** theory. That there is no differential change between the wardened and non-wardened areas reflects the fact that the wardens’ interventions have diffused into the wider, non-wardened, areas, so that recorded levels of crime fall in the wider sub-region as well as the areas in which the wardens operate;
  - The third theory is **Compensation**. Under this, recorded crime levels in wardened, and non-wardened areas, fall at the same rate because additional crime interventions are put in place in the non-wardened areas to ensure an even distribution of resources and anti-crime initiatives across the whole of the local authority area;

• There are 2 possible theories that can be put forward to explain **Rise** changes:-
  - The first **Rise Positive** can take 2 forms. First, there is an increase in the incidence of reported crime, but this is due to an increase in reporting (reflecting confidence that something will be done) rather than any actual increase in “real” levels. Alternatively, there has been an increase in the incidence of crime, but at a rate slower than the change in the wider area. This essentially suggests that the area has improved relative to the wider area. Both explanations can be interpreted positively; and
  - The second **Rise Negative** assumes that the incidence of crime increases and continues to increase, faster than the wider area comparator. The suggestion with this theory is that crime is essentially out of control and that the wardens have failed to have an impact.

These theories are underpinned to various extents by evidence from other evaluations. This will now be considered.

**The Evidence Base**

9.4 The theory most commonly discussed by commentators is **Rise and Fall (Confidence)**. In this, initially, there may be limited impact upon recorded figures for crime and offences. However, once the wardens become better known and trusted in the community reported crime levels rise as there is greater confidence that reporting an incident will lead to action being taken. Following this initial increase, crime levels begin to fall for 2 main reasons:-
Those inclined to undertake criminal and antisocial behaviour actions move elsewhere, as they realise that they stand a greater chance of being apprehended in the areas where the wardens are active: in effect displacement occurs; and

The intervention of the wardens results in those who perpetrate such acts becoming aware of the impact of their actions. This then causes behaviour modification. This might come about through such things as the wardens’ interventions with young people and school visits. However this is likely to be a long term impact and as such may be very hard to prove.

9.5 This scenario was the one envisaged by the Executive when the wardens schemes were first launched (Scottish Executive, July 2003b). It is supported by the work of Shiel et al (2005) who recognised the potential of crime prevention initiatives to contribute to an initial increase in observed crime rates as residents’ confidence grew. This was supported by the Evaluation of the Neighbourhood Warden Service in Northern Ireland which concluded that, amongst tenants, there was a greater willingness to report incidents after the wardens began operating (Northern Ireland Housing Executive, 2003, 67).

9.6 Local evidence to support this theory comes from the East Ayrshire “Building Strong, Safe, Attractive Communities” (BSSAC) Programme Evaluation (Holden McAllister, 2006, 49) where data showed that for the first 8 months of operation the numbers of reported incidents increased before falling dramatically and then levelling off.

9.7 However, conclusive evidence that wardens are contributing to behaviour modification is generally lacking due to the complexity of the issue, the number of variables involved and a lack of robust research. This, in part, reflects the relatively short timescale over which wardens have been operating. At best it is possible to present qualitative evidence of the impact of educational and diversionary activities and draw inferences about the potential impacts such interventions may have on offending behaviour.

9.8 There is little evidence to support the Rise and Fall (Misplaced Confidence) theory. This theory assumes that initially reported crimes increase as residents feel confident in the wardens and think that action will be taken. However, over time, this confidence begins to decrease as residents perceive that little has changed. Accordingly they begin to stop reporting crimes. The official figures fall but the “real” level of crime remains high.

9.9 Similarly, the evidence to support the Rise and Fall (Displacement) theory tends to be less than conclusive. For example, the Evaluation of the Community Safety Warden Initiative undertaken on behalf of Dundee City Council in 2006 reached an uncertain conclusion in relation to displacement. Focus group participants recognised that a degree of displacement might occur but they also commented that the movement of young people between areas was historical and had not occurred as a result of the introduction of the wardens (Blake Stevenson 2006, 20).

9.10 Qualitative evidence of displacement was, however, highlighted by Shiel et al (2005, 22) in relation to Renfrewshire. Following the introduction of wardens,
considerable pressure was put on Renfrew’s hire Council to extend the scheme across the local authority area. This support, asserted Shiel et al, arose partly in recognition of the need to reduce the level of displacement of antisocial behaviour from the areas patrolled by the wardens.

9.11 Under the **Positive Intervention** theory it is assumed that the wardens’ interventions are successful from the first with a resultant decrease in incidences of crime and antisocial behaviour. There is evidence to back up this scenario. For example, whilst residents of areas patrolled by wardens are more likely to be victims of crime than the national average, the Neighbourhood Warden Scheme Evaluation suggested that the risk had declined since the introduction of wardens. Thus the residents’ survey carried out as a part of the Evaluation suggested that there had been a 27.6% decrease in the overall rate of residents experiencing personal or property crime, amounting to 171,700 fewer offences in the 18 months between the 2 surveys (Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, 2004, 30). However, while recognising the role of Neighbourhood Wardens in crime prevention, the report emphasised that it would be unrealistic to attribute this decline solely to the wardens’ interventions.

9.12 The successes of the wardens were also highlighted by Shiel et al (2005, 21) who, when discussing the impact of Neighbourhood Wardens in Renfrewshire, presented evidence of reductions in a number of neighbourhood problems. For example, there was:

- An average reduction of 43.5% in the cost of vandalism to council properties;
- A reduction in the number of reported acts of vandalism;
- An average reduction of 25% in vehicle crimes across scheme areas, compared to a 17% reduction across Renfrewshire; and
- A reduction in disorder crimes in 3 of the 4 warden areas, with an average reduction of 7%, compared to an average increase across Renfrewshire of 5.2%.

9.13 The first main explanation of Neutral change is **No Impact**, when the wardens, because of the severity of problems in the areas in which they are based, or because they prove to be relatively ineffective, have no, or a very limited, impact upon recorded crime levels. There is little supporting evidence from evaluations to underpin this, although it must be seen as a possible outcome.

9.14 The second explanation under the **Neutral** theory is **Spillover** when there may be little, or no, measurable comparative difference in levels of crime and antisocial behaviour between areas served by the wardens and adjacent areas. The reason for this reflects the fact that the wardens’ interventions have had a widespread positive impact and have diffused benefits to a wider area than the one on which their activities are targeted.

9.15 Whilst diffusion of benefits, and spillover effects, have been well documented in relation to other crime and antisocial behaviour prevention strategies (for example, the installation of CCTV) evidence in relation to community wardens is inconclusive. This reflects the complexity of the issue and the limited data that is currently available. For example, the Neighbourhood Warden Scheme Evaluation draws attention to the findings of previous research that identified a degree of spillover to
non-scheme areas. However, as conclusive data was lacking, the evaluation assumed that diffusion of benefits was more or less balanced by displacement of crime from the scheme to adjacent areas (Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, 2004).

9.16 The final theory that could possibly account for Neutral change is Compensation. Again in this there may be no, or little, measurable difference in levels of crime and antisocial behaviour between areas served by wardens and comparator areas. This is because local authorities have directed additional resources to non-wardened areas to ensure that they do not suffer from comparatively higher crime rates. This scenario is proposed by the National Evaluation of the Street Wardens (Department for Communities and Local Government, 2006, 113).

9.17 The Compensation theory is also supported by the National Evaluation of Community Support Officers (CSOs) 24 (Home Office Research, 2006). This uncovered no discernable differences in trends in the numbers of crimes and incidents between areas with and those without CSO’s, before and after their introduction.

9.18 The Rise theories are not well evidenced. Few of the evaluation reports made any mention of an increase in the incidence of crime (either positively or negatively), especially a sustained increase in recorded offences. The only mentions came when talking theoretically about possible longer term increases in incidents. This lack of evidence is surprising, given that this must be considered as a realistic outcome in some areas.

Ascribing Cause and Effect

9.19 Scottish community wardens are not operating in isolation. Within Scotland they are but one of a large number of initiatives that have been implemented in recent years to try to deal with the problems of antisocial behaviour. For example, in addition to Community Wardens, East Ayrshire Council’s BSSAC Programme includes (Holden McAllister, 2006):-

- A dedicated Antisocial Behaviour Investigation Team;
- Provision of an antisocial behaviour “helpline” available to all East Ayrshire residents;
- Initiatives to discourage underage drinking;
- Extension of provision of Victim Support Services to those affected by antisocial behaviour across East Ayrshire;
- Purchase of a “Respond UK Netpoint” system to allow complainants to register incidences of antisocial behaviour using the internet; and
- Creation of new posts including: an Antisocial Behaviour Co-ordinator, an Antisocial Behaviour Development Officer and a Police/Council Administration Officer to facilitate information flow between key partners.

Although this range of initiatives may be exceptional, most of the case study local authorities have implemented other antisocial behaviour projects, in addition to the warden schemes, as part of their antisocial behaviour strategies.

---

24 They are sometimes referred to as Police Community Support Officers (PCSOS).
This diversity of initiatives means that attributing the contribution of community wardens to observed changes in crime and antisocial behaviour is difficult. Such difficulties are acknowledged in the evaluation of East Ayrshire Council’s BSSAC programme (Holden McAllister, 2006, 23) and the National Evaluation of the Street Wardens (Department for Communities and Local Government, 2006, 113). The latter hypothesised that, in order to ensure the equitable division of resources, local authorities may target non-warden areas for alternative crime and antisocial behaviour reduction measures thereby diluting evidence of the impact of community wardens.

It is also the case that any analysis, based on incidents reported to the police, is using data that is only a partial reflection of the reality of crime. For example, the Scottish Crime and Victimisation Survey suggests that only 44% of crimes recorded by the survey came to the attention of the police (Scottish Executive, 2006). The remaining 56% were unreported and unrecorded in official crime statistics. This suggests that there is scope for recorded crime to increase without there being any increase in the number of offences.

In addition, reporting of crimes and offences is influenced by media reporting of incidents, perceptions of the likelihood of action being taken if a crime is reported and fear of retribution if incidents are reported. Given these factors, ascribing changes to the interventions of wardens is, as previously stated, not a straightforward task. This is also the conclusion that has emerged from other studies that have tried to analyse the impact of wardens and similar types of interventions, in particular the Neighbourhood Warden Scheme Evaluation (Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, 2004) and the National Evaluation of Police Community Support Officers (Home Office Research, 2006).

There is also a need to acknowledge the potential impact on recorded crime following the implementation of the Scottish Crime Recording Standard (SCRS). The main change that this introduced was that there was no longer a need for corroboration for an incident to be recorded as a crime. The intention was to introduce a victim-orientated approach to crime reporting. The Executive’s view was that this would:

“Increase the numbers of minor crimes …….such as …..vandalism and minor thefts. However, it was expected that the SCRS would not have much impact on the figures for the more serious crimes such as serious assault, sexual assault, robbery or housebreaking” (Scottish Executive, 2005, Para 1.2).

Identifying the impact of SCRS has however, been made difficult by the introduction at the same time, of centralised call centres to deal with calls to the police. It is felt that this has encouraged greater reporting of incidents (Scottish Executive, 2005, Para. 3.2).

Despite these changes in recording and reporting, we have no evidence to suggest that they are likely to have had any differential spatial impact across Scotland. As such all warden schemes, and any comparator areas, should be affected to the same extent. Accordingly, for the purposes of this analysis, we feel that these changes can be ignored.
Conclusions

9.26 The above paragraphs highlight the complexity of trying to assess the impact of the warden schemes using official statistics. There could be many explanations for the apparent variations in performance across schemes. These could include:

- The quality of management;
- The quality of the wardens and the diligence with which they approach their job;
- The severity of problems in particular areas; and
- The ability of the wardens to influence some of the indicators as, for example, in Dundee where there are now doubts about the wardens’ ability to impact upon car crime.

9.27 This complexity was highlighted in the National Evaluation of the Neighbourhood Warden Scheme in England and Wales which stated that:

“Evaluating the impact on crime, which is attributable to a single intervention, is notoriously complex”, (Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, 2004, 30).

Other evaluations of warden schemes have failed to undertake any analysis of statistical indicators. This would seem to underline the difficulties, both of doing this and of interpreting the results\(^\text{25}\). Despite this, in the next Chapter attempts are made to analyse the statistics to see if it is possible to identify the impact of the wardens on recorded crime and other indicators and to substantiate some of the theories outlined earlier. We start by looking at the impact on the case study areas.

\(^{25}\) For example, the evaluations of the English and Welsh and the Northern Ireland warden schemes.
CHAPTER TEN  THE IMPACTS OF THE WARDENS ON CRIME IN THE CASE STUDY AREAS

Introduction

10.1 To measure the impact of the warden schemes on crime and antisocial behaviour, each scheme was required to produce a plan for monitoring and evaluating their service and required to collect survey and statistical indicators at 6, 12 and 24 month intervals. These were then to be used to monitor progress. As Chapter 8 makes clear, when the survey based indicators were assessed, following the submission of the 6 month reports, there was a degree of concern about the methodologies that some of the schemes were using. To remedy these deficiencies the decision was made to undertake independent attitudinal base and endline surveys in the case study and 2 control areas. The results of these are reported in Chapter Twelve. As such the focus of this Chapter is upon the statistical indicators.

10.2 As Chapter 2 makes clear, the schemes were to select a set of core statistical indicators from a list provided by the Executive. Schemes were, however, at liberty to select other indicators in addition to those prescribed by the Executive. The schemes were therefore undertaking self-assessment, with progress being measured against indicators that they had selected themselves: indicators that were to reflect objective attainment. However, as Chapter Eight (Paragraph 8.10) makes clear, in retrospect some scheme managers now feel that some of the indicators originally selected are no longer appropriate, in part as experience has shown that wardens are unable to have an impact upon some aspects of antisocial behaviour and crime.

10.3 The statistical indicators suggested by the Scottish Executive for use in the monitoring and evaluation of the schemes covered:

- The impact on crime (based on levels of recorded crime, focusing on crimes such as vandalism, littering, housebreaking and harassment);
- The impact on the number of recorded incidents of antisocial behaviour; and
- The impact on the number of empty properties and rental income generated.

As the above list shows, the Executive was generally not so prescriptive as to specify the exact indicators to be used. For example, antisocial behaviour covers a multitude of different crimes and offences. As such schemes had considerable discretion as to the indicators they selected.

10.4 Ideally impact assessment would be undertaken by looking at the changes in a range of crime and antisocial behaviour statistics over time across all of the Scottish warden schemes. These changes would then be compared to changes in the wider areas in which the schemes were based and the differential impact of the schemes could therefore be isolated. However, each of the schemes selected different combinations of indicators, reflecting the local priorities of partners and differing objectives. This means that there are relatively few indicators (if any) that are common to all schemes. It is also the case (as Chapter Eight makes clear) that the quality of the monitoring data provided varies considerably, with relatively few
schemes providing complete time series statistical data from base line through to the 24 month report.

10.5 Given these methodological issues, the approach taken in this Chapter is to analyse the data that relates to the selected indicators for the 9 case study areas. Each area is looked at alphabetically, starting with Aberdeen. The approach is to look at the changes in the statistical indicators and to compare these changes with the wider trends in the local authority area as a means of isolating the impact of the warden schemes. When possible the changes are related to the various theories outlined in Chapter Nine. The case studies and the survey data (that is explored more thoroughly in Chapter Twelve) are also drawn upon to provide additional evidence to explain the observed changes.

10.6 The analysis is complex and often does not result in clear conclusions being reached as to the impact that the wardens are having upon crime and antisocial behaviour. The analysis is further complicated by:-

- The failure of all schemes to provide full data sets;
- Variations across schemes as to whether they collected, and provided, data for all of the sub-areas in which the wardens operated. Generally the larger schemes did this, whilst the smaller ones tended to provide aggregated data only; and
- The existence of other initiatives targeted at antisocial behaviour, both within the areas patrolled by the wardens and the wider local authority area.

Aberdeen

10.7 In the Aberdeen case study 6 indicators were collected as part of the monitoring of the scheme. They covered:-

- Vandalism;
- Breach of the Peace;
- Drunk and Incapable;
- Racially Aggravated Conduct;
- Wilful Fire Raising; and
- Urinating in Public.

These indicators have been collected for 6 warden areas in the city. These cover Heathryfold/Middlefield (though there is no baseline data for this scheme which means it has been excluded from this analysis), Northfield and Cummings Park, Tillydrone and Woodside, Torry, Mastrick and Seaton and Old Aberdeen/Powmis. Where data for the whole of the local authority area are available this is used to draw comparisons.

10.8 Vandalism accounts for the single largest number of crimes in the Aberdeen warden scheme. Overall, the number of crimes increased from a baseline of 1,544 to 1,933 in year 2, an increase of 25%. This was faster than a 15% increase in Aberdeen as a whole, which suggests that the warden area has performed worse than the local authority area.
10.9 There was a significant degree of variation across the warden areas in the city. For example:-

- There was a 120% increase in incidents in Mastrick, although most of this took place between the baseline and year 1;
- There was a 52% decline in vandalism in Northfield and Cummings Park overall, with most of the decline occurring between the baseline and year 1, although there was a further, albeit slower, decline between years 1 and 2;
- There was an 87% increase in Torry between the baseline and year 2, although this hides a 4% decline between years 1 and 2;
- There was a 16% increase in Tillydrone and Woodside between the baseline and year 2, although this hides a 5% decline between years 1 and 2; and
- There was a 31% increase in Seaton, Old Aberdeen and Powmis between year 1 and year 2.

The changes across the individual areas and for the whole of the City are shown in Chart 10.1.

**CHART 10.1 Changes in Reported Incidents of Vandalism in Aberdeen**

This is a mixed picture showing some apparent successes alongside some significant growth in the number of vandalism crimes. When the results of the perception surveys are considered (Chapter Twelve, Table 12.4) it can be seen that the general view is that vandalism has increased between the base and endline surveys. However, consultations with the police and the scheme manager, suggest that proactive policing (supported by the wardens) has increased detection rates for vandalism under a city-wide crackdown. However, this might also result in perceptions of the scale of vandalism increasing. The opinion of the police and the
local authority is that the overall trend is positive and that the increase reflects vandalism having been made a priority for Grampian Police. This has increased the recording of incidents, the detection of perpetrators and the perceptions of it as a crime. Given this it could be argued that the trend conforms to the Rise (Positive) theory. However, it is equally plausible that the Rise (Negative) theory applies. As such it is wise to assume that no conclusive explanation can be put forward.

10.11 The number of recorded Breach of the Peace incidents was also used to monitor the impact of the warden service. Overall, there was an increase in the number of offences: from a baseline of 971 to 1,686 in year 2, an increase of 74%. This increase was significantly faster than the 52% increase in Aberdeen for the same 2 year period.

10.12 There was a significant degree of variation across the wardened areas, further complicating the picture. The key trends were that:-

- There was a 188% increase in the number of Breach of the Peace offences in Mastrick, though most of this occurred between the baseline and year 1;
- There was a 91% increase in Tillydrone and Woodside. Again most of this took place between the baseline and year 1;
- There was a 10% decline in the number of offences in Northfield and Cummings Park. This decline was relatively small but consistent between each of the years; and
- There was a 66% increase in offences in Seaton, Old Aberdeen/ and Powmis and a 50% increase in Torry. However, in each case the overall increase masks a decline (of 3% and 14% respectively) between years 1 and 2.

The changes are illustrated in Chart 10.2.
10.13 Again, this is a mixed picture, showing some decreases as well as some major increases in the number of offences. Although there is some evidence, from the perception survey (Table 12.4), that perceptions of antisocial behaviours most closely associated with breaches of the peace (noisy neighbours and intimidation) have improved over time, a more cautious interpretation would seem to be that the changes conform to the Rise (Negative) theory.

10.14 Overall, there was a 29% increase in the number of reported drunk and incapacable incidents. This is an increase from the baseline position of 209 to a year 2 figure of 269. The overall change though was slower than the 97% increase in the number of incidents across Aberdeen. This change also masks a 6% decline between year 1 and year 2. This fits with the Rise (Positive) theory in that the overall change is actually an improvement relative to the City.

10.15 The number of racially aggravated conduct incidents declined by 8% across the warden areas. This change has largely been driven by the decline between years 1 and 2 after a small increase from the baseline to year 1. Unfortunately an Aberdeen City comparator is not available that is calculated on the same basis. As such no definitive conclusion as to impact can be drawn.

10.16 The number of urinating in public offences increased by 400% across the Aberdeen warden schemes. However, this amounts to just 20 more incidents in year 2 than in the baseline. Across Aberdeen as a whole there were only 43 more incidents over the same period, suggesting that the warden areas accounted for half of the City’s increase. Given these small numbers it is dangerous to read too much into this change. However, the very public and victimless nature of this offence means that it is
possible that this increase in recorded incidents was driven by an increase in detection rates which could, in part, be due to the presence of the wardens. Despite this we feel that no conclusion as to impact can be drawn.

10.17 The data collected on fire raising incidents only covers the year 1 and year 2 monitoring periods, as no baseline data were collected. Between years 1 and 2 there was a 5% decline in the warden areas. The picture across the sub-areas was mixed, with there being:

- A 15% decline in Tillydrone and Woodside between years 1 and 2;
- A 3% decline in Torry and a 1% drop in Mastrick; and
- An increased number of incidents in Seaton, Old Aberdeen and Powmis and Northfield and Cummings Park (21% and 16% respectively).

While it is not possible to arrive at robust conclusions from just one year’s data the figures would appear to suggest that this change fits with the Positive Intervention theory. Initiatives such as the Gramps scheme will have played a key part in this positive change. This was developed under the banner of the Torry Total Communities initiative and involves the wardens working with a wide range of local partners, including the fire and rescue service, neighbourhood police and local nature reserve volunteers to reduce wilful fire raising in the Tullos Hill and Kincorth Nature Reserve. It may be that initiatives such as this are now being reflected in the statistics. However, without the wider local authority comparator data it is not possible to reach any definitive conclusions as to what was driving change.

10.18 Overall, it is difficult to assess the wider changes in the Aberdeen scheme. The broad pattern appears to suggest that the instances of reported crimes and offences have increased in the warden areas, with some showing a Rise and Fall pattern, but most showing a continual rise. Of the 4 indicators that show a rise in recorded crime, 2 (vandalism and breach of the peace) may conform to the Rise (Negative) theory because the increases in the wardened areas have been greater than those in the wider area. For the Drunk and Incapable indicator the increases in the wardened areas were smaller than in the wider comparator. This can, therefore, be explained by the Rise (Positive) theory. For the fourth indicator for which there was a rise in the number of incidents (Urinating in Public) we have not been able to speculate as to which theory may apply. Two indicators show a decline (racially aggravated and fire raising incidents). However, the lack of local authority comparator data means that it is not possible to explain this adequately. Overall, therefore, the analysis of the statistics shows a mixed picture with limited evidence of any across the board impact. However, this negative picture is, to some extent, contradicted by the perception surveys. For example, between the base and endline surveys there was a 48% increase in the numbers of respondents rating their Neighbourhood as “Very Good” whilst in the endline survey 51% of respondents felt that the wardens had improved the quality of life in their locality.

Dumfries and Galloway (North West Dumfries)

10.19 In the Dumfries and Galloway case study 9 indicators were to be collected to monitor the scheme, which covers the 5 communities of Lochside, Lincluden,
Stakeford, Summerhill and Summerville. The data was, however, not collected for the individual sub-areas but for the scheme as a whole. The indicators were:-

- Neighbourhood disputes;
- Breaches of the Peace;
- Assaults;
- Cases of Shoplifting;
- Number of needles collected;
- Housebreaking;
- Drug Related Crimes;
- Malicious False Alarm; and
- Vandalism.

In retrospect the manager now feels that several of these indicators are things that the wardens can have little impact upon, for example assaults, shoplifting and burglaries. However, they are still being used to monitor progress and accordingly are analysed here.

10.20 There are 2 gaps in the data across the Dumfries scheme. There is no year 2 figure for the number of Drug Related Crimes and no baseline for the number of instances of Vandalism. Accordingly these indicators have not been included in the analysis.

10.21 The number of neighbourhood disputes in the Dumfries scheme has decline from a baseline of 405 to a year 2 position of 176, a reduction of 57%. This change reflects a substantial decline in the number of disputes between years 1 and 2, as there had been a considerable increase from the baseline to year 1. This seems to conform to the Rise and Fall (Confidence) theory. This is backed up by the perception survey (Table 12.4) which shows that the perception of the prevalence of noisy neighbours as an issue has decreased by 12% between the base and endline surveys. However, the absence of a local authority comparator means that this interpretation cannot be proved.

10.22 The number of Breach of the Peace offences has increased from a baseline of 79 to a year 2 figure of 262, an increase of 232%. This compares to a 6% reduction in offences across Dumfries and Galloway. However, the wardens in Dumfries take a proactive approach to public drinking offences by targeting drinking dens in the Whitesands area of the town. The increase in the number of offences may, therefore, reflect this (particularly as detection of Breach of the Peace depends heavily on surveillance) and provides support for the Rise (Positive) theory. This positive view is backed up by the perception survey (Table 12.4) where perceptions of the prevalence of 4 out of 5 types of antisocial behaviour show decreases. However, given the size of the increase, it is difficult to rule out the Rise (Negative) theory, indeed given the scale of the increase it is probably cautious to ascribe impact to this theory.

10.23 The number of assaults has increased from a baseline of 45 to a year 2 figure of 194, an increase of 331%, in contrast to the 17% decline in serious assaults and the 8% decline in minor assaults across Dumfries and Galloway. As such we conclude that this change can be explained by the Rise (Negative) theory, with crime appearing to be increasing quite substantially as against a reduction in Dumfries and Galloway.
as a whole. However, as mentioned later (Paragraph 11.3) it seems unlikely that the wardens can have a direct impact on assaults. As such this may not be a sensible, or fair, indicator against which to measure progress.

10.24 The number of cases of shoplifting has risen from the baseline of 15 to a year 2 figure of 120, an increase of 380%: substantially greater than the 14% increase across Dumfries and Galloway. This rapid increase, from a low baseline figure, again highlights what appears to be a consistent trend across the warden areas, of an increase in recorded crime. The change has been significantly faster than the increase in shoplifting across the local authority as a whole. As such we classify this as Rise (Negative). Yet, as with assaults, the wardens may have difficulties in having any impact upon shoplifting, which calls into question the relevance of this indicator.

10.25 The numbers of needles collected increased substantially, from a baseline of 99 to a year 2 figure of 402, a 308% increase. However, this indicator differs from the others in that it is an output, not an outcome, measure: that is it is a measure of activity not impact. As such it does not lend itself to interpretation in terms of the theories outlined in Chapter 9.

10.26 The number of housebreakings has more than doubled (+113%) from a baseline of 23. This increase was in stark contrast to a 42% decline across Dumfries and Galloway. This change is heavily skewed by the low baseline, which means that the overall change is not as extreme as it might appear. Again, the pattern shows a clear increase at a time when recorded incidents in the whole local authority area have fallen. This suggests the Rise (Negative) theory, with the wardens being unable to influence this indicator.

10.27 The number of malicious false alarm calls has increased from a baseline of 8 to a year 2 total of 21, an increase of 263%. However, given the small absolute numbers, it is probably foolish to read too much into this. Accordingly no conclusions as to impact have been drawn.

10.28 Overall there appears to be a clear trend in the Dumfries scheme that suggests that there has been limited impact on crime or antisocial behaviour by the wardens. On almost all indicators the figures have increased rapidly from the baseline and between years 1 and 2 at the same time as the wider local authority area has been experiencing sustained reductions in the same types of crimes and offences. However, this rather negative interpretation has to be balanced by the generally positive picture that merges from the perception survey (see, for example, Tables 12.4 and 12.7).

Dundee

10.29 In Dundee 8 monitoring indicators were selected for the 6 warden areas in the city: Hilltown and Bowbridge, Douglas, Whitfield, Stobswell, Lochee West and Charleston and Pitkerro. The indicators are:-

- Youth Disturbance calls;
- Noise related calls;
- Vandalism;
- Break-ins to Motor Vehicles;
• Theft of Motor Vehicles;
• Fire incidents Reported for Malicious Intent;
• Malicious Fire Incidents Attended; and
• Malicious Fire False Alarms.

10.30 Although the indicators are being used to monitor the scheme, and are reported to the Executive in the templates, the Dundee scheme manager is now reviewing the 3 indicators associated with malicious fire raising, in partnership with the fire and rescue service, to assess their suitability. The manager also now feels that it is unclear what impact the wardens can have on the 2 motor vehicle offences. However, as these 5 indicators are being reported to the Executive they will be analysed, although they will only be assessed for the whole scheme, rather than the sub areas, in order to provide some assessment of the direction and scale of change.

10.31 Overall, the number of Youth Disturbance Calls to the police has declined from a baseline of 3,109 to a year 2 figure of 2,423: a 22% reduction. This overall decline was generally matched in the individual sub-areas (see Chart 10.3). Thus:-

• There was a 46% decline in the number of calls in Douglas;
• There were substantial decreases in Stobswell (33%), Pitkerro (30%) and Hilltown and Bowbridge (29%);
• There was a slower decline in the number of calls in Whitfield (5%); and
• The only area to experience an increase was Lochee West and Charleston where the number of calls increased by 12%.

Dundee-wide data is only available for years 1 and 2. This shows a decrease of 19% (9,096 to 7,390), which is close to the decline in the wardened areas overall. Given this, the conclusion is that change in this indicator is Neutral. Although this is unlikely to reflect the No Impact theory (given what is known about the wardens’ activities in Dundee) it may be due to Spillover or Compensation.
10.32 Related to this indicator is the number of Noise Related Calls to the police. Overall, there has been a 9% increase in these between the baseline and year 2. This means the number of incidents has increased from 1,220 to 1,335 in the 2 years for which the warden service has been collecting data. Comparator data is only available for years 1 and 2 for the whole of Dundee. This shows a 24% increase (from 3,915 calls to 4,843). The comparable increase in the wardened areas was 3% (from 1,292 to 1,335 incidents).

10.33 There was a mixed pattern across the 6 warden areas:

- There was a 79% increase in the number of noise related calls in Douglas;
- There was a 28% increase in Lochee West and Charleston. However, this hides a 5% decline between years 1 and 2;
- There was a 5% increase in Hilltown and Bowbridge;
- There was a 2% increase in Stobswell, although this masks a 6% reduction between years 1 and 2; and
- There were reductions in both Pitkerro (18%) and Whitfield (8%).

The changes are illustrated in Chart 10.4.
The picture, therefore, varies across the 6 areas, with 4 experiencing an overall increase in calls. Interpretation is, however, complicated by the introduction of Noise Wardens by the local authority. The scheme’s manager feels that this has contributed to the overall increase in calls. Given this, it is very difficult to relate any changes specifically to the interventions made by the wardens and to explain these in terms of the earlier theories. Accordingly no conclusion is drawn as to impact.

The number of reported incidents of vandalism has gone from 1,175 at the baseline to 1,240 in year 2, a 6% increase. This was in contrast to the 3% decline across Dundee as a whole. However, the overall increase hides a 5% decline between years 1 and 2 (although for the same period the decline was 6% across Dundee). This means that, even accounting for the decline between years 1 and 2, the overall picture is one of a worsening situation in the warden scheme areas.

Again, there was a mixed pattern across the 6 areas, as Chart 10.5 shows. The key trends were:-

- A 36% decline in Stobswell;
- A 26% decline in Douglas;
- There were also lesser falls in Lochee West/Charleston (3%) and Pitkerro (1%);
- However, there was a 55% increase in Hilltown and Bowbridge, although this all took place in year 1 with there being virtually no change between years 1 and 2; and
- Vandalism increased by 37% in Whitfield, although this hides a 2% decline in the area between year 1 and year 2.
Whilst there is a degree of variation across the 6 areas, there has been a reduction in the number of reported occurrences of vandalism in 4 areas overall, whilst one other exhibits rise and fall. There was an overall increase in the final area, although this hides little change in the number of crimes between years 1 and 2. The perception surveys show that perceptions of vandalism have increased (Table 12.4). Given this it would seem that the best theoretical explanation for these changes is the Rise (Negative) pattern.

The number of break-ins to motor vehicles increased from a baseline of 256 to a year 2 figure of 266. This was a 4% increase from the baseline, in contrast to the 20% decline across Dundee as a whole. However, the overall increase in the Dundee warden scheme hides a 12% decline in the number of incidents between years 1 and 2, albeit that this was less than the Dundee wide change (a decrease of 38%). This might reflect the Rise and Fall (Confidence) theory. However, the views of the scheme’s manager as to the wardens’ abilities to impact on motor vehicle offences may mean that this interpretation is too positive and that a more realistic interpretation would be Rise (Negative).

The number of reported thefts of motor vehicles also increased by 4% between the baseline and year 1. This increase contrasts sharply with the 15% decline in such thefts across Dundee for the same period. Again, this suggests there has been a worsening of this crime in the wardeden areas relative to the change across Dundee. Theoretically this can be explained by the Rise (Negative) theory which would reflect the views of the scheme’s manager.

There were declines in: the number of malicious incidents attended (down by 17%); incidents reported for malicious intent (a 14% fall); and malicious false alarms (a 7% decline). This overall decline in each of these 3 indicators hides an increase
between years 1 and 2. Given this, it is difficult to relate these changes definitively to any theory, especially as the scheme’s manager now questions their relevance.

10.41 There are, therefore, mixed messages in relation to the overall performance of the Dundee scheme. There were slight increases in 4 of the indicators. For 3 of these (vandalism and break-ins to, and theft of, motor vehicles) this increase occurred whilst there was a decline in the wider local authority area. This seems to conform to the Rise (Negative) theory. For the fourth indicator showing an increase (noise related calls) this was far below the increase in the wider local authority. However, as comparator data were not available for the whole period it is not possible to draw definitive conclusions. For 3 indicators related to Malicious Intent there was an overall decline. However, the absence of comparators means that firm conclusions cannot be drawn. For the final indicator (Youth Disturbance Calls) the overall impact seems to be neutral. Given this, it is not possible from the analysis of crime statistics to definitively ascribe impacts to the wardens. However, the scheme manager now feels that some of the original indicators have proved to be less relevant than originally thought for monitoring the wardens’ impact. The introduction of initiatives such as Noise Wardens also makes attribution difficult. Drawing on the perception surveys seems to show that for some antisocial behaviours (Youth Disturbances) the wardens may be having an impact, but their effect on other activities is far less clear.

East Renfrewshire

10.42 East Renfrewshire collected 3 monitoring indicators. These were:-

- Vandalism to void properties;
- Graffiti; and
- Fire Raising Incidents.

The data was aggregated for the whole of the wardens’ patrol areas (Thornliebank, Barrhead and Auchenbach and Neilston).

10.43 The reduction of vandalism to void properties was a primary aim of the East Renfrewshire wardens. The number of instances declined from 229 in the baseline to 167 in year 2: a fall of 27%, or 62 less instances over the period. This drop has been consistent from the baseline to year 1 and then to year 2. Closely related to the vandalism indicator is the decline in the number of removal requests for graffiti across the scheme areas. There were 59 requests in year 2, down 26% from the baseline figure of 75. Again the decline has been consistent from the baseline to year 1 and then on to year 2.

10.44 Both of these trends are closely related and show a similar picture, namely a decline in the number of incidents. This suggests that we can categorise both indicators as conforming to the Positive Intervention theory, with an immediate fall in the warden area. This suggests that the wardens might be having a positive impact across the scheme areas. However, in the absence of comparator data this must be a speculative so that it may be wiser to reach no conclusion.

10.45 There was no baseline figure for the number of incidents of fire raising so it is not possible to fully assess change. However, the available data shows that there has
been a decline in the number of incidents from 420 to 347: a fall of 17% between years 1 and 2. As there is a lack of complete data for this indicator, as well as no local authority comparator, it is difficult to come to firm conclusions as to the reasons for this change.

10.46 In the absence of comparator data for the wider local authority area it is difficult to interpret the changes in East Renfrewshire. However, as Chapter 12 shows (Tables 12.4, 12.6 12.7 and 12.8) there have been improvements in residents’ perceptions of the prevalence of a variety of types of antisocial behaviour as well as increases in feelings of safety. Given this the statistical interpretation may be too pessimistic.

**Edinburgh**

10.47 In the Edinburgh South case study 3 indicators were collected retrospectively by GEN. The reason for this was that the scheme did not appear to have collected data on a consistent basis and therefore had little useful monitoring information. The indicators covered:-

- Vandalism;
- Housebreaking; and
- Fire Raising.

These indicators cover the Edinburgh South area, as defined by the EH16 6 and EH17 7 postcode sectors. These include the areas of Burdihouse/Southhouse, Gracemount and Liberton.

10.48 The number of vandalism crimes in Edinburgh South has increased from a baseline of 281 to a year 2 figure of 469. This is an increase of 66%, or 188 more incidents in the wardeden area. This was greater than the change across Edinburgh as a whole (14%). Given this, this would seem to be best explained in terms of the Rise (Negative) theory, as the problem would appear to have got worse locally.

10.49 The number of housebreaking crimes in Edinburgh South declined from a baseline of 195 to a year 2 figure of 174: a fall of 11% at a time when housebreaking increased by 10% in Edinburgh as a whole. It also represents a consistent fall since the introduction of the warden service. This would appear to suggest that the wardens are having an impact. When coupled with the wider increase in the number of crimes, this suggests that this change can be explained by the Positive Intervention theory and indicates a major improvement locally.

10.50 The number of fire raising incidents in Edinburgh South has remained relatively steady, at around 10 incidents a year, over the lifetime of the warden service. Across Edinburgh as a whole, incidents of this nature increased by around a third. The wardens work locally with the fire and rescue service on the “Cool Down Crew”. This involves both services working with local youths to promote fire safety. The wardens have a good relationship with the fire and rescue service locally and the service acknowledges the wardens’ role in removing combustible material from the streets. This may help to explain why there has been little change in the number of incidents at a time when they have been increasing in Edinburgh as a whole. As such
we would classify this as fitting with the Positive Intervention theory, as conditions locally have improved relative to Edinburgh as a whole.

10.51 Overall, there are signs that the Edinburgh warden scheme is having an impact on the local area, with fewer fire raising incidents and less housebreaking relative to Edinburgh as a whole. Despite these positive changes, there has been a sharp rise in the number of vandalism crimes. Paradoxically, the perception survey (Tables 12.4 and 12.6) shows that vandalism was perceived to have become less of a problem between the base and endline surveys, both absolutely and relatively. This might imply that the wardens’ presence is providing reassurance, regardless of the reality of the scale of crime.

Inverclyde

10.52 In Inverclyde 4 indicators were collected. These were:-

- Detection rates for Disorderly Conduct;
- Detection rates for Vandalism;
- Issuing restorative warnings26; and
- The number of persistent offenders.

10.53 The use of detection rates, rather than reported incidents, is interesting. It could be argued that this is more a measure of the effectiveness of the police service than of the wardens. However, the scheme sees this as being a measure of the way that it works closely with the police to overcome problems and ensures that offenders are caught. Despite this view, the data used are not a measure of detection rates at all. They simply count the number of detected offences. Without knowing what proportion of offences are detected we have no way of knowing whether any rise in detection is due to the increased effectiveness of police and wardens or to a rise in the number of offences that are being committed. Although the data are summarised below we do not, therefore, draw any conclusions from it. The final 2 indicators are essentially measures of long term change and reflect the work that the wardens do with Council Street Mediators and the police. The aim is to target persistent offenders and, through the use of such things as restorative warnings, ensure that they do not enter the criminal justice system. The measure of the success of these interventions will be falls in the number of persistent offenders.

10.54 The indicators cover the localities of Port Glasgow, Central Greenock, Larkfield, Bow Road and Fancy Farm. However, the scheme aggregates the data rather than collating it for each sub-area. For most of the indicators local authority-wide comparators were not available.

10.55 Detection rates for disorderly conduct have increased from a baseline of 1,200 to a year 2 total of 1,297: an increase of 8% on the baseline. This may suggest that the warded areas have been more effective at tackling this form of antisocial behaviour.

---

26 Restorative warnings were introduced in Scotland in 2004 and involve the police issuing warnings to young offenders (aged 8 to 15). The process involves the police making a formal recorded intervention which is intended to reduce the risk of re-offending. It is hoped that by doing this the young person will become aware of the impact of their activity and will modify their behaviour (Scottish Executive, 2004).
but, as explained earlier, it might also suggest that there has been a rise in Breach of the Peace offences. There are no comparator local authority data. Accordingly no conclusions as to impact have been reached.

10.56 Detection rates for vandalism have declined from the baseline of 294 to the year 2 figure of 258 detected incidents: a 12% decline. Again there are no comparator local authority data. However, the perception survey (Table 12.4) found that the incidence of vandalism was thought to have increased between the base and endline survey dates. Given this, it would seem that there is limited evidence to show that the wardens are having an impact. Accordingly no conclusions are reached.

10.57 The introduction of a service from the police to issue restorative warnings has resulted in 14 warnings being issued in year 1 and a further 24 in year 2. The wardens work closely with the police and help to identify persistent offenders who can then be issues with warnings. The 24 warnings were seen as a major achievement by the Inverclyde scheme manager. However, this can be seen as a measure of activity rather than of impact. For this reason, and in the absence of local authority comparator data, it has not been interpreted in terms of any of the theories of change.

10.58 The number of persistent offenders recorded by the Scottish Children’s Reporters Administration has fallen from a baseline of 21 to 14 in year 2, with the entire decline taking place between years 1 and 2.

10.59 The fall is felt by the scheme’s manager to be a real success. A number of the case study areas raised the issue of the impact that persistent or troublesome individuals can have on recorded crime and, in particular, the quality of life for residents. The wardens’ role is not direct but is very much a reflection of the help they give to the police to identify those who should be issued with restorative warnings. In the longer term it is hoped that this will result in behaviour modification. However, the lack of comparators makes interpretation difficult in any theoretical sense. Accordingly no conclusion as to impact is drawn.

10.60 Overall there are some mixed patterns in the Inverclyde scheme with an increase in detections of Breach of the Peace incidents at the same time as detection rates for Vandalism have declined. However, the number of persistent offenders has declined and the number of restorative warnings issues has increased which suggests that there are positive trends in the warden areas. This positive interpretation is backed up by the perception surveys which show an increase from 17% to 40% in residents rating their area as being “Very Good” in which to live. However, the lack of comparators makes any more definitive conclusions hard to draw.

Orkney

10.61 Three indicators were collected in Orkney. These were for:-

- Vandalism;
- Complaints of antisocial behaviour; and
- The financial cost of antisocial behaviour.
The indicators cover the whole of the local authority area so that there are no local comparators.

10.62 Crimes of Vandalism account for the largest single category of crime in the Orkney area. Overall, the number of crimes increased from a baseline of 240 to a year 2 figure of 270, a 13% increase. This overall increase masks a 3% decline in the number of vandalism crimes between years 1 and 2.

10.63 Consultations with the scheme manager suggested that, given the relatively low level of vandalism in Orkney, the statistics can vary significantly as a result of the actions of a small number of people. The manager felt that much of the increase could be explained in this way. Given that there is no comparative date it is not possible to relate this change to any of the theories outlined in Chapter Nine.

10.64 The total number of complaints of antisocial behaviour in Orkney increased from a baseline of 112 to 176 in year 2: a 57% increase. Most of this increase was between years and 2 as there was an initial fall in complaints in year 1.

10.65 Accordingly there is a mixed picture on this indicator, with an initial fall being overtaken by a rapid increase in the number of complaints. This may be the result of the warden service bedding down in the area with a greater number of people now complaining because they believe that something will be done. However, the perception surveys (Table 12.4) show that for 4 out of 5 indicators of antisocial behaviour the situation is felt to have become worse between the base and endline surveys. One theoretical explanation of this might be the Rise (Negative) theory. However, it needs to be remembered that behavioural norms in Orkney are likely to be different to those on the mainland, with levels of tolerance being far lower for what many would see as being very minor offences. This, coupled with the lack of comparators, makes interpretation doubly difficult. Accordingly no conclusions are drawn as to impact.

10.66 The final indicator, looking at the cost of antisocial behaviour to the council, only has data for years 1 and 2. The figure declined from a cost of £6,408 per annum to £3,806 in 2005/06. This was 40% lower and could indicate significant progress in the warden scheme and a substantial cost reduction for the council.

10.67 As data is not available for the whole time period it is difficult to draw any firm conclusions. However, consultations with the scheme manager suggested that this was a longer term trend and that the wardens were now patrolling schools, play areas and other council properties to reduce vandalism and graffiti. It is felt that these actions explain the changes. Accordingly this could be explained in terms of the Positive Intervention theory, with the wardens having an immediate impact. Yet they lack of a comparator means that no definitive conclusions have been drawn.

10.68 Overall the indicators for Orkney show a mixed picture. The number of vandalism incidents and the number of complaints of antisocial behaviour have increased as have perceptions of the prevalence on antisocial behaviour. However, the absence of comparators makes interpretation difficult.
Perth and Kinross

10.69 In Perth and Kinross 3 indicators were selected, covering:-

- Vandalism;
- Complaints of antisocial behaviour; and
- Street cleanliness.

The indicators cover the areas of North and South Letham and Hilliland. Again the data was collated for the whole of the scheme area.

10.70 The number of incidents of vandalism increased from a baseline of 1,100 to 1,169 in year 2: a 6% increase. This was faster than the change in the local authority area as a whole (a 1% increase). All of this change took place between years 1 and 2, there being little change from the baseline to year 1. This suggests that there has been some negative change in the area, with incidents increasing faster in the warden areas than across the authority as a whole, resulting in an overall deterioration in the relative position of the warded areas. However, this is not backed up by the perception surveys (Table 12.4) which show a 77% decrease in the proportion of residents reporting vandalism to be “Very” or “Fairly Common” between the base and endline surveys. Residents therefore feel that vandalism is far less of a problem at a time the statistics show it to be increasing. It may be that the increase therefore reflects increased reporting and, as such, this may reflect confidence in the wardens and could be interpreted in terms of the Rise (Positive) theory.

10.71 Complaints of antisocial behaviour declined from a baseline of 2,082 to a year 2 figure of 2,045: a reduction of 2%. This masks an increase of 15% between years 1 and 2. Whilst the overall change on this indicator was positive, the scheme manager believed that the jump in incidents between year 1 and year 2 could be explained by the return to the area of offenders from prison. The location of temporary accommodation centre in Letham, which houses people with chaotic lifestyles, was felt to have added to these problems, whereby those moving to the centre created local difficulties. This was seen as an ongoing issue that could result in fluctuations in data used to monitor the service. Interpreting this in terms of theories needs to take account of the improvements of perceptions of antisocial behaviours that were positive across all 5 types of behaviour (Table 12.4). Given this our interpretation is positive, the Rise (Positive) theory, with increases in complaints between years 1 and 2 reflecting greater confidence in the wardens’ ability to take action. However, the absence of a local authority comparator means that this must be speculative.

10.72 There has been an increase in Environmental Street Cleanliness from a baseline score of 73 to a year 2 position of 75. However, this represents a lower score than in year 1 when it stood at 83. A baseline for the local authority is not available, but the decline between years 1 and 2 was also experienced across the local authority, with the year 2 score being lower than the year 1.\(^{27}\) The overall direction of change is, however, positive. The scheme manager believes that the wardens’ role in securing the removal of abandoned vehicles and dealing with dog fouling and lighting faults had helped to improve the streets and hence the street cleanliness indicators. This is

\(^{27}\) The 2004/05 (year 1) local authority figure was 76, the year 2 figure 73
backed up by the wardens’ survey. As such, this can be explained in terms of the Positive Intervention theory there being an overall improvement in the areas in which the wardens are working.

10.73 As with other case study schemes the picture that emerges is mixed, when the indicators are considered in isolation. However, when taken in conjunction with the positive results from the perception surveys, the conclusion is that the wardens are having a positive impact in the area.

South Lanarkshire

10.74 In South Lanarkshire 9 indicators were collected. These covered:-

- Vandalism;
- Breach of the Peace;
- Graffiti;
- Street Drinking offences;
- Fly Tipping;
- Abandoned Vehicle Fires;
- Refuse Container Fires;
- Vandalism to Fire Hydrants; and
- Racial Harassment.

They were collected for the 4 warden areas: East Kilbride, Cambuslang and Rutherglen, Hamilton and Clydesdale. The 4 areas cover the entire local authority. This means that there is no wider local authority comparator for this scheme.

10.75 The analysis concentrates on the first 5 of the indicators. This is because the other 4 (abandoned vehicle fires, refuse container fires, vandalism to fire hydrants and racial harassment) have low baseline figures. Given this, we did not feel that it was appropriate to assess the change in each of the 4 warden areas, as small absolute changes can result in apparently significant percentage movements.

10.76 Vandalism accounts for the single largest number of crimes in the South Lanarkshire warden scheme areas. Overall, the number of crimes has increased from a baseline of 5,446 to 6,443 in year 2: an 18% increase on the baseline but a fall of 8% from year 1.

10.77 There was a broad increase in the number of vandalism incidents across the 4 wardens’ areas (Chart 10.6), although some exhibited greater change than others, in particular:-

- There was a 70% increase in Clydesdale, with most of this taking place between the baseline and year 1;
- There was a 13% increase in Hamilton between the baseline and year 2. However, this hides an 8% decline between years 1 and 2;

---

28 All 5 wardens from Perth and Kinross responded to the survey. The majority indicated that they felt their greatest impact was on dealing with abandoned vehicles and fly tipping.
• There was a 10% increase in Cambuslang and Rutherglen, although this again masks an 8% reduction between years 1 and 2; and
• There was a 4% increase in East Kilbride. However, this has to be set against a 17% decline between years 1 and 2.

**CHART 10.6  Changes in Reported Occurrences of Vandalism in South Lanarkshire**

10.78 These trends suggest that the Rise and Fall (Confidence) theory could apply, with most warden areas experiencing an increase in reported incidents in the first year followed by a reduction between years 1 and 2. The scheme’s manager believes that the proactive approach to vandalism has driven these changes. The schools initiative provides a good example of this approach. The wardens visited 51 schools regularly during the holiday periods to identify issues such as vandalism and take appropriate action. A total of 7,165 visits were carried out in the 24 month period with a number of incidents being reported to the police. Interestingly perceptions of vandalism as a problem have increased, albeit only by 5% (Table 12.4). However, the lack of comparator data means that interpretation must be speculative and it is probably wisest to draw no conclusions.

10.79 The number of Breach of the Peace offences increased from a baseline of 4,043 to a year 2 figure of 4,872: an increase of 21%, though there was a 4% decline between years 1 and 2.
There were broadly similar increases in each of the 4 areas between the baseline and year 2 (Chart 10.7). For example:

- There was a 31% increase in offences in East Kilbride. However, this hides a fall in the number of offences between years 1 and 2;
- There was a 23% increase in Clydesdale between the baseline and year 2;
- There was a 17% increase in Cambuslang and Rutherglen, although most of this was between the baseline and year 1; and
- There was a 15% increase in Hamilton between the baseline and year 2. However, the overall change hides a 9% decline between years 1 and 2.

These trends suggest that the Rise and Fall (Confidence) theory might apply, as the broad trend is for there to be a rapid increase in the number of offences in the first year followed by a gentler decline over time. Consultations with the scheme manager suggested that, whilst there has been an overall increase, the subsequent decline might be evidence that the wardens are now beginning to have an impact. This reflects the introduction of a number of targeted initiatives. For example, the wardens are working with the police to curb youth drinking, with the wardens identifying outdoor drinking dens that are then raided by the police. However, the statistical pattern could also indicate that the Rise and Fall (Misplaced Confidence) theory was applicable, especially as the surveys show that perceptions of the incidence of the types of antisocial behaviours most closely aligned to Breach of the Peace (noisy neighbours, vandalism and intimidation) had all increased (Table 12.4). This was, however, countered to some extent by the 63% increase in residents thinking that the area was a “Very Good” place to live (from 24 to 39 respondents). Again the absence
of a comparator for a wider area makes conclusions speculative so that no definitive conclusion as to impact has been drawn.

10.82 The number of reports of graffiti increased from a baseline of 2,238 to a year 2 figure of 2,677: an increase of 20%, although between years 1 and 2 there was a 21% decline.

10.83 There was a general increase in each of the 4 warden areas (Chart 10.8). For example:-

- There was a 164% increase in the number of reports of Graffiti in Clydesdale. This was, however, from a baseline of just 81 incidents. There was also a decline in the number of incidents between year 1 and year 2;  
- There was a 21% increase in East Kilbride, although most of this occurred in year 2;  
- There was a 17% increase in Hamilton, which occurred after an initial fall between the baseline and year 1; and  
- There was a 10% increase in Cambuslang and Rutherglen between the baseline and year 2. However, this hides a 43% decline between years 1 and 2.

CHART 10.8 Changes in Reported Occurrences of Graffiti in South Lanarkshire

10.84 The scheme manager believes that these trends have been driven by the local authority’s proactive approach to graffiti removal, close links with the police and improved reporting systems. One example of this approach covers the Fernhill graffiti and vandalism initiative. The wardens assisted Strathclyde Police in cataloguing graffiti “tags” and took digital photographs which were subsequently made into intelligence packages. These allowed the Community Police to charge 3 of the most
persistent offenders. However, the surveys (Table 12.4) show that perceptions of the incidence of vandalism and graffiti have increased slightly (5% between the base and endline). It may be that this is a reflection of the increased publicity given to this type of behaviour so that, paradoxically, launching initiatives to tackle it results in perceptions of its frequency increasing. The theoretical models explaining the statistical changes are the Rise and Fall, (Confidence) or (Misplaced Confidence). On balance it is perhaps best not to make any theoretical attribution.

10.85 The number of Street Drinking offences reported to the police is also seen by the scheme as a key indicator of progress. Overall, there was an increase in the number of offences: from a baseline of 1,912 to a year 2 figure of 4,880; an increase of 155%, or 2,968 more incidents over a 2 year period.

10.86 There were increases on this indicator in each of the 4 areas:-

- Increases of 286% and 238% in Hamilton and East Kilbride respectively; and
- Less extreme changes in Cambuslang and Rutherglen and Clydesdale (44% and 13% respectively), but incidents have still increased between the baseline and year 2.

10.87 The scheme’s manager suggested that these changes were driven by the local authority’s approach to tackling youth alcohol and related antisocial behaviour. This was a broader council initiative, supported by the wardens. Through this the wardens identified “hot spots” where street and public drinking was occurring, including wooded areas and children’s play areas. They then carried out environmental visual audits, recording their findings, taking photographs and arranging clean ups of the discarded bottles, cans and litter. In addition, the wardens also gathered intelligence for the Police on sources of sales of alcohol to under-aged drinkers. The wardens worked closely with the Community Police and patrolled the hot spot areas. They were also involved in developing and running diversionary activities for young people in the targeted areas (including sport activities, youth clubs, art projects and music events). The scheme manager suggested that this approach may have increased the number of reported incidents but was tackling the problem and would lead to more sustainable longer term outcomes. If this interpretation is correct then the Rise and Fall (Confidence) theory would explain the statistical changes although comparator data would be needed to support this view. Without this, firm conclusions cannot be drawn.

10.88 The number of reports of fly tipping reported to the council was also used as a measure of progress. Overall, there had been an increase from 1,511 reports to 3,072 reports between the baseline and year 2: an increase of 103%. However, the broader pattern of change reflects a substantial increase between the baseline and year 1 and then a reduction between years 1 and 2.

10.89 There was an increase in each of the 4 warden areas, though 2 in particular exhibited a substantial increase over the period:-

- There were increases of 145% and 107% in Hamilton and Cambuslang and Rutherglen; and
• There were less extreme changes in East Kilbride and Clydesdale (74% and 29% respectively), but both still showed increases between the baseline and year 2.

10.90 The pattern of statistical change would seem to reflect Rise and Fall. Given that the surveys indicate that perceptions of the prevalence of litter have decreased quite substantially (a fall of 46%) the Rise and Fall (Confidence) theory would seem to offer the best explanation. Again the absence of comparator data makes this conclusion difficult to justify.

10.91 As with most of the case studies, interpretation of the changes is open to debate. Our analysis has shown that the statistical changes for the 5 key indicators follow the Rise and Fall pattern, although the lack of comparator data makes it difficult to know if the theoretical explanation is the Confidence or Misplaced Confidence theory. There is evidence to support the Confidence theory, for example the scheme manager’s views on the various initiatives that are being implemented and which have an impact upon reported levels of offences and the perception surveys.

The broad change has been an increase in the number of incidents between the baseline and year 2. However, this then masks a fall between years 1 and 2. This would seem to indicate that positive changes are starting to take place. It is, however, important to note that this is the overriding trend. Underneath this there is a picture of considerable complexity both within and across the scheme the interpretation of which is made more difficult by the absence of comparator data.

Conclusion

10.92 Analysis of changes across the case study areas is complicated. The lack of complete time series data for all indicators means that there is insufficient evidence on which to draw firm conclusions for all indicators and all schemes. There are also many other initiatives that have been implemented that impact upon recorded levels of crime and antisocial behaviour. Given this, it should be no surprise that the picture across the individual warden schemes is complex, with rises in some sub-areas being offset by falls in others. This makes drawing firm conclusions both challenging and complicated.

10.93 In order to simplify the analysis and draw out some overarching conclusions, Appendix 4, Table 4.1 summarises the conclusions reached in the earlier text. It can be seen that overall there are 39 indicators in the Table for the 9 case studies. Of these:

• For 23 (59%) it has not been possible to draw definitive conclusions as to which of the impact theories accounts for the observed changes;
• The changes for a further 9 (23%) have been interpreted in terms of the Rise (Negative) theory, that is the increases in the reported occurrences of crimes and antisocial behaviours have been faster in the warded areas than in the wider local authority;

---

29 For example there has been a 63% increase between the base and endline surveys in those who rate their neighbourhood as being “Very Good”, whilst those who feel “Very” or “Fairly Safe” when walking after dark has increased by 89%. 
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• Changes in a further 3 indicators (8%) have been interpreted in terms of the Rise (Positive) theory. Here occurrences of crimes and antisocial behaviours have increased in the wardeden areas but this increase has been less than in the wider local authority area;
• A further 3 (8%) have been interpreted in terms of the Positive Intervention theory. The implication of this is that the wardens’ interventions have begun to have an almost immediate impact; and
• The final indicator has been interpreted in terms of the No Impact theory. Here there are no differences between the changes in the indicator in the warded area and those in the wider local authority area.

10.94 Looking at the change in each of the case study areas:-

• In 2 areas (Dumfries and Galloway and Dundee) there is no statistical evidence that the wardens have had an impact on the reported instances of crimes and antisocial behaviours on which the schemes wanted to be evaluated;
• For Aberdeen and Edinburgh the selected indicators show some evidence of impact, which is backed up by the findings of the perception surveys;
• For 4 of the case studies (East Renfrewshire, Inverclyde, Orkney and South Lanarkshire) the lack of comparators means that definitive conclusions cannot be drawn, although:-
  • In East Renfrewshire the perception surveys show considerable improvements;
  • In Inverclyde residents feel that the areas have improved; and
  • In South Lanarkshire all of the indicators conform to the Rise and Fall pattern. Given that perceptions of neighbourhood quality have improved, and our awareness of the various initiatives that the wardens are involved in, there seems a strong possibility that the theoretical explanation for these changes is Rise and Fall (Confidence); and
• In Perth and Kinross there is clear statistical evidence that the wardens are having an impact. This is backed up by the results of the perception surveys.

10.95 It is disappointing that, for so many of the case study indicators, it has not been possible to arrive at definitive conclusions as to the impact of the wardens. The main reason for this is data inadequacies, in particular failures to collect data, especially comparators. Given this the conclusions summarised at the foot of Table 10.1 are very cautious and are based solely on the crime and antisocial behaviour statistics, which are notoriously difficult to interpret (see Paragraphs 9.21 to 9.24). At various places in the analysis other sources of evidence, such as the perception surveys and the views of scheme managers have been highlighted. Often these are far more positive about the impact of the wardens’ interventions. Accordingly any final conclusions about impact need to wait until all of the evidence has been presented. Given that so much of the analysis of the indicators in the case study areas was thwarted by lack of data, in the next Chapter we extend the analysis to non-case study schemes. The focus is on the indicators that were used to monitor progress by more than one scheme and for which, therefore, more data was available.
CHAPTER ELEVEN ASSESSING OVERALL CHANGE

Introduction

11.1 As Chapter Ten has shown, assessing change at the level of the individual scheme is complex and often few consistent messages emerge. This Chapter takes a different approach, by looking at the changes that have taken place in a number of indicators that have been selected by more than one scheme. As such it moves away from a spatial to an aspatial analysis. Unfortunately a small number of case study and non-case study schemes selected the same indicators and an even smaller sub-set had complete data that could be analysed. Accordingly the analysis in this Chapter is based upon a small sample so that the conclusions need to be treated with a degree of caution.

Case Study Areas

11.2 Across the case study areas there were 4 indicators that were used to monitor progress in at least 2 schemes. These were:-

- Breach of the Peace, selected by 3 schemes;
- Racially aggravated conduct (2 schemes);
- Vandalism (6 schemes);
- Malicious false alarm (2 schemes).

Table 11.1 looks at the comparative changes in these indicators. Although the data is not complete what can be seen is that:-

- For Breach of the Peace the change in the warded areas has been greater than in the comparators, with the number of reported incidents increasing;
- Malicious False Alarms have increased in the warded areas at a slower rate than in Scotland as a whole, although no comparator local authority data were available;
- Incidences of vandalism have increased in the warded areas at a slower rate than in Scotland but at a far faster rate than in the comparator local authorities where the change has been almost static; and
- Racially Aggravated Conduct has increased at a far slower rate than in the local authority comparator areas. However, interpretation of this statistic needs to be done with caution due to the relatively small number of reported incidents.
TABLE 11.1 Comparative Changes in Key Indicators - Case Study Areas
(Baseline to Year 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Percentage change in the wardens areas</th>
<th>Percentage change in the comparator local authorities</th>
<th>Percentage change in Scotland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breach of the peace&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>+34%</td>
<td>+24%</td>
<td>+15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malicious False Alarm&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>+27%</td>
<td>N/A&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>+45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>+19%</td>
<td>+12%</td>
<td>+24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racially aggravated conduct&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>+5%</td>
<td>+113</td>
<td>N/A&lt;sup&gt;6&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:-
1. The schemes on which this analysis is based are Aberdeen, Dumfries and Galloway (North West Dumfries) and South Lanarkshire.
2. The schemes on which this analysis is based are Dumfries and Galloway (North West Dumfries) and Dundee.
3. The schemes on which this analysis is based are Aberdeen, Dundee, Edinburgh, Orkney, Perth and Kinross and South Lanarkshire.
4. The schemes on which this analysis is based are Aberdeen and South Lanarkshire.
5. Data is not available for the comparator authorities.
6. Data seems not to be available at the Scottish level.

11.3 Table 11.2 looks in greater detail at the changes in the indicators over time. This shows a more interesting picture. Although all of the indicators show increases between the baseline and Year 2 there is an initial increase in Year 1, followed by a fall in Year 2 for 3 of the 4 (Malicious False Alarms is the exception). The falls between Years 1 and 2 are:-

- For Breach of the Peace: a fall of some 2%;
- For Vandalism a fall of 4%; and
- Racially aggravated conduct: a fall of 24%, albeit the numbers are small in comparison with the other indicators.

This pattern follows the Rise and Fall scenario outlined in Chapter 9 and was predicted by the Executive in its initial guidance to the schemes. Malicious False Alarms do not follow this pattern, showing a consistent increase. Why there should be this difference may reflect the nature of the crime/offence with the 2 that have fallen being observational crimes that may fall because perpetrators feel that they stand a chance of being seen (and reported) by the wardens. Malicious False Alarms, on the other hand, are “remote” crimes that may be more difficult to influence by such interventions as wardens.
TABLE 11.2 Changes in Selected Indicators- Case Study Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Change Baseline to Year 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breach of the Peace</td>
<td>5,093</td>
<td>6,937</td>
<td>6,820</td>
<td>+1,727 +34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malicious False Alarm</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>+17 +27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>8,668</td>
<td>10,758</td>
<td>10,344</td>
<td>+1,676 +19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racially aggravated conduct</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>+5 +5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11.4 Qualitative evidence from the case study consultations backs the Rise and Fall (Confidence) theory. The general view is that the wardens take time to establish themselves in their patrol areas and to build trust among local residents. Residents gradually come to believe that there is some value in reporting incidents of crime or antisocial behaviour as there now seems a greater chance that something will happen. The result is that the reported level of crime increases so that it is closer to the “real” level. The decline from Year 1 to Year 2 could, therefore, indicate that the wardens are having an impact in their target areas, though ongoing monitoring will be necessary to prove this point and, importantly, to test the alternative explanation that Rise and Fall is due to the realisation that confidence in the wardens was misplaced. If this were the case then the Rise and Fall (Misplaced Confidence) theory would be a more accurate interpretation.

Non-Case Study Areas

11.5 Across the non-case study areas there were 7 indicators that had been used to monitor progress by more than one scheme and for which full datasets were available. These were:-

- Housebreaking (selected by 4 schemes);
- Vandalism (3 schemes);
- Breach of the Peace (2 schemes);
- Dishonesty (2 schemes);
- Anti social behaviour (2 schemes);
- Vehicle crime (2 schemes); and
- Wilful fire raising (2 schemes).

11.6 Table 11.3 looks at comparative changes in these indicators. There has been a decline in the incidences of all 7 with some (housebreaking, Breach of the Peace and vehicle crime) falling by quite large percentages.

11.7 The comparative change picture is very positive, with several of the indicators falling at a far faster rate than in the wider area. Indeed some of the indicators are moving in the opposite direction to the comparators, with the incidence of the crime/offences decreasing at the same time as there is an increase in the wider area. Breach of the Peace and wilful fire raising both fall into this category.
### TABLE 11.3 Comparative Changes in Key Indicators – Non-Case Study Areas  
(Baseline to Year 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Percentage change in the wardens areas</th>
<th>Percentage change in the comparator local authorities</th>
<th>Percentage change in Scotland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housebreaking</td>
<td>-41%</td>
<td>-26%</td>
<td>-14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>+24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breach of the Peace</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>+8%</td>
<td>+15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dishonesty</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>-11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisocial behaviour</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Crime</td>
<td>-19%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilful fire raising</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>+55%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
1. The schemes on which this analysis is based are Angus, Dumfries and Galloway (North West Dumfries), Fife and Shetland.
2. The schemes on which this analysis is based are Angus, Dumfries and Galloway (North West Dumfries), and Shetland.
3. The schemes on which this analysis is based are Angus and North Lanarkshire.
4. The schemes on which this analysis is based are Dumfries and Galloway (North West Dumfries) and North Lanarkshire.
5. The schemes on which this analysis is based are Fife and North Lanarkshire.
6. The schemes on which this analysis is based are Fife and North Lanarkshire.
7. The schemes on which this analysis is based are Moray and North Lanarkshire.
8. Comparators figures are not available for these crimes/offences.
9. Comparator figures are not available at the Scottish level.

11.8 Table 11.4 looks at the changes in the indicators over time. The year on year changes show a number of patterns:-

- Three indicators conform to the Rise and Fall theory (Breach of the Peace, Dishonesty and Vehicle Crimes);
- Three (Vandalism, Antisocial Behaviour and Wilful Fire Raising) fall between the baseline and Year 1 but then rise in Year 2, although not quite to the Year 1 levels; and
- Housebreaking falls consistently over the 3 years, albeit that this seems to be a trend throughout Scotland as Table 11.3 shows.
TABLE 11.4  Changes in Selected Indicators- Non-Case Study Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Change Baseline to Year 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housebreaking</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>-243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breach of the Peace</td>
<td>3,765</td>
<td>4,501</td>
<td>3,004</td>
<td>-761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dishonesty</td>
<td>1,264</td>
<td>1,498</td>
<td>1,218</td>
<td>-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisocial behaviour</td>
<td>3,218</td>
<td>2,877</td>
<td>3,113</td>
<td>-105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle crime</td>
<td>1,490</td>
<td>1,569</td>
<td>1,211</td>
<td>-279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilful fire raising</td>
<td>1,552</td>
<td>1,418</td>
<td>1,514</td>
<td>-38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11.9 Explaining this varied pattern of change is difficult. The nature of the crimes/offences does not seem to be a factor, given that observational crimes figure in all 3 patterns of change. Nor is change in the wider area a factor, given that, as Table 11.3 shows there are increases in the Scottish figures for both Breach of the Peace and Vandalism, which appear in different change patterns. It may, therefore, be that the figures are influenced by circumstances that are specific to the individual schemes and their management.

Combined Case Study and Non Case Study Schemes

11.10 When the case and non-case study areas are combined there are 4 indicators that are used in both types of areas: that is at least one case study and one non-case study scheme selected them. These are:-

- Housebreaking, selected by 5 schemes;
- Vandalism, selected by 9 schemes;
- Breach of the Peace 5 schemes; and
- Vehicle crime, selected by 3 schemes.

The analysis below looks at the changes in each of these indicators for those areas that selected them and draws comparisons with the wider local authority areas and Scotland.

11.11 Chart 11.1 shows that there has been a fairly substantial decline in the number of Housebreaking crimes across the schemes. The chart also shows that the decline has been faster than in the wider area and in Scotland. Thus:-

- There has been a 36% decline in Housebreaking crimes in the 5 warden schemes selecting this indicator; and
- This decline was faster than the fall in the wider areas (26%) and across Scotland as a whole (14%).

What seems to be shown is that, when the statistics for a number of schemes are combined (thereby diluting the extremes), then for Housebreaking the change over time conforms to the Positive Intervention theory outlined earlier.
11.12 Chart 11.2 looks at changes in vandalism. What can be seen is that:

- Crimes of vandalism increased by 17% in warden areas;
- This increase was faster than the growth in the wider area (9%) but slower than across Scotland as a whole (24%); and
- However, between year 1 and year 2 the warden areas experienced a faster decline than the wider area and Scotland.

This change has been affected by the introduction of the Scottish Crime Recording Standard, which increased the number of minor crimes of vandalism recorded by the police\(^{31}\). The broad picture however, appears to be that vandalism is starting to fall at a faster rate within the warden areas, there being a gradual decline in the number of incidences after a sharp increase between year 1 and 2. This conforms to the **Rise and Fall (Confidence)** theory in that the fall in the wardened areas has been steeper in relative terms than in the comparators. It could, however, be argued that the **Rise and Fall (Misplaced Confidence)** theory could apply equally. However, if this was the case one would not expect the same pattern of change (Rise and Fall) across Scotland and the wider local authority as well as the wardened areas.

---

\(^{30}\) The schemes that selected this indicator were Angus, the 2 Dumfries and Galloway schemes, Fife and Shetland.

CHART 11.2  Comparative Changes in Vandalism Crimes

11.13 Chart 11.3 looks at Breach of the Peace offences. There has been a sharp increase in the number of offences followed by a large fall in the warded areas, the wider comparators and across Scotland as a whole. In detail it can be seen that:

- There has been an 11% increase in Breach of the Peace offences in warden areas over the 2 year period, though there was a sharp increase from the baseline position to year 1 followed by a gradual fall; and
- There was a 13% increase in Breach of the Peace offences in the wider area and a 15% increase across Scotland as a whole.

While Breach of the Peace offences have increased on their baseline position, there has been a clear shift in direction, with the number of offences now declining after a sharp initial increase. This suggests that some progress has been made by the warden schemes in helping to reduce the number of instances of Breaches of the Peace. Again this pattern conforms to the Rise and Fall (Confidence) theory in that the fall has been at a far faster rate than in the comparators.

32 The schemes that selected this indicator were Aberdeen, Angus, Dumfries and Galloway (Dicks Hill and Belmont), Dundee, Edinburgh, Orkney, Perth and Kinross, Shetland, and South Lanarkshire.
11.14 Chart 11.4 looks at vehicle crimes. These have declined in all 3 types of area. In particular:

- There has been a 16% decline in Vehicle Crimes in warden areas, despite a small increase from the baseline to year 1; and
- This decline was slower than the fall in the wider comparator, which fell by over half (52%) between the baseline and year 2. However, the fall in Scotland was smaller (21%). It is also the case that the decline between years 1 and 2 in the warden areas was faster than in Scotland.

The picture from this indicator is mixed with a decline in the number of crimes, but at a slower rate than in the comparator areas. Whilst this suggests some progress, it can also be interpreted as a real increase in the number of crimes relative to other areas. Given that at least one scheme (Dundee) now feels that it can have little or no impact upon vehicle crime this might be conforming to the No Impact theory.

33 The schemes that selected this indicator were Aberdeen, Angus, Dumfries and Galloway (North West Dumfries) and North and South Lanarkshire.
Conclusion

11.15 This Chapter has tried to assess the extent to which the indicators selected by more than one warden scheme, to measure impacts upon crime and antisocial behaviour, have changed and to try to relate these changes to a wider theoretical underpinning. The fact that the schemes selected a diverse range of statistical indicators, with relatively little commonality across schemes, and that many schemes had incomplete data sets means that the analysis has had to be based upon a relatively small sub-set of schemes. As such any conclusions must be treated as tentative, albeit they are based on the best available data.

11.16 Given this it seems that:-

- In both the case study and non-case study areas there is evidence to show that the pattern of some reported crimes and offences initially rises and then falls. This is the pattern predicted by the Executive in its 2003 Guidance (Scottish Executive, 2003) and conforms to the Rise and Fall pattern of change;
- The changes in other indicators follow different patterns. Some show consistent falls, other initially fall and then rise;
- When the 4 indicators that were chosen by at least some of the case and non-case study areas are analysed then:-
  - Two (Vandalism and Breach of the Peace) show a classic Rise and Fall pattern. Although this is replicated in the comparator areas, the rate of decline in the warded areas for reported Breach of the Peace offences from year 1 to year 2 was far faster than in the comparators. The rate of decline for Vandalism was faster than in Scotland and about the same as for the local authority comparators. This would seem to suggest that the

---

34 The schemes that selected this indicator were Dundee, Fife and North Lanarkshire.
wardens are having a positive impact on instances of some recorded crimes. The pattern for both of these crimes/offences conforms to the **Rise and Fall (Confidence)** theory outlined earlier;

- For Housebreakings there seems to have been a consistent decline in the warded areas and in the comparators. The rate of decline in the warded areas was initially faster than in the comparators. It is now roughly the same. We would argue this reinforces the **Positive Intervention** theory where the wardens begin to have an impact almost from day one; and

- For vehicle crimes an initial increase has been followed by a decline that has been at a faster rate than for Scotland, but at about the same rate as for the wider local authority areas. We argue that this reflects the **No Impact** theory, with the wardens having no differential impact upon the reported incidence of this type of crime. This is something that is, to an extent, reinforced by case study evidence.

**11.18** Overall we would argue that there seems to be statistical evidence to show that the wardens are having a differential impact upon reported incidences of some crimes and offences. When taken with the analysis in Chapter 10 it seems that, both at the scheme and at a more strategic level, there is evidence that, in those areas where wardens are operating, some types of crime and antisocial behaviours are falling at a faster rate than in comparator areas.
CHAPTER TWELVE WHAT IMPACT HAVE COMMUNITY WARDENS HAD UPON RESIDENTS’ PERCEPTIONS?

Introduction

12.1 There is evidence that shows that, whilst crime rates in the country as a whole are declining, public perceptions may not always reflect this. Thus, the recent Audit Commission Report (2006) highlighted the fact that over 60% of respondents to the British Crime Survey in 2004/05 said that they believed that the incidence of crime in the United Kingdom continued to rise. In addition, over 40% felt that crime in their local area had increased over the same period (Ibid, 13). Similarly, Tilley (2005, 269) notes that the British Crime Survey has consistently found the perceived risk of victimisation to exceed the actual risk and that there are high levels of public anxiety surrounding crime.

12.2 In spite of well documented difficulties in definition, Moore and Shepherd (2006, 293) contend that fear of crime (FoC) is a powerful motivator of economic and social behaviour. This is supported by the findings of “liveability” surveys carried out in 2001 and 2005 which revealed low crime rates, or perceptions of low levels of crime, to be the single most important factor in determining where people wanted to live (MORI (2001,2005) cited in the Audit Commission 2006, 12). Furthermore, Moore and Shepherd (2006) contend that the effects of FoC extend far beyond any tangible losses imposed, or potentially imposed, by criminal behaviour. For example, fear can result in the alteration of daily habits and negative psychological effects with a corresponding detrimental impact on the fabric of society. It is therefore unsurprising that perceptions of crime and fear of crime are now viewed with nearly equal importance as crime reduction itself in the formulation of government policy (Home Office Annual Report 2001-2002 citied in Moore and Shepherd 2006, Tilley 2005).

12.3 Given the significance of perceptions, the purpose of this Chapter is to look at changes in the views of residents in the case study areas over time. The Chapter starts by looking at the aggregate changes over all 9 areas, goes on to look at the impact in the case study areas individually and finishes by comparing selected changes in the case study areas with changes in the wider area, drawing on the results of the Scottish Household Survey (SHS).

12.4 The methodology is outlined in Chapter Two. In summary it involved base and endline surveys in the 9 case study and 2 control areas. To enable comparisons to be made, a number of the questions in these surveys were identical to those used in the SHS. Some of the information from these surveys, for example awareness of the wardens and perceptions of their impact, is used elsewhere (Chapter Fourteen). As such it is not drawn on here.

12.5 The remainder of this Chapter looks at the results of the 2 surveys. To make the Chapter more readable the majority of the Tables on which the analysis is based
are presented in Appendix 2, which is cross referenced as appropriate. The initial analyses look at the changes in the case study areas between the 2 survey dates.

**Neighbourhood Quality of Life – Case Study Areas**

12.6 Interviewees were asked to rate their Neighbourhood as a place to live on a 5 point scale ranging from “Very Good” to “Very Poor” (Table A2.1). The picture that emerges in the case study areas is one of gradual improvement between the 2 survey dates. For example:-

- Those perceiving their neighbourhood to be a “Very Good” place to live increased from 35% to 42%; whilst
- Those perceiving it to be “Very Poor” decreased slightly from 7% to 5%.

12.7 This finding mirrors that of other scheme evaluations from across the country. For example, the Neighbourhood Warden Scheme Evaluation (Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, 2004, 20) identified a 27% increase in satisfaction in areas patrolled by wardens between January 2001 and May 2003. Similarly, the National Evaluation of the Street Wardens Programme (Department for Communities and Local Government, 2006, 10) found residents in street warden areas to be more satisfied with their local area as a place to live than they were 2 years earlier.

12.8 In terms of community involvement (Table A2.2) interviewees were asked how involved they were in their local community. The picture that emerges is mixed:-

- There has been a slight increase in those who claim a “Great Deal” of involvement (from 4% to 6%); however
- Those who claimed to be “Not At All” involved increased from 34% to 51%.

The interpretation of these statistics must be speculative. However, generally there has been a decrease in involvement in community based activities. Contrary to this are the efforts that have been made in some areas, particularly areas of deprivation, to stimulate greater community activity, through such initiatives as Community Voices. What the statistics may therefore be showing is this polarisation, with most residents having little wider involvement (in line with society generally), whilst a few are very intensively involved.

**Neighbourhood Safety - Case Study Areas**

12.9 The SHS asks questions about how safe people feel when alone in their homes, and when walking alone in their neighbourhoods at night. In order to allow some comparisons with Scotland as a whole the base and endline surveys asked similar questions.

12.10 The picture that emerges from these 2 questions in the case study areas (Tables A2.3 and A2.4) is again one of gradual improvements. Thus:-

---

35 The Appendix 2 Tables are denoted with the prefix A2.
36 For example the Scottish Household Survey shows that the percentage of respondents who gave up time to help as an organiser/volunteer over the last 12 months fell from 26.4% in 1999-00 to 23.5% in 2003-04.
• The percentage of those feeling “Very Safe” when walking alone at night increased from 27% to 32% whilst those feeling “Very Unsafe” fell from 19% to 15%; and
• The percentage of those feeling “Very Safe” in their homes increased from 52% to 62% between the 2 survey dates, whilst the percentage feeling “Very Unsafe” declined from 5% to 3%.

12.11 This conclusion is in keeping with the findings of the Neighbourhood Warden Scheme Evaluation (Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, 2004) in England and Wales which concluded that wardens have had greatest success in addressing quality of life issues and fear of crime. Within those areas patrolled by the wardens, resident concern over crime was seen to have reduced relative to comparator areas. In addition, the percentage of residents in scheme areas who believed that crime had increased in the past year was below the national average of 53%. In Northern Ireland conclusions differed slightly. Opinion among tenants was divided as to whether there had been any change in the levels of crime and fear of crime in the community since the warden initiative started. However, amongst those who believed change had occurred, the majority believed that crime and fear of crime had decreased either slightly or significantly (Northern Ireland Housing Executive, 2003, 66).

12.12 Given that perceptions of fear of crime can influence attitudes and opinions about ones neighbourhood, these results would seem to indicate that the quality of life in the case study areas has been gradually improving. This is in keeping with the findings from other evaluations. Why this should be, might become clearer when we examine the extent to which perceptions of antisocial behaviour in the case study areas have changed between 2005 and 2006.

Perceptions of the Occurrence of Antisocial Behaviour - Case Study Areas

12.13 Both the base and endline surveys asked a number of questions about the perceptions of the prevalence of particular neighbourhood problems and antisocial behaviours. The types of antisocial behaviour about which questions were asked were:-

• Noisy neighbours or regular loud parties;
• Vandalism, graffiti or deliberate damage to property;
• Intimidation and harassment;
• Drug misuse or dealing;
• Rubbish or litter lying about; and
• Rowdy behaviour.

12.14 Selection of these types of antisocial behaviours seems appropriate given that a 2006 survey commissioned by ADT Europe (ADT Europe, 2006) found disrespectful behaviour, rowdy behaviour and vandalism to be forms of antisocial behaviour highlighted most frequently by respondents from Great Britain. Likewise the Audit Commission (2006) found that one in 3 people living in deprived areas believed that antisocial behaviour was damaging their quality of life, whilst the Neighbourhood Warden Scheme Evaluation (Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, 2004) found that antisocial behaviour continued to be the principal cause of dissatisfaction for 46% of residents in warden scheme areas. Accordingly, whilst it is
acknowledged that “quality of life” is affected by multiple and complex components, perceptions of antisocial behaviour seem to be a significant factor.

12.15 For each type of antisocial behaviour interviewees were asked to rate their perceptions on a sliding scale, from the occurrence being “Very Common” to “Not at all Common” in their neighbourhood. For the endline survey this question was repeated, along with a further 2 questions that asked:-

- If the antisocial behaviour occurrence had become “More Common”, “Less Common” or had “Stayed the Same” over the last 12 months; and
- Those who claimed that the occurrence had become “Less Common” were asked if they felt that wardens were responsible for this reduction.

The data for each of these questions for each type of antisocial behaviour is shown in Tables A2.5 to A2.22 in Appendix 2.

12.16 Interpretation of the results is not straightforward, mainly as no simple or consistent, pattern emerges from the data. In part this may reflect the fact that some types of antisocial behaviour may be more easily influenced by the wardens’ actions than are others, something highlighted in Chapter 11 (Paragraph 11.3).

12.17 If we try to interpret the data, by looking at the perceptions of behaviours that are said to be “Very” or “Fairly Common” (Table 12.1) then it seems that between the base and endline surveys:-

- There has been no or little change in the perceptions of the prevalence of incidents of noisy neighbours and vandalism; and
- The other 4 types of behaviours have all seen reductions in the numbers stating they were “Very” or “Fairly Common”, with 3 showing differences of over 20% between the base and endline survey dates (Harassment, Rubbish/Litter and Rowdy Behaviour).

Given this, it could be argued that, between 2005 and 2006, the quality of life in the 9 case study areas has improved, in part because occurrences of a range of antisocial behaviours have decreased. It is particularly worth noting that no incidences of antisocial behaviour are believed to have become more common.
TABLE 12.1 Comparisons of Baseline and Endline Surveys on Perceptions of the Occurrence of Particular Types of Antisocial Behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of antisocial behaviour</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Column 3/ Column 2 *100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noisy neighbours</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Misuse</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish/Litter</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowdy Behaviour</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:-
1. This information is derived from Tables A2.5, A2.8, A2.11, A2.14, A2.17 and A2.20.

12.18 That the wardened areas have seen improvements in the incidence of a number of types of antisocial behaviour mirrors the findings from other research. For example:-

- The Neighbourhood Wardens Scheme Evaluation (Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, 2004) found evidence of changing perceptions in relation to antisocial behaviour, with there being a 0.7% decline within wardened areas amongst those stating that young people loitering was a problem compared to a 5.4% increase in the areas without wardens;
- In Northern Ireland two fifths of tenants who participated in the survey stated that there had been fewer incidences of antisocial behaviour since the introduction of the wardens (Northern Ireland Housing Executive, 2003); and
- In England and Wales the wardens were felt to have had a positive impact on environmental problems such as litter and dog fouling (Department for Communities and Local Government, 2006).

12.19 Overall the survey results indicate that the quality of life in the case study areas has generally improved between the 2 survey dates. For example:-

- Ratings of the neighbourhoods as places to live have improved;
- Fear of crime has decreased; and
- A range of antisocial behaviours are felt to have become less common.

12.20 Given this, when the changes in the case study areas are considered in isolation, there is evidence of a positive impact on the quality of life. However, we now need to consider the extent to which these positive changes are mirroring changes in the control areas.

Changes in the Control Areas

12.21 The control areas were intended to represent the “policy off” scenario. The aim was to look at the changes within the wardened case study areas, compare these
to changes in the control areas and then ascribe any differences to the wardens’ interventions. The control areas (Oxgangs and Firhill in Edinburgh and Rattray in Perth and Kinross) were selected so that, as far as possible, they had similar characteristics to the wardened areas, but did not have additional antisocial behaviour initiatives in place (Paragraphs 2.26 to 2.27).

12.22 When the endline surveys are considered what emerges is a picture of improvements in both the case study and control areas. However, the magnitude of the improvements in the control areas has, for some variables, been greater than in the case study areas, in some cases by a considerable margin. For example:-

- The percentage increase in those feeling “Very Safe” walking after dark between the base and endline surveys was 18% for the case study areas but 112% for the controls, whilst the comparable figures for feeling “Very Safe” in the home were 19% and 53% (figures derived from Tables A2.3 and A2.4, Appendix 2); and
- There has generally been a greater decrease in the percentages of those claiming that certain types of antisocial behaviour were “Very Common” in the control than in the case study areas (Table 12.2). Thus it can be seen that:-
  - For 4 of the types of antisocial behaviour the improvements in the control areas were greater than in the case study; and
  - For Rubbish/Litter and Rowdy Behaviour there was a greater comparative change in perceptions in the case study areas. Interestingly Rowdy Behaviour is one of the forms of antisocial behaviour which had a very low level of attribution to the wardens (see Table 14.1)\(^\text{37}\).

### TABLE 12.2 Comparative Changes for Those Claiming that Certain Types of Antisocial Behaviour were “Very Common” between 2005 and 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of antisocial behaviour being claimed to be “Very Common”</th>
<th>Percentage change in Case Study Areas between 2005 and 2006</th>
<th>Percentage Change in Control Areas between 2005 and 2006</th>
<th>Column 3/Column 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>-33%</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td>-50%</td>
<td>-78%</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Misuse</td>
<td>-22%</td>
<td>-28%</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noisy Neighbours</td>
<td>-17%</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowdy Behaviour</td>
<td>-46%</td>
<td>-40%</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubbish/Litter</td>
<td>-31%</td>
<td>-25%</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:-
1. The percentages are derived from Tables A2.5, A2.8, A2.11, A2.14, A2.17 and A2.20, in Appendix 2.

12.23 These changes in both types of area are reflected in perceptions of the quality of the areas as places to live (Table 12.3). Both areas have improved but the improvements have been greater in the control areas.

\(^{37}\) One tentative explanation for this may be that wardens lack enforcement powers.
TABLE 12.3  Comparative Changes in the Ratings of Neighbourhoods as Places to Live between 2005 and 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighbourhood Rating</th>
<th>Percentage change in Case Study Areas between 2005 and 2006</th>
<th>Percentage Change in Control Areas between 2005 and 2006</th>
<th>Column 3/Column 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Very Good”</td>
<td>+20%</td>
<td>+43%</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Fairly”/“Very Poor”</td>
<td>-35%</td>
<td>-54%</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1. The percentages are derived from Table A2.1, Appendix 2.

12.24 Why have the control areas seemingly improved far more than the wardened case study areas? Both areas were initially similar in both socio-economic and perceptual terms, yet the wardens’ interventions do not seem to be reflected in a greater differential improvement in the case study areas. One can put forward 2 overlapping hypotheses to explain this:-

- The introduction of the wardens, as the evidence in Chapter 14 shows (Paragraph 14.5), resulted in residents thinking that they could make a difference. This might result in residents becoming less tolerant and their perceptions of the intensity and severity of antisocial behaviours may have increased as they now expect that something will be done about it. This interpretation of the statistics shows the wardens in a very positive light; and/or
- It may be that the control areas have experienced additional interventions, or other changes, that have resulted in perceptions of antisocial behaviour changing significantly.

12.25 There is evidence from the case study areas that perceptions of wardens amongst some are positive (see, for example, Paragraph 14.5). This might lend credence to the first interpretation: that residents in wardened areas have become less tolerant as they expect that the wardens will make a difference. They therefore become more critical about local conditions (Table A2.25).

12.26 There is also evidence to support the fact that there have been changes in the control areas, despite attempts being made to select stable areas. Thus, the Edinburgh wardens’ manager attributes the changes in Oxgangs/Firrhill to the clearance of tower blocks that had been a focus for antisocial behaviour. The demolition of the blocks is said to have changed residents’ perceptions of crime considerably. This may explain why the fear of crime in the control areas has decreased so significantly when compared to the case study areas (Paragraph 12.22). The reasons for the changes in Rattray are not as clear cut. The Perth and Kinross scheme manager\(^38\) is not aware of any physical changes in the area, or of any changes to housing management, that might have resulted in antisocial tenants being moved elsewhere. In terms of antisocial behaviour initiatives, the local authority’s Youth Services department has

---

\(^{38}\) The warden schemes manager is also Antisocial Behaviour Co-ordinator for the whole of the local authority and therefore is familiar with actions across the authority.
set up “Midnight Football” schemes. However, the manager did not feel that they alone could account for the substantial changes in perceptions.

12.27 Difficulty in identifying changes attributable to wardens is not unique to schemes in Scotland. The National Evaluation of the Street Wardens Programme (Department for Communities and Local Government, 2006) concluded that there was no measurable difference in the change in perceptions of livability\(^{39}\) between the wardeden and comparator areas. Two explanations were proposed:-

- Despite being well implemented, schemes had failed to improve livability of their neighbourhoods; and/or
- It is too difficult to measure any change in livability brought about through wardens by relying on residents’ surveys as:-
  - Livability is a complex concept which is therefore problematic to measure;
  - The Street Wardens Programme used a number of approaches that had varying degrees of success;
  - The impact of the Street Wardens Programme has been dispersed; and
  - Local authorities may have directed additional resources towards non-wardened areas in compensation.

12.28 This failure to be able to clearly identify a differential impact is disappointing, although not unexpected in the light of other evidence. We will now turn to look at change in the individual case study areas.

Changes in Perceptions in the Individual Case Study Areas

12.29 Table 12.4 looks at the changes across the 9 areas on perceptions of antisocial behaviour for 5 of the indicators used in the base and endline surveys\(^{40}\). The negative changes (that is change that is moving in the correct direction with perceptions of the incidence of antisocial behaviours decreasing) have been highlighted.

12.30 What emerges is a very mixed picture. Of the 9 areas:-

- East Renfrewshire and Perth and Kinross show decreases across all the 5 indicators, often by quite substantial amounts. Residents therefore feel that their areas have improved considerably between the 2 dates. Arguably Dumfries and Galloway can also be placed into this category, given that it shows improvements on 4 of the indicators, whilst the fifth (drug misuse) is static;
- In Inverclyde 4 of the indicators have moved in the correct direction, with the fifth (vandalism) showing an increase;
- In 3 areas (Aberdeen, Dundee and Edinburgh) there is a mixed picture, with different combinations of pairs of indicators showing improvements whilst the other 3 show increases in the prevalence of antisocial behaviour; and
- At the other extreme there have been significant increases in the perceptions of incidences of 4 of the indicators in Orkney, albeit that the base is often quite

---

\(^{39}\) “Livability”, as used in the report, is a concept that covers social inclusion, environmental improvements, reducing crime and the fear of crime and deterring antisocial behaviour.

\(^{40}\) The data is in Appendix 2, Table A2.5, 2.8, 2.11, 2.14 and 2.17.
small. Thus 7% of interviewees felt that noisy neighbours were “Very” or “Fairly Common” in 2005. This increased by almost a third in 2006. Over the same period perceptions of drug misuse increased threefold.

12.31 When the indicators are considered individually across the schemes no pattern emerges. For example, it is not the case that some indicators are all moving in the same direction, which might indicate that the wardens were able (or were not able) to have an impact upon some activities but not others.

12.32 To try to explain these changes we can first look at the changes in the wider area, using the SHS in an attempt to isolate the wardens’ interventions from changes in the wider area. For example, although the perception of an incidence might be increasing in one of the case study areas, if this is not increasing as fast as within the wider area then it could be argued that the wardens are having a positive impact. However, there are problems in using the SHS data, as highlighted earlier (Paragraph 2.29-2.30). For example, the wording of the questions between the surveys and SHS was not always comparable41. Of more significance is the fact that local authority level data is only collated every 2 years for the smaller authorities. For the intervening year the data is only available for geographically larger areas. This means that while the baseline position across the wider area was measured by reference to the SHS results at Local Authority level, the endline had to be measured by reference to a larger geographical area in some cases. For this reason some scheme managers were very sceptical about the validity of any comparisons using SHS data. Our view, however, is that it is better to have some comparative data that none at all. Table 12.5 shows the areas for which the data is available in 2004/05 and 2005/06.

41 There were not comparable questions in the SHS for the base/endline question about rowdy behaviour. There were also slight variations between some of the survey and SHS questions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study Area</th>
<th>Percentage changes between the base and endline surveys of people reporting that the indicator was “Very” or “Fairly Common”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perception of the prevalence of noisy neighbours/loud parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumfries and Galloway</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundee</td>
<td>-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Renfrewshire</td>
<td>-73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverclyde</td>
<td>-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orkney</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth and Kinross</td>
<td>-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lanarkshire</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 12.5 Areas for Which Scottish Household Survey Data is Available

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Warden Case Study Areas</th>
<th>Scottish Household Survey 2004/05</th>
<th>Scottish Household Survey 2005/06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Torry, Aberdeen</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Grampian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumfries</td>
<td>Dumfries and Galloway</td>
<td>Southern Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitkerro, Dundee</td>
<td>Dundee</td>
<td>Tayside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auchenback, Barrhead, Renfrewshire</td>
<td>East Renfrewshire</td>
<td>Renfrewshire and Inverclyde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh South</td>
<td>City of Edinburgh</td>
<td>City of Edinburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larkfield, Gourock, Inverclyde</td>
<td>Inverclyde</td>
<td>Renfrewshire and Inverclyde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orkney</td>
<td>Orkney</td>
<td>Highlands and Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North and South Letham, Perth</td>
<td>Perth and Kinross</td>
<td>Tayside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambuslang, Lanarkshire</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>South Lanarkshire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 12.33 Table 12.6 compares the percentage changes in perceptions of the prevalence of various forms of antisocial behaviour in the case study areas (measured using the base and endline surveys) and changes in the wider area (measured by the SHS) between the base and endline surveys. Again the cells in the Table have been highlighted where the decrease in perceptions of the indicator being “Very” or “Fairly Common” are greater in the wardeden area than in the wider area. Although the caveats about the different geographies need to be borne in mind, what emerges is that:-

- Again both the East Renfrewshire and Perth and Kinross case studies have experienced changes in perceptions between the 2 survey dates that are greater, in some instances far greater, than the changes in the wider areas;
- One area (Aberdeen) has experienced relative increases in perceptions of the incidence on all 5 indicators, that is antisocial behaviour has got relatively worse;
- A further 3 areas (Dumfries and Galloway, Inverclyde and Orkney) have experienced relative positive changes on 3 indicators and negative on the other 2. Of these, all 3 areas have experienced positive change on perceptions of the prevalence of noisy neighbours and rubbish and litter. All 3 have also seen negative change on the intimidation indicator; and
- The final 3 areas (Dundee, Edinburgh and South Lanarkshire) have seen negative changes on 4 out of the 5 indicators.
### TABLE 12.6  Comparative Changes in the Incidence of Antisocial Behaviour Between the Case Study and Wider Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study Area</th>
<th>Perception of the prevalence of noisy neighbours/loud parties</th>
<th>Perception of the prevalence of vandalism, graffiti and damage to property</th>
<th>Perception of the prevalence of groups/individuals intimidating/harassing others</th>
<th>Perception of the prevalence of drug misuse/dealing</th>
<th>Perception of the prevalence of rubbish/litter lying around</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-47</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-38</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumfries and Galloway</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundee</td>
<td>-72</td>
<td>-44</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-42</td>
<td>-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Renfrewshire</td>
<td>-73</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-64</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>-62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverclyde</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orkney</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth and Kinross</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-77</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lanarkshire</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12.7 looks at changes in perceptions of safety across the case study areas. Again the cells in the Table that show increases between the 2 survey dates have been highlighted. Overall a far more positive picture emerges, with only Inverclyde showing a decrease in perceptions of safety on both indicators whilst 5 areas show increases on both. Some of these are quite considerable, for example East Renfrewshire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study Area</th>
<th>Perception of safety when walking alone in the local neighbourhood after dark</th>
<th>Perception of safety when at home alone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumfries and Galloway</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundee</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Renfrewshire</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverclyde</td>
<td>-39</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orkney</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth and Kinross</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lanarkshire</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12.8 looks at the comparative changes in perceptions of safety. Again the cells in the Table have been highlighted to show those areas where there has been a comparative increase in the percentage of residents who reported feeling safer. What is apparent is that:

- In 5 of the case studies (Dumfries and Galloway, Dundee, East Renfrewshire, Orkney and South Lanarkshire) feelings of safety have increased in comparative terms on both indicators;
- In Aberdeen and Inverclyde comparatively residents feel less safe; and
- In Perth and Kinross and Edinburgh there is a mixed picture, with both showing increases on one indicator and decreases on another.
### TABLE 12.8 Comparative Changes in Perceptions of Safety Between the Case Study and the Wider Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study Area</th>
<th>Percentage changes between the base and endline surveys and SHS surveys of people reporting that they felt “Very” or “Fairly Safe” on the indicator</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perception of safety when walking alone in the local neighbourhood after dark</td>
<td>Perception of safety when at home alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Base and endline</td>
<td>SHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumfries and Galloway</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundee</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Renfrewshire</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverclyde</td>
<td>-39</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orkney</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth and Kinross</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lanarkshire</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What Impact Has There Been in the Case Study Areas?

12.36 The point was made earlier that, when the case study areas are considered in isolation, the quality of life for residents seems to have improved (Paragraph 12.19). There is also evidence that attributes these changes to the wardens. For example:-

- Residents feel that the wardens have the potential to improve the quality of life in their areas (Paragraph 14.5);
- A third felt that the wardens had already had a positive impact; and
- A minority attributed positive changes in the occurrence of various types of antisocial behaviour to interventions by the wardens.

12.37 However, when the changes in perceptions of various forms of antisocial behaviours are compared to changes in the control areas a less positive picture emerges, with the control areas experiencing more positive change on most of the indicators. This might imply that the wardens are having limited impacts, although changes in the control areas, especially in Edinburgh, mean that such an interpretation is probably erroneous.

12.38 When the individual case study areas are considered a very mixed picture of changes in perceptions of the various antisocial behaviour indicators emerges in that only 2 of the 9 case studies show improvements on all 5 indicators. However, when the indicators are considered across the case studies:-
• Of the 45 cells in Table 12.4 (which looks at changes in incidences of 5 indicators) 27 (60%) show positive change; and
• When the changes are placed in context of the comparative change in the wider area (Table 12.6), then of the 45 cells 22 (49%) show changes that compare favourably with changes in the wider area.

12.39 An even more positive picture emerges when perceptions of safety are considered. For example:-

• Of the 18 cells in Table 12.7, 13 show positive change (72%); and
• Of the 18 cells in Table 12.8, 13 (72%) demonstrate changes that are greater than those in the wider area.

When making these interpretations the deficiencies in the SHS data (Paragraph 12.32) need to be remembered.

12.40 Overall we would argue that, in the areas where wardens operate, there have been comparative positive changes in perceptions of the frequencies of a range of antisocial behaviours and, to a greater extent, in perceptions of safety, both in the neighbourhood and in the home. The data is not “clean”, in that by no means all of the areas show positive changes on all indicators. However, given the complicated inter-relationships between interventions and impacts, and the fact that the wardens in different areas are likely to have different priorities, this must be expected. It is however, worth considering if there is any relationship between perceptions and the reality of crime and antisocial behaviour.

Do Perceptions of Crime Bear any Relationship to its Reality?

12.41 Exploring the relationship between the reality of crime (as measured by the statistics of recorded crime) and perceptions of its frequency, is difficult for a number of reasons:-

• As has been highlighted earlier (Paragraph 9.21) recorded crime is not an accurate reflection of the “true” levels of crime within an area; and
• Comparable data across the case study areas are not always available.

12.42 Accepting these problems, it is possible to look at the relationship between the recorded number of incidents of vandalism and residents’ perceptions of vandalism across 5 of the case study areas (Table 12.9). What can be seen from the Table is that there does seem to be a relationship in that (with the exception of Dumfries and Galloway) changes in recorded vandalism levels are matched by changes in residents perceptions of the extent to which vandalism is felt to be “Very” or “Fairly Common”. Although this is a very small sample, this visual relationship is backed up by statistics, there being a correlation coefficient of +0.949 between the 2 variables. This implies that as reported incidents of vandalism rise or fall then there is an almost exact rise or fall in perceptions of their incidence.\(^{42}\)

\(^{42}\) Statistically this relationship was significant at the 0.05 level.
### TABLE 12.9 Comparative Changes in Recorded Crime and Perceptions of its Incidence - Vandalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case study area</th>
<th>Change in the percentage of recorded incidents of vandalism between the baseline and Year 2.</th>
<th>Changes in the percentage of residents who reported that vandalism, graffiti and damage to property was “Very” or “Fairly Common”.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>+25</td>
<td>+10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumfries and Galloway¹</td>
<td>+13</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundee</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Renfrewshire</td>
<td>-27</td>
<td>-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lanarkshire</td>
<td>+18</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note**:  
1. The data for Dumfries and Galloway relates to the change between year 1 and 2 as no baseline was provided.

### Conclusions

12.43 On the basis of the evidence presented here it could be argued that perceptions of safety and antisocial behaviour are grounded in reality. Thus, as is shown in the earlier paragraphs, if perceptions are becoming more positive this might imply that crime and antisocial behaviour occurrences are decreasing. There is also evidence that attributes these changes, at least in part, to the wardens. Accordingly we would argue that the surveys indicate that the wardens are having a positive impact on residents’ perceptions which, in its turn, reflects their success in reducing crime and antisocial behaviour.

12.44 This impact is not always simple to interpret and seems to vary across the case study areas. Accordingly this may be seen as an unduly optimistic interpretation, given that, in Table 12.6, around half of the Table’s cells indicate that the case study areas have experienced changes in perceptions that are not as positive as those experienced in the wider comparator areas. However, against this has to be balanced the fact that, at the time of the endline survey, the wardens had been operating for a maximum of 2 years and often less. They were also working in areas where the antisocial behaviour problems were long standing and often quite severe. Given these factors one could argue that the improvement seems to have been better than one might have expected.
CHAPTER THIRTEEN THE WARDENS’ AND SCHEME MANAGERS’ VIEWS ON IMPACT

Introduction

13.1 The earlier Chapters looked at a number of sources of statistical and survey evidence and concluded that the wardens seemed to be having some impact on crime and perceptions of crime. This Chapter deepens this analysis by considering the views of the wardens and the scheme managers as to the impact that they feel they are having on crime and antisocial behaviour. It starts by considering the results from the wardens’ survey.

The Wardens

13.2 Respondents to the wardens’ survey were asked to comment on what had gone particularly well during their time as a community warden. The most common answer related to community relations, and the fact that many of the wardens had built up good relationships with the communities in which they worked. Indeed, 70% of respondents mentioned this. Of these, 32% referred to their work with young people. Examples of comments received included:

- “Building relationships and trust with local youths. Response from the community towards wardens”;
- “Gaining the respect and trust of the community, working and listening to the youths”;
- “The community are beginning to realise we are there for them”;
- “Making a real difference on the street”; and
- “The local area is more noticeably cleaner”;

13.3 Respondents were also asked what had not gone so well. A third of comments (33%) focused on the poor relationships that the warden service had with either the police, or council departments. For instance:-

- “Lack of communication with certain people in the council”;
- “Our working relationships with the safer communities police and the youth action team police services”;
- “Lack of help from other agencies which is becoming frustrating and not being able to use my own initiative”; and
- “We get very little help or support from police, at times they have not even turned up to 999 calls from us when we have been under attack.”

13.4 Other comments were more varied, but issues such as poor management, and difficulties in breaking down barriers with local youths, were more commonly cited than others.

13.5 The wardens were asked to give their views on the types of antisocial behaviour that they felt they had made the greatest impact on. Eighty three respondents felt the biggest impact had been on Youth Disorder followed by 63 who each identified Graffiti and Fly-Tipping (Table 13.1). The lowest impact was felt to
be on Crimes of Dishonesty (10 responses) and Assaults (7 responses), although this is not surprising given the low percentage that said they spent time dealing with these issues (Table 5.1). These are also the types of offences that fall within the remit of the police, rather than the wardens, given their limited powers.

### TABLE 13.1 On What Areas Would You Say that you have had the Biggest Impact in your Time as a Warden/concierge?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth disorder</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fly tipping</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-street drinking</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned vehicles</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire raising</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug abuse</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood disputes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crimes of dishonesty</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assaults</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other instances of antisocial behaviour</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=101
Note:- 1. Some respondents gave more than one response.

### 13.6 Less than half of respondents (44%) felt that their impact had increased over time (Table 13.2). However, rather worryingly almost a third (29%) felt their impact over time had decreased. It is not clear from the survey why this should be. However, the case study fieldwork found that there was a view amongst some, particularly in the areas having the worst antisocial behaviour problems, that initially the wardens were able to have an impact. Young people, especially, were uncertain as to the wardens’ powers and roles and therefore modified their behaviour. After a while they realised that the wardens had no, or limited, powers. Accordingly their behaviour reverted to what it had been before the wardens were introduced. Given that this theory was advanced in more than one case study area, it may be the correct explanation for this perception of diminishing impacts over time.

### TABLE 13.2 Changes in Impact Over Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased over time</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayed the same</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased over time</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Scheme Managers

13.7 The managers were asked to identify their key achievements. A variety was cited, ranging from the general to the scheme specific. Looking across the schemes, the 3 main achievements of the wardens were felt to be:-

- Improving the quality of life for residents in warded areas;
- Success in integrating with the community in a short period of time; and
- Progress with the wardens cementing their position within the wider partnerships set up to tackle antisocial behaviour and environmental issues.

13.8 The above 3 themes represent an amalgamation of the numerous achievements cited by individual scheme managers. Some specific examples of these were:-

- Dundee feeling that getting several diverse departments pulling together and working as a team was a major achievement;
- Dundee also felt that the Community Safety Wardens Advisory Group, which has 2 representatives from each of the sub-areas, was a very effective way of communicating with local communities and determining the direction and focus of the overall initiative;
- The wardens making a real difference in tackling antisocial behaviour in Inverclyde. This was evidenced by the fact that they have had over 60 citations to act as professional witnesses in court in 28 months;
- Improving the environment of the neighbourhoods patrolled in Perth and Kinross through the wardens monitoring property, streets and public spaces and taking action as necessary;
- Working in partnership in Edinburgh to tackle graffiti and littering; and
- Developing trust with local youths in South Lanarkshire.

13.9 In summary, scheme managers were broadly satisfied with the achievements of their schemes within the relatively short time they had been operating. There was general agreement that it had been difficult, at first, to find a natural home for the wardens and establish their credibility, given that other public services were well established and the community knew what they did. Initial teething problems had now been overcome, although there was recognition that there was still much work to be done in developing the service.

13.10 Despite the strides made by the wardens in integrating with the community, the majority of managers were frustrated by the fact that, generally, the wardens were not well understood by the general public. This refers to misunderstandings on a number of levels, such as:-

- Basic recognition and understanding that the community warden service was there to be used by the general public. The managers felt that there were still too many local residents putting up with antisocial behaviour and environmental problems rather than taking action by reporting these to the wardens;
• Getting the general public to understand that community wardens are not the police, are not a substitute for the police and are not “policing on the cheap”;
and
• Getting the public to understand that wardens can only operate within the confines of their granted powers. They are not a panacea and they do not have the powers to deal with criminality.

13.11 It was recognised that developing this understanding amongst the public would take longer than the 2 to 3 years most schemes had been running. As such, this was seen as one of the key development priorities.

13.12 Scheme specific disappointments included:-

• The local authority’s unwillingness to fund wardens in Inverclyde. In light of the benefits that wardens were bringing to the area, it was thought that even a small number of wardens should have been mainstreamed by the council. To date, this has not happened; and
• Difficulties in accurately measuring the wardens’ impact on antisocial behaviour in Edinburgh. Frustration was also expressed at wardens passing on information to the police and not receiving any feedback on whether there had been a successful outcome as a result.

13.13 On the whole, the managers were realistic enough to understand that, in attempting to implement a scheme of the size of the community wardens, there were always going to be disappointments. There was, however, unanimous agreement that the positives had outweighed the negatives.

13.14 In terms of the managers’ views on the impact on crime and the fear of crime, without exception, all 9 case study managers felt that the wardens had been effective in reducing the fear of crime and antisocial behaviour in the neighbourhoods they patrolled, something backed up, to various degrees, by the evidence in Chapters 10, 11 and 12. Attendance at community meetings, informal chats with members of the community and letters of support from the general public were evidenced as backing up this interpretation. Making residents feel safer in their own areas was seen as the key strategic objective of wardens and all schemes’ managers were agreed that this had been achieved.

13.15 In terms of the wardens’ impact on levels of reported crime, the majority of scheme managers were unsurprised that levels of some incidences of crimes had increased over the life of the scheme. The explanation put forward was that residents were more willing to report crime and antisocial behaviour as they now knew that there was a dedicated service in place to deal with these issues. The managers felt that lower level crimes and antisocial behaviours would have previously gone unreported as residents felt that the police were too busy to deal with them, particularly on weekend nights. Now there were said to be many “repeat” users of the warden service. Residents, who had called the service once, were given a prompt and efficient response and as such have continued to use the service when needed.

13.16 Managers were cautious about drawing conclusions on the effectiveness of the wardens, based on reported crime and antisocial behaviour statistics. Several
commented that rises and falls in statistics were notoriously difficult to make sense of and only told part of the story. It was argued that crime and antisocial behaviour reporting can be driven by a range of factors, many of which were beyond the control of wardens and even the police. As such any assessment of the effectiveness of the wardens must take account of the role they play in changing perceptions as well as the statistical changes.

13.17 The views of wardens as just “one piece of the jigsaw”, when it comes to tackling crime, antisocial behaviour and environmental issues, came across strongly in the final interviews with the scheme managers. All managers were realistic enough to understand that, without the support and input of partner services (such as the police, fire and rescue and other council departments), the wardens would be ineffectual. The role of wardens as a conduit between partner services and the community was emphasised strongly by managers. Partner services were said not to have the resources to cope with the range of issues prevalent in scheme areas. Wardens were felt to fill this void by listening to residents’ concerns, in their role as “the eyes and ears” of the community, and then linking in with the relevant partners to resolve these. Moreover, scheme managers firmly believed that partner services were able to achieve much more with the wardens than they otherwise would have been be able to do.

13.18 However, it was felt that more time was required for the full impact of the wardens to be realised. This would allow schemes to test whether the investment in developing relationships with their local communities had resulted in positive and long term behaviour modifications.

Displacement

13.19 Throughout the case study visits, displacement was not considered to be an issue by consultees. However, the final interviews with managers saw it raised by a small number. Targeted warden initiatives, on activities such as drinking alcohol in public or vandalism in children’s play parks, were said to have driven perpetrators from wardened areas to non-wardened areas that were not always immediately adjacent to wardened areas. For example, those responsible may travel to the town centre, or to other less visible parts of town, to escape the attentions of the wardens.

13.20 Dealing with displacement was not an easy task according to the managers. The wardens’ success was built on regular, high visibility patrols. Through this consistent tracking of “hot-spots”, wardens could quickly extinguish unwanted activity as soon as it became evident. It was felt that this resulted in the perpetrators then moving to another location. However, if the new location was outside of the warden patrol areas then it might not be targeted and the disturbance could continue.

13.21 The majority of scheme managers used their wardens flexibly to some extent so that they could be used to target areas where antisocial activities had been displaced to. However, this flexibility usually consisted of wardens making courtesy visits to non-wardened areas in response to direct calls or requests. This was felt by managers to be too infrequent to make any lasting difference on the adjacent areas as well as diluting the impact wardens could have on their own designated patrol areas.

13.22 Despite these reports of displacement, it should be emphasised that this was not identified as a major issue by managers. The view was that relating any new
bursts of antisocial behaviour in neighbouring areas causally to the presence of wardens was difficult to prove. There was also a belief that police activities had caused displacement before the wardens were introduced and this was still a factor in displacement (Paragraphs 15.44 to 15.49 present a longer discussion on displacement).

**Conclusions**

13.23 The wardens and the managers felt that they were having an impact. This was not always straightforward. For example, reported crime levels might increase as confidence in the wardens’ abilities to initiate actions permeated the community. There was also recognised to be an issue with youth related incidents as over time the wardens became less effective as their limited powers were recognised.

13.24 Clearly the wardens and managers have vested interests in making such claims. Yet they do seem to be backed up to some extent by the statistical and survey evidence on recorded crimes and their perceptions. What is therefore beginning to emerge is a picture of Scotland’s community wardens having a positive impact on the problems in the target areas. The next Chapter extends this analysis by considering the extent to which the communities in these areas ascribe impacts to the wardens and their interventions.
CHAPTER FOURTEEN THE COMMUNITY’S VIEWS ON IMPACT

Introduction

14.1 This Chapter looks at the perceptions of the wardens and their impact as seen by those resident within the case study areas. It draws on 3 main sources:-

- The analysis of the 24 month templates
- The base and endline surveys, which were reported more fully in Chapter 12; and
- A series of focus groups undertaken with young and older people\(^{43}\). The majority of focus groups, involving young people, were carried out in youth clubs and involved groups of young people aged between 11 and 16. However, in Aberdeen a primary school was visited and in Dundee the focus group was carried out in an after school care club. All of the focus groups undertaken with older people were carried out with residents of sheltered housing complexes. Focus groups were undertaken in October and November 2006.

Further details of the methodology are given in Paragraphs 2.41 to 2.44. We start by considering awareness of the wardens as identified in the surveys, as clearly a prerequisite of being able to ascribe impacts to an intervention is awareness of that intervention.

Awareness of Wardens

14.2 The base and endline surveys asked questions about awareness of the wardens. Although the local communities had had limited, or no, involvement in the planning of the warden schemes (Paragraph 7.2) awareness was now generally good (Table A2.23)\(^{44}\), with almost three quarters of survey respondents in the case study areas indicating that they were aware of them. However, the change in levels of awareness since the baseline survey was slight: an increase from 70% to 72%. This may reflect the fact that, when the baseline survey was undertaken, wardens were already operational in some areas, and, even in those schemes where the wardens were not yet on the streets, advanced publicity may have generated awareness. Despite this, it is surprising that awareness has changed so little over the year. This might imply that there is a ceiling of awareness that, once attained, is difficult to exceed. As such it may be unrealistic to expect awareness to have risen markedly between the 2 surveys.

14.3 Most of those who were aware of the wardens had first become aware of them through having seen them on patrol (Table A2.24). This would seem to indicate that visibility is the key to awareness. In its turn this might then result in people talking about them to friends and neighbours thereby increasing awareness even further.

\(^{43}\) Focus groups with 31 older residents were carried out in Aberdeen (15), Dundee (6) and Orkney (10) and focus groups with 53 young people were undertaken in Aberdeen (7), Dumfries (8), Dundee (12), Inverclyde (12), Orkney (6) and Perth (8). It was not possible to arrange focus groups in the other case study areas either as the timescale was too short or it proved difficult to contact groups who were willing to co-operate.

\(^{44}\) The Tables referenced in this Chapter are in Appendix 2 and are denoted by the prefix A2.
The findings of the National Evaluation of the Street Wardens (Department for Communities and Local Government, 2006) highlighted a positive correlation between awareness of, or contact with, wardens and perceptions that the neighbourhood had improved. The extent to which this relationship was seen in Scotland is explored next.

Perceptions of the Wardens’ Impact

The base and endline surveys both asked questions about perceptions of the impact that wardens could have and have had. The baseline survey showed a picture of considerable optimism as to what the wardens could achieve, with 33% of respondents feeling that wardens could improve the quality of life “Considerably” in their areas (Table A2.25). Only 14% did not know. The endline survey showed that perceptions of the potential impacts of the wardens had changed based, one assumes, on experience. Thus, 15% now felt that wardens could have a “Considerable” impact on the quality of life, whilst 27% “Did not Know”. One interpretation of this is that there is now a realisation that the wardens are not going to have a dramatic impact upon all facets of antisocial behaviour. However, the fact that there is still a feeling, amongst some interviewees, that wardens could have an impact implies that there is scope for progress as well as optimism amongst residents about what impact the wardens could have.

The endline survey asked if interviewees felt that wardens had improved the quality of life (Table A2.26). A substantial percentage “Did not Know” (42%). However, 6% felt that the wardens had “Considerably” improved the area and 25% that they had improved it a “Little”, 31% in total. In contrast 27% felt that the wardens had been responsible for “Not Much” or “No” improvements.

These figures are disappointing when compared to survey results from elsewhere. For example, in Northern Ireland 86% of residents surveyed for the national evaluation believing that the wardens provided a “Useful” or a “Very Useful” service (Northern Ireland Housing Executive, 2003). However, in common with the results of the Scottish base and endline surveys, the evaluation in Northern Ireland received a mixed response when the changes in specific types of antisocial behaviour were considered.

To explore those areas where wardens were perceived as having an impact, their impact on specific types of antisocial behaviour will now be considered. Those who stated that the incidence of the 6 types of antisocial behaviour had become “Less Common” (Tables A2.6, A2.9, A2.12, A2.15, A2.18 and A2.21) were asked if they thought this was due to the wardens. Table 14.1 shows the results. Interpretation needs to be done cautiously for, as the final column in the Table indicates, the absolute number of interviewees is often very small. Accepting this, it can be seen that:

These 6 types of antisocial behaviour were: Noisy Neighbours or Regular Loud Parties, Vandalism and Graffiti, Intimidation, Drug Misuse, Rubbish and Litter and Rowdy Behaviour.
Overall 44% of those who answered this question felt the wardens had had a positive impact upon the incidences of antisocial behaviour. This means that 103 out of the total of 889 respondents to the survey (12%) felt that at least one type of antisocial behaviour had become less common and that the wardens were responsible for this;

The highest figures were for Vandalism, Drug Misuse, Intimidation and Litter; and

The lowest levels were for Noisy Neighbours and Rowdy Behaviour, with this latter type of antisocial behaviour having a particularly low level of attribution. One explanation for this may be that people do not see the wardens as having a role in dealing with these types of behaviours, but feel that they are the responsibility of housing officers or other specialists. This is, however, speculation on our part.

Given the findings of similar evaluations it seems likely that those who ascribe a positive impact to wardens’ interventions do so as they have personal experience of what the wardens can do, as was found in Northern Ireland.

### TABLE 14.1 Attributions of Positive Impacts on Antisocial Behaviour to Wardens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Antisocial Behaviour</th>
<th>Percentage of respondents who felt the type of Antisocial Behaviour had become “Less common” (absolute numbers in brackets)¹</th>
<th>Percentage of these who attributed this to the wardens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>8 (54)</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug misuse</td>
<td>2 (14)</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimidation</td>
<td>4 (30)</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter</td>
<td>8 (60)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noisy Neighbours</td>
<td>4 (35)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowdy behaviour</td>
<td>4 (41)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average/Total</td>
<td>5 (234)</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ These are the absolute number of respondents who felt that the particular type of antisocial behaviour had become “Less Common”.

14.9 The base and endline surveys, therefore, present a picture of general awareness of the wardens amongst residents and optimism about what they can achieve. This is reinforced by those who feel that the wardens have had a positive impact on reducing some types of antisocial behaviour. To explore whether these views were shared

---

46 The breakdown of responses was that 44% of respondents felt that the wardens had an impact, 12% felt that they had not and 44% did not know.

47 It may also be that residents are more willing to report certain types of antisocial behaviour than others. For example, things such as litter and vandalism might be reported without any fear of reprisals as often there may be no obvious perpetrator. Other types of antisocial behaviour (such as noisy neighbours) may not be reported because of a fear that those reporting may be targeted by the perpetrator.
amongst particular groups within the community, we will now look at the focus group findings.
Young People and Community Wardens

14.10 The majority of young people involved in the focus groups seemed very aware that community wardens were operating in their areas, thereby reinforcing the findings of the surveys. In Dundee, participants (including younger children) could identify the extent of the patrol area. This was highlighted by the comments of a young child in Dundee who lived outwith the warded area but knew that the wardens could be found around his friend’s house.

14.11 When asked about the role of the wardens, young people seemed unclear. All of the attendees understood that the wardens patrolled neighbourhoods, tried to stop them behaving in a manner that was perceived to be antisocial and moved them on if they were congregating in large groups. The majority of participants were also aware that the wardens did not have any formal powers, unlike the police.

14.12 There was a general lack of awareness of the role of the wardens in building community relations and in improving the quality of the local environment. Young people in Dumfries knew that the wardens removed hypodermic needles but said that they had never seen any action to remove, or prevent, littering or graffiti.

14.13 The role of the wardens in locating and removing hypodermic needles also emerged in Dundee where all of the children indicated that they had been taught to contact the wardens should they discover a needle. A number of the children indicated that this had happened to them. They had left the needles where they were and told a warden about them. However, when asked how they would contact a warden, should the need arise, the children seemed unsure: stating that the wardens “are just there”.

14.14 Young people were asked questions about their contact and relationships with the wardens. The general impression was that the wardens were friendly and were more approachable than the police. Young people in Orkney commented that the wardens were:-

- Friendlier than the police;
- Gave advice; and
- Listened to what they said.

The younger children in Dundee seemed to have particularly good relationships with the wardens, whom they knew by name. The majority had stories to tell of wardens having helped them across busy roads or stopping to play football for a few minutes during their patrol.

14.15 The wardens were regularly seen around the neighbourhoods that they patrol yet, whilst the children in Dundee said that they often see the wardens at their after school club, young people in other areas said that the wardens rarely or only occasionally visited youth clubs. Further, young people in Dumfries commented that the wardens tended to speak to youth workers rather than directly to them and, when on patrol, they usually drove around in their van with the windows rolled up and made little effort to interact. Whilst they were seen on foot more often in the summer months, the young people said they had little contact with them outwith the summer football initiative.
Those who attended the Perth focus group said that they had never asked the wardens for help. In Dumfries the young people held the view that they would rather report incidents to the police than the wardens as there would be more chance of action being taken.

Enforcement by the wardens was also discussed at the focus groups. In Dundee one boy spoke about the wardens asking him to stop kicking a football in his estate. At first he ignored the wardens, but when they returned, and explained to him that he was causing a disruption and might cause damage, he stopped the game. When asked how he felt about being told to stop his game, the boy said that he did not mind as he knew he should not have been acting in that way. A similar sentiment was also expressed by another participant at the Dundee focus group who related how her older sister had been moved on by the wardens for hanging around in a large group. The girl felt that this was justified as she has been taught that large groups of young people may intimidate older people. These findings seem to illustrate the importance of explaining to children, from a young age, why they are being asked not to act in certain ways as opposed to merely reprimanding them and appearing, as one participant in Dumfries commented, that they were trying to stop them from having fun.

The interaction of wardens with older children and adolescents appears, in some cases, to have been less successful. This was, however, expected given the comments of some scheme managers. The Perth focus group revealed teenagers to be indifferent to the wardens, whilst in Orkney teenagers said that when the wardens move them on they often return 15 minutes later and carried on as before. The teenagers present at the Dumfries focus group often choose to ignore the wardens, following realisation that they had no formal powers, a point that was raised in relation to underage drinking. The view was that they would not pour their drink away if requested by a warden and would carry on with their activities unless they knew that the police were on their way. This disrespect seems to have been fuelled by resentment at perceived inequality in the treatment of older and younger adolescents by the wardens. The younger group members in Dumfries complained that they were targeted by the wardens whilst they overlooked the offending behaviour of older teenagers who were more abusive towards them.

The impression that wardens target some groups, and areas, whilst avoiding others, also emerged in other focus groups. Younger children in Inverclyde made similar comments to those in Dumfries, feeling that they were targeted by the wardens because of their youth, whilst the older young people were left alone. In addition, attendees in Aberdeen said that the wardens focused their activity on safer areas as opposed to tackling the more serious problems in other parts of the neighbourhood.

Participants were asked about the impact that the wardens had had on their neighbourhoods. The responses varied considerably between the focus groups. In Dundee all of the participants, including the club leaders, enthusiastically indicated that they believe the wardens were “a good thing” and that they should continue to be

---

48 Paragraph 13.6 makes the point that some wardens felt that their impact decreased over time as young people realise that they had limited powers and therefore, after a while, reverted to their previous behaviours. The findings from this focus group seem to confirm this.
funded. This view was also expressed in Aberdeen, where the focus group concluded that the warden service should be continued, and expanded, as the wardens’ presence made them feel safer.

14.21 The views of focus group participants in Perth, as to the impact and value of community wardens, were mixed. Around two thirds of the young people present stated that they felt safer following the introduction of wardens. The remainder felt that they had made little difference. Mixed views were also revealed in relation to the impact of wardens on graffiti and environmental problems. However, a number of participants believed that the area was now a “nicer” place in which to live since the wardens became operational.

14.22 In Orkney, focus group participants did not believe that wardens had made a notable impact on levels of antisocial behaviour, underage drinking or vandalism, stating that it would make little difference if wardens were taken away tomorrow. These comments do, however, have to be interpreted in the context of levels of antisocial behaviour that were generally very low.

14.23 This was also the feeling that was expressed in Dumfries where young people highlighted fire raising, fighting, drugs and underage drinking as neighbourhood problems but did not believe that the wardens had had any success in addressing them. The focus group said the wardens were “too soft”, lacking in power and respect. As such the young people appeared to laugh at the wardens calling them “PC Wanabes” and “cheap bacon”. The young people stated that they did not feel any safer knowing that wardens were patrolling their neighbourhood and that, in their opinion, the service should not continue to receive funding.

14.24 Very negative views of the community wardens were expressed by young people in Inverclyde: particularly the older adolescents present at the focus group. Young people struggled to understand the purpose of the wardens and saw the service as a waste of resources. In addition, the young people were hostile towards interaction with the wardens as they were seen as “grasses” who feed back information to the police. However, this finding is not surprising, given the comments of the scheme manager who recognised problems with youth engagement in the area where the focus group took place. The scheme manager was, however, confident that these difficulties were far less pronounced in other patrol areas.

14.25 The views of impact from young people are therefore very mixed, with the older ones, in particular, being often quite negative in their perceptions of the wardens and their impact. However, given that it is this group that is most likely to be the target of the wardens’ activities this is perhaps not surprising. Yet it does seem to indicate that, in some areas, more needs to be done to develop positive relationships based on mutual respect.

Older People and Community Wardens

14.26 Awareness of community wardens amongst the older people involved in the focus groups was generally high and participants appeared to have a good understanding of their role and the ways in which they could support the work of the
police. They were also aware of the limits of warden’s powers and, in Aberdeen, supported changes that would allow wardens to issue fixed penalty notices.

14.27 All focus groups involving older people took place in sheltered housing complexes. It appeared that the wardens in these areas maintained regular contact with the complex and the residents. Wardens dropped in to visit whilst on patrol thereby building relationships and reassuring residents that they were there should they need them. Participants in Orkney did, however, comment that they would like to see more of the wardens. Older residents in Aberdeen had all been given a card listing contact details for the wardens so it is always to hand should they have a problem. In Dundee, residents said that they can report incidents to the management of the housing complex who then called a warden on their behalf. In general, the wardens were perceived to be friendly and approachable and all participants felt able to contact the wardens should the need arise.

14.28 When asked about their use of the warden service, the majority of participants referred to problems they had encountered with local young people. Those in Dundee spoke about young people hanging around their complex, vandalising property and drinking. Since the wardens began operating in the area residents believed that the situation had improved. An employee of the complex added that the wardens had greatly increased the security of the building, providing reassurance to residents. One resident did, however, state that many youths returned to the area and continued their activities after the wardens had left.

14.29 Similar themes emerged in Aberdeen and Orkney where residents complained about young people causing trouble when leaving a nearby youth club. In order to address this issue, the wardens had begun escorting young people home from the club, ensuring the safety of the young people whilst also preventing them from acting in an antisocial manner and making older people feel insecure. Since the wardens began operating in Torry, older people believed that there had been a reduction in the number of young people hanging around and causing trouble, making the neighbourhood a more pleasant place in which to live and making them feel safer. If the wardens were withdrawn they feared the problems would resurface.

14.30 In addition to reducing the number of young people hanging around, participants in Aberdeen felt that there had been a noticeable reduction in incidences of vandalism and damage to property since the wardens began patrolling. Given this, they were thoroughly satisfied with the service provided by the wardens and believed that the initiative should continue to receive funding.

14.31 Participants were less clear about the impact of the wardens in Dundee on the environment, stating they were unsure if there had been a reduction in vandalism, graffiti and litter since they became operational. When asked about improvements that could be made to the service, a lively debate ensued with residents discussing the most appropriate way to deal with antisocial behaviour. Some believed that an authoritarian approach was required whilst others felt that engagement with young people and the provision of activities and facilities was more appropriate.

14.32 When asked if the wardens should continue to receive funding the Dundee group agreed unanimously that they should. However, this was followed by a request
for more policing, additional lighting and the installation of CCTV, indicating a
general desire for more services to enhance the security of the area.

14.33 Participants in Orkney agreed that the warden service should continue to
receive funding and commented on the wardens’ impact on rowdy youths in the
Papdale area of the town. The group also said that they felt reassured knowing the
wardens were there, even if they did not see enough of them.

14.34 The older people were, therefore, generally favourably disposed towards the
wardens, feeling that they had a positive impact upon the quality of life. This was
underpinned by a general desire to see the wardens to continue to receive funding.
These positive views were reinforced by the 24 month template analysis and the
opinions of those members of the general community consulted in the course of the
case study visits.

The Views of the General Community

14.35 Almost all of the 24 month templates stated that residents were very happy
with the warden schemes. In the majority of cases the evidence for this came from
residents personally thanking wardens whilst they were on patrol for the work that
they did, or else writing or telephoning to the council to note their appreciation.
Wardens also received feedback on a regular basis through groups such as tenants’
and residents’ associations and community councils. In addition some local authorities
had carried out residents’ surveys, whilst a small number had developed Customer
Satisfaction Surveys to allow people who made a report to the wardens to comment
on the service they received. Comments made by residents included:-

- Expressions of thanks for the invaluable work being done by the wardens;
- Reports of feeling safer and more secure in their neighbourhoods; and
- Residents stating that their quality of life had improved since the warden
  scheme began.

14.36 Three schemes provided details of survey results in the templates:-

- In North Ayrshire 30% of the surveyed residents believed that the wardens had
effected positive change, 22% were yet to be convinced that they had made the
  area better, whilst the remaining 48% either did not know or didn’t respond.
The local authority believed these findings reflected the lack of awareness of
the work that the wardens do, which they plan to address;
- Overall, 81% of Perth and Kinross respondents were very satisfied or satisfied
  with the service; and
- In Renfrewshire, 49% of residents surveyed felt safer as a result of the
  wardens, and 72% agreed that central and local government should fund the
  continuation of the scheme.

Methodological issues, such as the extent to which the surveys are representative,
mean that the results need to be treated with a degree of caution. Despite this, the
results are generally supportive of the wardens.

14.37 The majority of comments reported in the templates were positive with there
being generally very little reported negative feedback from residents. The majority of
the negative comments that were made focused on resources. These included: a desire to see more wardens, extending their patrol hours and wanting to see them in areas that were currently without wardens.

14.38 A common theme running through the consultations undertaken in the case study areas was praise for the prompt response times of the wardens. Residents’ groups commended the fact that, when a call was logged, wardens were on the scene quickly. This was seen as a major advantage of the wardens’ service over the police, with lengthy police response times being criticised in a number of scheme areas.

14.39 Prompt response times were viewed as bringing a number of benefits:-

- Immediate reassurance to the person reporting the incident that the complaint was being addressed;
- Better identification of the perpetrator(s) of the incident through quick arrival on the scene; and
- Ongoing deterrence as the perpetrator(s) came to understand that community wardens responded quickly.

14.40 The high visibility of wardens was also rated favourably by community representatives. Residents stated they felt safer in the knowledge that wardens were patrolling the streets. For example, in Inverclyde, some residents reported waiting for the regular wardens patrol passing before they would go out at night, for example to visit the local shop or take the dog for a walk. Community wardens were seen as providing the peace of mind needed to carry out these everyday tasks.

14.41 The high degree of flexibility shown by the wardens’ management was recognised by community representatives in several areas. The willingness of wardens to adapt their patrols and duties in line with community concerns was felt to be important in demonstrating their value to the community. Where recurrent environmental or antisocial behaviour issues were raised with the wardens, residents were confident that wardens would take steps to try to address them.

Conclusions

14.42 Overall awareness of the wardens was high, although by no means all were aware of their powers and responsibilities. Whilst young people did not, perhaps, feel that the wardens’ impact had been very significant, at least some did feel that the wardens had improved the quality of life in their localities. Older people were generally more positive about impact, some exceptionally so.

14.43 Generally the wardens had established better relationships, and were more highly valued, by older people in the community than the younger age groups. This finding was unsurprising given the remit of the wardens to reduce crime, fear of crime and antisocial behaviour and the common perception that young people were the perpetrators of many of these offences. As such, young people may feel victimised by stereotypes attached to them and react in a defensive manner to interventions that appeared to target them. The positive views expressed by younger children in Dundee were, however, encouraging and may suggest that educating and building relationships with children when they are young could engender the kind of behaviour
modification envisaged by the Scottish Executive when introducing community wardens across the country.

14.44 In order to become a feature of the community that is respected and valued it seems important for wardens to engage positively with all sections of that community. Interaction should not merely be reactive and negative. Therefore, it is important for wardens to spend time with older residents on an informal basis and to interact with young people in a positive manner when they are not acting in a way perceived to be antisocial.

14.45 Positive and continual engagement with the community may be enhanced by training which builds on the characteristics of individual wardens. Focus groups revealed the negative response of young people to perceived victimisation and authoritarian behaviour, a point that was reinforced by the opinions of some older people in Dundee. It therefore seems important for wardens to address young people as equals and respond to offences in a consistent manner, regardless of the age of the perpetrator. An example of positive and continual engagement with young people was seen in Orkney where 2 of the wardens were employed as youth workers at the local youth club.

14.46 Socio-economic characteristics and behavioural norms may be significant in understanding perceptions of, and reactions to, the introduction of community wardens. For example, in areas such as Orkney, which was not perceived to suffer from major environmental and antisocial behaviour problems, informal mechanisms of social control were felt to regulate behaviour. This resulted in low levels of antisocial activity. Whilst young people may have misgivings about the impact of the wardens, they showed respect to them as individuals and paid attention when they were asked to stop doing something, although they might return to it later in the kind of rebellious manner common amongst adolescents.

14.47 Alternatively, the lack of perceived impact and value of wardens in areas such as Inverclyde, which suffer from considerable environmental and antisocial behaviour problems, may be explained in a different way. As authority figures, young people from deprived areas in which community relations with formal institutions are poor, may react with suspicion to the introduction of wardens. In addition, in areas faced with high rates of criminal activity, the role of the wardens in addressing low level crime and antisocial behaviour and environmental issues (such as littering) may be seen as trivial. As a result wardens may be perceived as a waste of resources and treated with indifference. In instances such as these, engagement of wardens with the local community is considered vital.

14.48 Despite these views there is evidence, from the surveys, the focus groups and case study interviews, that the wardens were felt to have an impact, both on perceptions and the incidence of low level crimes and antisocial behaviours. This therefore backs up the earlier statistical and survey analysis.
CHAPTER FIFTEEN  EMERGING ISSUES

Introduction

15.1 During the course of the evaluation a variety of issues emerged. This Chapter tries to synthesise these, drawing upon a number of sources, including the analysis of the templates, the final interviews with each of the scheme managers in the case study areas and the wardens’ survey. The Chapter covers the following:-

- Staff recruitment and retention;
- Things the managers would do differently with the benefit of hindsight;
- Challenges in setting up the scheme;
- Challenges in managing the scheme on a day-to-day basis;
- The wardens’ role;
- Training;
- Data collection and data systems;
- Sustainability;
- Displacement;
- Relationships with the Scottish Executive; and
- Overall conclusions.

Recruitment and Retention of Staff

15.2 Recruitment and retention of wardens has been an issue throughout the evaluation. There are currently (October 2006) 49 vacancies. This figure includes 21 vacancies in West Dunbartonshire, which are mainly part time. North Ayrshire also has a high level of vacancies, with 9 posts being currently unfilled. The remaining schemes have between 0 and 3 vacancies. Were these vacancies to be filled there would be 553 wardens in employment across Scotland.

15.3 The templates asked scheme managers to report on the number of wardens who had been recruited but had subsequently left. In the 12 month report managers claimed that 68 wardens had left from 26 schemes, an average of 2.6 wardens per scheme. In the 24 month reports they reported that 148 wardens have left 30 schemes. Given that the total number of wardens seems to be around 553 in the 32 schemes (Paragraph 15.2) this implies an annual turnover rate of 27%. This is equal to the turnover rate in the retail industry (Future Skills Scotland, 2005). Given that wardens need to develop good relationships with their local communities, this would seem to be difficult if a quarter of staff leave every year.

15.4 Analysis of the 12 month templates found that over the first year the main reasons for wardens leaving their jobs were:-

- Career development and promotion;
- Pay and conditions not being agreeable (or found to be more agreeable at another scheme as quoted by East Renfrewshire where wardens had left to join Renfrewshire);
- The buoyant economies in some areas (for example Aberdeen and Edinburgh) that made recruitment for many posts difficult. In Edinburgh this problem has
been partially solved by use of “Deal Me In”, a council run New Deal initiative;

- Looking for something more permanent (essentially related to the short term nature of the funding for the warden schemes which made such things as getting a mortgage or a loan difficult); and
- Problems with shift working.

Similar reasons were cited in the 24 month templates. There is also evidence to show that some schemes face long term recruitment problems. For example: Scottish Borders reported that one of its vacancies took 3 months to fill and another 8 months. Highland also commented that it had found it difficult to fill posts due to the temporary nature of the contract.

15.5 A small number of schemes have, however, managed to retain all of their wardens. Aberdeenshire, Argyll and Bute, Eilean Siar, Moray and Perth and Kinross all reported that no wardens had left to date. These are, however, small schemes employing no more than 7 wardens.

15.6 The reasons for some schemes being able to retain all of their staff were explored in more detail. For example, in Perth and Kinross the scheme’s manager attributed retention to a number of factors:-

- The small team of 5 in Perth meant that communications between the scheme manager and the wardens was more “two-way” than it would be in a larger team;
- The manager and the wardens work together to devise new initiatives. This was said to help keep the job interesting and adds a different dimension to the nightly patrols; and
- The wardens were given ownership of specific duties. For example one has responsibility for looking after abandoned cars, and another has responsibility for resolving incidents of fly-tipping. This was felt to lead to greater job satisfaction.

15.7 If retention of wardens is to be improved then it would seem that consideration needs to be given to: ensuring that an appropriate career structure is in place supported by training and development; reviewing the pay and conditions of the posts; securing funding to enable the posts to become permanent; and ensuring sufficient wardens are in post to enable the implementation of more suitable/flexible shift patterns. The type of working practices used in Perth and Kinross may also have something to commend them.

15.8 However, despite the relatively high staff turnover, several schemes experienced significant demand for advertised vacancies. South Lanarkshire commented upon the high number of applications received per post, whilst Inverclyde received over 70 applications to fill 3 vacancies. Similarly the recent advertisement of a warden’s post in Perth attracted over 30 applicants. Given this, it would seem that the uncertainty associated with the fixed term contracts offered to wardens is not so much affecting the ability to recruit new staff as the ability to retain existing ones, albeit that local labour market conditions are also likely to have an impact.
Evidence to support this view comes from the wardens’ survey which found that the younger wardens saw the job as being an opportunity to move on, for example to another job in the local authority or the emergency services (see Table 4.4). The managers’ interviews confirmed this. For example:-

- In Dumfries and Galloway the scheme manager reported that at least 2 of his 4 wardens intended to leave in the near future. One had secured a newly created position as an Antisocial Behaviour Co-ordinator with the council whilst the other had applied to join the police; and
- In South Lanarkshire a number of staff had left the wardens’ service for promoted positions with other council departments. For example, a number of community wardens had moved to the new noise wardens’ team set up by the local authority.

Low turnover was seen by several managers as a crucial element in the success of the schemes. It was felt that the relationship between the wardens and the community had the best chance of developing through retention of the same staff working in the same areas. Specific examples of initiatives to retain wardens in post were few. However some good practice was evident across schemes:-

- When recruiting, scheme managers tried to appoint individuals who were genuinely interested in making a difference and had a passion for the work the wardens undertake;
- Managers tried to manage wardens in a fair and equitable way. For example, by allowing them to swap shifts with each other if required; and
- As in Perth, other scheme managers had attempted to vary the work of the wardens by introducing new initiatives and tasks when required. This was said to be important in keeping the job interesting and preventing the monotony that can set in from nightly patrols of the same area.

The smaller warden schemes highlighted the fact that the limited number of wardens they had can cause problems with cover for sickness and holidays. This can impact on maintaining a full presence in patrol areas and had often led to a temporary reduction in wardens’ services from 7 nights a week to 6 in some areas.

In summary, the recruitment and retention of wardens appears to be determined by 2 main factors. These are:-

- The attractiveness of the posts in terms of pay, conditions and availability in relation to the wider labour market; and
- The innovation and management shown by the scheme manager in varying wardens’ duties.

Things Scheme Managers Would Do Differently With the Benefit of Hindsight

There were no consistent messages coming from managers on what they would do differently if they could start the scheme again. Examples of the relatively minor things that individual managers would have done differently included:-
• Aberdeen and Dumfries and Galloway would have liked partner services such as other council departments, the police and fire and rescue service to have committed resources to training at the start;

• The manager in Dundee felt it would have been useful to have had more time to consider the indicators and the impact wardens could be expected to have on them. The view was that not all the current indicators were relevant to the problems that the wardens could influence (see Paragraph 8.10);

• East Renfrewshire would have checked the pay scales of neighbouring schemes prior to employing wardens. This was done latterly in the scheme, but the view was that the initial retention problems would have been stemmed if this exercise had been carried out at the start; and

• Edinburgh would have tackled recruitment differently. The original job description was felt to have been too vague and did not give a clear expectation of the tasks that the wardens would be expected to get involved in, particularly given the differing issues faced by the area teams across the city.

15.14 The main message is therefore that most scheme managers would not do anything significantly different. There was recognition that schemes had not always got everything right, but it was felt important that they learnt from their mistakes.

Challenges in Setting up the Scheme

15.15 It was recognised by managers that establishing a service from scratch was always going to present challenges. Apart from the recruitment issues, which have already been discussed, securing acceptance of the wardens by the local community and other services was felt to be challenging from the start. Several managers reported initial resistance from community groups and local politicians. The novelty of wardens, and a lack of understanding of their roles, meant that some members of the community argued that the money would be better spent on additional police officers. The lack of powers afforded to wardens appears to have been a key factor in fuelling this resistance, with many asking the question “what can the wardens do if they do not have any powers?”

15.16 Overcoming this initial resistance was not an easy task according to the managers. They admitted there were still sections of the community who felt this way about wardens. However, through community engagement, high visibility patrols and close partnership working with other services, managers feel they have made considerable progress in changing initial perceptions, something that the Home Office (2006) anticipated in its advocacy of high visibility policing.

15.17 Establishing a permanent base for the wardens was a challenge when setting up the scheme and still remains an issue in a number of areas. The unsociable hours that the wardens work has posed problems in using local authority offices after 5 pm. In some areas, wardens start their shifts from council offices but after the offices close, they have no fixed base for the rest of their shift. This was felt to contribute to the wardens’ perception of themselves as a new and even “temporary” service.

15.18 Dundee had initial difficulties in securing premises in each of the patrol areas that could be used by the wardens when taking breaks, although this has now been resolved. In Orkney, wardens are continuing to operate without a permanent base of
there. Breaks are taken in Kirkwall police station which helps to promote communication between police officers and wardens, but the lack of their own base causes problems with such things as the storage of wardens’ paperwork and equipment. Similarly, in Perth, wardens started off without a base then progressed to being based in a vacant flat in Letham. They have recently moved into a dedicated office, which the manager felt brought considerable benefits by making the wardens feel wanted and a permanent part of the council.

**Challenges in Day-to-Day Management**

15.19 Staffing issues loomed large in day-to-day management of the schemes. These were on 2 main levels:

- Maintaining adequate cover when operating below the full complement of wardens. Combined with holidays and sickness, this was felt to be particularly challenging in smaller schemes such as Dumfries and Galloway, East Renfrewshire and Orkney; and
- Operational management of staff including tasking and supervision.

15.20 Smaller schemes, perhaps understandably, appeared to have less capacity to absorb personnel problems than the larger ones. For example, in areas where there were already difficulties with recruitment, such as Dumfries and Galloway and East Renfrewshire, periods of sickness and holidays have caused difficulties with maintaining a full service. Even schemes which reported no recruitment difficulties, such as Perth and Kinross, reported coverage issues caused by sickness and holidays. In contrast, larger schemes like Aberdeen, Dundee and Inverclyde had more capacity to resolve coverage problems. This was generally overcome by bringing wardens in from different shifts to cover for those who were off sick or on holiday.

15.21 Operational management of staff was a challenge for a number of the managers. The fact that wardens work until 11 pm or midnight every night means that managers were not always on hand to respond to issues the wardens might face. This meant that wardens had to use their initiative. The introduction of senior wardens in some schemes had, however, helped to bridge this management gap.

15.22 Keeping wardens focused on the duties they were intended for was a challenge in Edinburgh. The devolved management structure in place, with 5 area managers reporting into the overall scheme manager, was said to have led to some misunderstandings over the role of the wardens. In the scheme manager’s view, area managers were often willing to provide the wardens for duties which should be carried out by other council employees, such as housing officers. It was felt that this meant that the wardens were not always carrying out the tasks they were intended for.

15.23 The manager in Dundee reported challenges in managing a large staff of manual workers. She had moved from managing a team of professional staff to having to deal with staff from different backgrounds, some of whom could be quite challenging.

15.24 The Aberdeen manager felt that limited formal input from the partner services in the city had been a challenge. The poor recording of the meetings and the informal
nature of some of them meant that it was often not clear what was expected of wardens. This issue has been raised with partner services and was currently being addressed.

The Wardens’ Role

15.25 The overwhelming consensus of all the wardens consulted as part of the case study visits was that they enjoyed their jobs. The majority had been in post for over a year and had experienced what they termed “the highs and lows” of the job. The positive consisted of philosophical and practical aspects and included:—

- The satisfaction that they were helping to improve people’s quality of life;
- Providing peace of mind to vulnerable members of the community;
- Communicating with local residents;
- Building trust with local residents;
- Positive feedback from local residents;
- Seeing environmental improvements as a result of issues they had reported;
- The variety of duties involved in the role;
- Working outside;
- “Banter” with the local youths;
- The salary; and
- The shift patterns (often 4 days on, 4 days off).

15.26 The wardens’ survey asked what respondents felt was the best thing about the job. As Table 15.1 shows, the results correlate well with the qualitative information, with over a third citing “Making a difference to people’s lives”. This focus upon interactions with the public would seem to validate the stress on inter-personal skills that typified most of the original wardens’ job descriptions (see Table 4.1).

### TABLE 15.1 What is the Best Thing About Your Job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making a difference to people’s lives</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being involved in the local community</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting new people</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being outdoors</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The salary</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift work</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>162</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=101

Note:-

1. Some respondents gave more than one response.

15.27 The positive aspects of the job were felt to outweigh the negative. However, there were several negative things cited. Amongst these were:-
• Verbal and physical abuse from youths and adults;
• Fears for personal safety in some circumstances;
• Lack of community understanding of the role of wardens;
• Poor response times from police;
• Slow responses to logged issues from other council departments;
• Lack of recognition and praise from within the council;
• Inadequate numbers to cover the size of the patrol area;
• Bad weather; and
• Association with the police.

15.28 Association with the police was seen as negative in that it could cause problems in developing relationships with youths. The majority of warden schemes had invested considerable effort in trying to educate youngsters that wardens and police were separate entities. However, the perceived collusion between the 2 groups had led to hostile reactions from a small minority. This was particularly the case in some parts of Inverclyde where the wardens were described as “grasses” by the young people who attended the focus group.

15.29 However, this had not been the case in the Aberdeen scheme, where the wardens were managed by the police, had worked on joint operations with the police and where the wardens were dressed like the police. The Aberdeen wardens believed that they were able to build effective relations with the local community and that they had not received any adverse reaction as a result of this close association. This may reflect the close relations that they had been able to develop with the local community and the fact that they were perceived to be making a difference. Allied to this was the fact that they did not behave in an authoritarian manner. If this interpretation is correct then the doubts that many managers have about too close an association with the police may be unfounded.

15.30 Generally these negative aspects mirrored those identified in the wardens’ survey, as shown in Table 15.2.

### TABLE 15.2 What is the Worst Thing About Your Job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encountering potentially dangerous situations</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor management</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift work</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=97

Note:-
1. Some respondents gave more than one response.

15.31 The survey found that satisfaction with the equipment provided for the role was fairly high (70%). However, almost a third of respondents (30%) indicated that they did not have the correct equipment to allow them to do their job effectively. Most complaints centred on the poor quality of clothing. Examples included:-
• “Waterproof jackets leak and are not practical for severe conditions”;
• “Our overcoats are not very waterproof”; and
• “Need protective clothing for potentially dangerous situations.”

15.32 When survey respondents were asked what they would like to see to allow them to be more effective in the future, a range of answers were given, with 18% wanting improved communications with external agencies such as the police and other council departments.

Enforcement

15.33 The wardens in Aberdeen were to have the power to serve fixed penalty notices for a number of offences, such as dog fouling and littering, by the end of 2006. Other schemes, such as Orkney and Inverclyde, were considering granting limited enforcement powers to wardens. It also seemed likely that other schemes would go down this route.

15.34 The debate on whether to grant powers was a recurrent theme during our case study visits. In the main, local authorities were reluctant to take this step although a number of wardens felt that the lack of enforcement powers stopped them doing their job effectively, whilst 18% of respondents to the wardens’ survey wanted increased powers.

15.35 However, those consulted during the case study visits felt that the implications of increasing powers needed to be carefully assessed. Several felt that the dynamic between wardens and the public would change dramatically if they were given punitive powers. It was also commented that this would strengthen their perceived association with the police rather than weaken it, something earlier identified as an issue (Paragraph 15.28).

15.36 Dundee appeared to deal with this issue by working closely with their partners who do have enforcement powers. Each partner knows their own strengths and weaknesses and uses the strengths of others to compensate where they are weak. One recent initiative illustrates this succinctly. The “Top 10 Project” involves Community Intelligence Unit partners targeting the top 10 addresses where rubbish is left lying around. The fire and rescue service carries out an initial fire risk assessment and the wardens then monitor the situation and re-issue warning letters as necessary. If no action is taken the matter is passed to the environmental team to take enforcement action, with further inaction resulting in escalation to the Antisocial Behaviour team to pursue Antisocial Behaviour Orders (ASBOs).
Training

15.37 Most of the concerns raised in the 12 and 24 month template reports focused on training, something also highlighted in the wardens’ survey where 20% of respondents requested on-going training support49.

15.38 For the managers, training was a concern as it was not fully costed in the budgets for the schemes. This was problematic as continuous development was cited by several councils as being the key to ensuring consistency of approach by the wardens. Simply organising training was seen as difficult by some of the rural authorities, as it would mean wardens being away from their posts for at least one day.

15.39 Specific training needs identified, included:-

- Drug awareness training;
- Dealing with challenging behaviour,
- Disposing of sharps; and
- I.T. training.

As recruitment and retention had been stabilised across the schemes, training was emerging as a greater priority. This may be resolved through the plans for the development of a Scottish Vocational Qualification (SVQ) for community wardens. Several schemes were participating in its development, with South Lanarkshire leading on this work. This was taking place through the Scottish Wardens network, based on a model adopted in England. In addition a number of authorities had been working in partnership to deliver joint training thereby reducing costs.

Data Collection and Data Systems

15.40 Data collection and data systems had been problematic since the schemes were first set up, although they seemed to be less of an issue in the 24 month monitoring reports. Lack of I.T. infrastructure to co-ordinate, store and retrieve data continued to be an issue in some local authorities, whilst a small number noted difficulties in obtaining data from other departments or agencies, or general difficulties gathering data to monitor progress. These issues had made it difficult to set solid baselines and track progress. However, given the amount of time since the schemes were set up, one would have expected these problems to have been resolved earlier. That they have not, may reflect the limited priority given to monitoring in many schemes.

Sustainability

15.41 Unsurprisingly the lack of clarity about what was to happen after the funding ends in 2008 was a cause of concern for many scheme managers. Making long term plans for the development of the scheme was said to be compromised by the 2008 cut

---

49 Despite this, satisfaction with the training that had been provided was high, with 87% of survey respondents feeling that they had received the appropriate level of training to allow them to do their job effectively.
off. In addition, retention of wardens was becoming more difficult and would only get worse the closer schemes got to 2008.

15.42 In terms of sustainability, 27 schemes did not mention any plans for continuing schemes post BSSAC funding in their 24 month monitoring reports. Of those that did, the Scottish Borders submission mentioned plans to look for support for the entire antisocial behaviour initiative from other funders. Stirling also mentioned this. Shetland’s submission stated that continuation beyond the 2 years of funding would be decided after evaluation and on the recommendations of the Community Safety Partnership. Aberdeen City stated that it would continue to fund wardens after the 2 years, whilst East Renfrewshire planned to consider mainstreaming wardens once funding finishes.

15.43 Given that so few schemes mention their future funding it may be that, unless the Executive gives continuing support, there will be problems with continuity beyond 2008. Accordingly a timely decision from the Executive on whether wardens will continue to be funded beyond 2008 was something that all managers would welcome.

Displacement

15.44 Views were split on the extent to which displacement was an issue. However, there was some agreement that it was difficult to prove whether any displacement which did exist was due to the presence of the wardens.

15.45 In Perth, the police commented there had been an ongoing issue with youths from Letham travelling over to Scone and causing disturbances. However, this was not seen as displacement as it had been happening before the introduction of wardens. Similar issues were raised in Aberdeen, but were seen as reflecting the historical patterns of movement by youths and were not felt to have been driven by the activities of wardens.

15.46 In Inverclyde, the Broomhill/Overton area lay between 2 wardens’ areas. The view was that some displacement had taken place into this area. However, it was difficult to stop this altogether. Again, this was said to have happened before the wardens were introduced when the police focused on a specific area.

15.47 Displacement was also seen as cyclical by some. It was noted that trouble could flair up in an area and then die away as quickly as it had started. This could often be driven by one off incidents or external factors. An example given was relationships between male and female teenagers from different areas. Young males from one area travelling into another to see girls was said to cause territorial issues. This could then lead to an intensive period of conflict between the 2 groups which would then tail off again as soon as the male-female relationships ended.

15.48 Displacement of antisocial behaviour was also said to be limited by territorial factors in places such as South Lanarkshire and Dundee. The gang culture which existed was said to limit the movements of youths to their own area. Fear of confrontation on another gang’s “patch” meant that displacement was not a significant issue.
Interestingly, displacement was also seen as positive by some. One police officer commented that when issues are displaced they are often diluted. It was felt that the more a problem is shifted about, the weaker it gets. This gives local residents a break and the police a better opportunity to control it. It was the view of some that the only way to stop displacement entirely was to have warden schemes cover the whole of the town or city they were based in. However it was recognised that this was costly and impractical.

**Relationships with the Scottish Executive**

The evolution of the relationship between the Executive and local authorities delivering the schemes had been an interesting and, at times, challenging process for managers. Comments covered 4 themes:

- Guidance issued by the Executive;
- Monitoring and evaluation;
- Lack of feedback from the Executive; and
- The advice managers would give to the Executive on setting up and running warden schemes.

There were mixed views on the level of guidance issued by the Executive for setting up the schemes. There was general agreement that the guidance had not been too prescriptive. This gave individual schemes the flexibility to tailor their service to the needs of their own local community. This was welcomed by several scheme managers as they were left alone to develop the scheme with the Executive in the background to provide assistance as, and when, necessary. However, a number of managers were dissatisfied with what they termed the Executive’s “hands off” approach to guidance. This sits alongside the wider issue of the Executive transferring the responsibility for antisocial behaviour to local authorities. A minority felt this was done with limited consultation and was imposed at relatively short notice. Indeed one felt that the nationwide publicity campaign on antisocial behaviour launched by the Executive was sending out confusing signals to the public. Feedback they had received suggested that the general public did not know whether to contact the police or the local authority to report cases of antisocial behaviour.

Discussions on the monitoring and evaluation requirements of the Executive tended to draw less favourable comments. The majority of scheme managers felt there were too many reporting procedures. In addition, a number were still unclear what the Executive was doing with the managers’ returns. Reporting to the Executive had, generally, been a fraught process for managers. Submission of reports was seen as a repetitive process with much of the same information being asked for as was provided to the Executive in the local authority’s antisocial behaviour outcome agreements. In light of this, there were calls to have the reporting requirements for wardens merged with the wider antisocial behaviour outcome agreements.

Lack of feedback from the Executive featured prominently in the final discussions with scheme managers. Several noted that they were continually asked for information from the Executive but received little feedback in return. This referred not only to the monitoring and evaluation requirements but also to the information provided to GEN as part of the national evaluation. Several managers expected some
feedback from the Executive on how their scheme was performing in relation to others as the 2 year evaluation progressed. There was a degree of dissatisfaction at not getting this.

15.54 Managers were asked, with the benefit of hindsight, what advice they would give to the Executive on setting up and running warden schemes. A number of suggestions were made:-

- The Executive should provide a national template on wardens schemes which would cover things such as:-
  - Pay scales;
  - Shift patterns; and
  - Wardens’ duties;
- The Executive should establish a national information sharing scheme that would allow scheme managers to see what was going on in other areas and share good practices50; and
- The Executive should carefully consider the publicity they are producing, relating to antisocial behaviour, as it is creating false expectations in the minds of the public about what local authorities (and by implication the wardens) can achieve.

Conclusions

15.55 This Chapter has identified some of the issues identified by managers and wardens on the development of the schemes to date. The main conclusions are that:-

- Recruitment of staff had been less of an issue in most areas than had retention. This seems to have been a particular issue amongst younger staff who wanted to move to more secure work within the local authority or the emergency services;
- Low turnover rates seemed to be associated with good local management practices. In some areas the strength of the local labour market meant that wardens’ posts were not competitive. However, these problems can be overcome by innovative approaches, such as using New Deal;
- Despite this, initial guidance from the Executive on pay, conditions and job descriptions might have resulted in greater staff stability in some areas;
- One of the greatest challenges identified was getting the wardens accepted, by other departments, agencies and the public. This was not helped by such operational problems as the inability to secure a permanent base for some schemes;
- Ensuring that sufficient staff were available to cover holidays and sickness was a challenge, especially for the smaller schemes;
- Despite these issues job satisfaction was high, with the feeling that the wardens were able to make a difference to people’s lives being identified as a key factor;

50 This is currently being piloted by the Executive in North Ayrshire and Aberdeen City. They are currently procuring databases to facilitate the exchange of information corporately. Evaluation of this pilot will be undertaken in 2007/08.
• Negative factors were such things as abuse from members of the community and poor management;
• Views on enforcement powers amongst the wardens were mixed. The general view was that any wholesale move towards giving the wardens powers needed to be considered carefully as it might impact upon relationships with the community;
• The wardens were generally happy with the training they had received, whilst managers were concerned about its cost. The introduction of a formal qualification should see consistent standards applied across Scotland;
• Few schemes had any future funding plans in place. Given this, most managers interviewed felt that without ongoing Executive support the future of their schemes could not be guaranteed;
• Displacement was widely agreed to be difficult to prove. There was recognition, that inevitably, there had to have been some. However, the view was also held that displacement had been going on before the wardens were introduced in response to a range of other interventions; and
• On the whole, relationships with the Scottish Executive were described as good, but there remained a lack of understanding amongst scheme managers on what the Executive expect from them and concern about the demands made for information.

15.56 Overall most of the issues, with the exception of enforcement and future funding, seem to be relatively minor. As such they are probably more a reflection of the development of any new initiative rather than being indicative of fundamental flaws in the management and operations of the warden schemes.
CHAPTER SIXTEEN CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

16.1 When the wardens were first introduced they were moving into a policing void in many areas. The areas selected were chosen because of their levels of deprivation. As well as high levels of unemployment and low levels of educational attainment they also suffered from high crime rates and high levels of antisocial behaviour and associated environmental problems such as graffiti and fly tipping. Resource constraints on the police, and other public staff such as caretakers and park keepers, meant that what were seen as minor crimes and offences often went unchecked, regardless of the enervating impact these can have upon people forced to live with their consequences on a day-to-day basis (Payne, 2003). In many areas the behavioural norms of a number of residents meant that the informal types of social control, that many take for granted, had broken down. Into this policy and enforcement vacuum the wardens moved.

16.2 The areas that they were to operate in varied, from those where the “problems”, on any scale of severity, were minor, to ones where the scale of disorder was serious. In such areas there was a culture of non-compliance with official rules and regulations from some residents (Payne, 2003 and Power, 2004). Although undoubtedly in a minority, they often had an impact out of all proportion to their numbers.

16.3 This context needs to be remembered when assessing the achievements of Scotland’s community wardens. They were, and still are to some extent, trying to modify the behaviour of residents, some of whom live by norms that many would find alien. What also needs to be remembered is that this evaluation is taking place, at most, 2 years into the implementation of many warden schemes. Arguably 2 years is a very short time in which to engineer social change and behavioural modifications.

16.4 In the light of this what can be concluded about the impact of Scotland’s community wardens? There were 4 main objectives of the evaluation (Paragraph 2.2). Some of these related to formative elements (such as supporting the collection of monitoring information), whilst others were about identifying good practices and exploring process issues. However, all of these are relatively immaterial if the schemes fail to achieve their fundamental aims of decreasing the occurrence of crime and antisocial behaviour in their target areas. Accordingly it is with this that this Chapter begins.

What Impact Have the Schemes had upon Crime and Antisocial Behaviour?

16.5 At various places in the report the difficulties of assessing impact have been outlined. It is also the case that most other national evaluations of warden initiatives have encountered these problems. Having said that, we have attempted to assess impact in 3 complementary ways, by:-

• Collecting survey data on residents’ perceptions (Chapter Twelve);
• Undertaking a variety of qualitative research through the case study visits;
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• Analysing official statistics on crimes and antisocial behaviour (Chapters Ten and Eleven).

16.6 The survey data on perceptions does not show a simple picture of uniform change or of change moving in one direction. Given the diversity of schemes, in terms of differing problem severities and different approaches to dealing with these, this is probably to be expected. However, we would argue that, in the case study areas, there is evidence that residents feel that a range of antisocial behaviours have decreased in frequency and that perceptions of safety have improved (see Paragraphs 12.36 to 12.40). These are both absolute and comparative changes. It needs to be stressed that not all areas show such improvements on all indicators. That this is the case may reflect the issues highlighted above: the severity of problems in some areas and the relatively short time that the wardens have been operating.

16.7 The surveys also attribute some of these positive changes to the interventions made by the wardens. Again it should be stressed that by no means all residents made such attributions. Yet again this is to be expected as by no means all survey respondents were aware of the wardens.

16.8 Overall we would conclude that, in those areas where the wardens operate, there is evidence that the quality of life has improved. Some of this improvement is ascribed to the activities of the wardens (see Paragraphs 14.5 to 14.9).

16.9 In a less structured way, the various agencies and the community representatives consulted as part of the case study visits, felt that the wardens had resulted in improvements to the quality of life in their target areas. That this seems to be a widely held view can be seen from the demands to have wardens that are increasingly being made by communities from other areas and local politicians.

16.10 However, perceptions are one thing. To what extent does the reality of reported crime and antisocial behaviour back up these views? A number of theories were outlined in Chapter Nine to explain changes in statistics over time.

16.11 Trying to relate these theories to the changes observed in individual case study areas was challenging. As with perceptions, it was not always the case that there was a consistent pattern of change. Again this should be expected, given the variations in the characteristics of the case studies and the different levels of severity of antisocial behaviours.

16.12 These problems were exacerbated by gaps in the data sets, especially a lack of suitable comparators against which to benchmark changes in the wardened areas. Despite these problems attempts were made, in Chapter Ten, to explain the observed changes in the crime and antisocial behaviour statistics selected by the 9 case study areas, in terms of a variety of impact theories. Of the 39 indicators:-

• It was not possible to come to any definitive conclusions as to impact for 23 (59%), largely as there was a lack of suitable comparator data;
• The observed changes in 9 indicators (23%) were interpreted negatively in that the incidence of crime and antisocial behaviours had increased at a faster rate in the wardened areas than in the wider spatial comparators;
• Changes in 6 indicators (16%) were interpreted positively in that crime and antisocial behaviours had either declined or had risen at a slower rate than in the comparator areas; and
• Change in one indicator was judged to be neutral in that it was tracking change in the wider local authority area.

16.13 The interpretation of the statistical changes is cautious, with a positive attribution to the wardens only being made when there is clear evidence of differential changes in the wardened areas. Despite this the results are disappointing in that only for a minority of indictors is it possible to claim with a degree of certainty that the wardens have had an impact.

16.14 When the changes in the individual case study areas are considered then a more positive picture emerges:-

• For one scheme (Perth and Kinross) there was clear evidence that the wardens had made an impact;
• For a further 4, although the lack of comparators made it difficult to arrive at definitive conclusions, the perception surveys in 3 of the 4 indicated that there had been positive changes in attitudes and perceptions, some of which were quite substantial. Given this, it may be that the interpretation of the statistics is far too cautious;
• For 2 areas there was evidence of impact on some of the indicators. Again these positive changes were backed up by the results of the perception surveys; and
• For the final 2 areas there was no statistical evidence that the wardens had impacted on the statistics of recorded crime and antisocial behaviours.

16.15 To extend this analysis the changes in the indicators selected by more than one scheme (in the case study and non-case study areas) were analysed. A positive picture emerges in that, for 3 of the 4 indicators considered, the changes can be explained in terms of the wardens having had an impact upon crime and antisocial behaviours. For the fourth indicator there was no evidence of the wardens having had any differential impact.

16.16 If all of this evidence (the perception surveys, case study analysis and the analysis of crime and antisocial behaviour statistics) is brought together then it can be argued that the wardens are having a positive differential impact upon incidences of crime and antisocial behaviour in their target areas. Given this it seems that the wardens are effecting additional change: that is, but for their interventions, the reality and perceptions of crime and antisocial behaviours in their patrol areas would be higher than they currently are. In parallel with this, given that perceptions of crime seem to be related to its reality (Paragraph 12.42) it can be argued that perceptions of changes in the quality of life in the wardened areas would not be as positive as they seem to be but for the presence of the wardens.

16.17 The extent to which these positive impacts have been achieved at the expense of other areas, that is problems have been displaced to adjacent localities, is difficult to assess and the evidence tends to be contradictory. For example:-
• In some areas, especially those where problems are quite severe, displacement is limited as there are often territorial issues that mean that young people, in particular, are unlikely to move elsewhere to undertake antisocial activities; and
• Some managers felt that a degree of displacement took place when, for example, they targeted specific activities such as drinking. However, it was felt that this had always happened historically when, for example, the police undertook targeted initiatives focused on certain areas or types of offence.

16.18 Overall we do not feel that there is evidence that displacement is a significant issue, certainly not one that should stand in the way of implementing warden schemes in other areas.

16.19 Our conclusion is, therefore, that there is evidence from a number of sources, statistical, survey and anecdotal, that the wardens are having a positive impact on the quality of life in their targeted areas. This comes through actions in reducing crime and antisocial behaviour and, as a consequence, increasing residents’ perceptions of safety and security. This is not a pattern that is consistent across all schemes or all types of crime and antisocial behaviours, nor is this always supported by the analysis of crime statistics. Yet, overall, there is complementary evidence that the wardens are having a positive differential impact in those areas in which they operate. This begs the question as to why they are having this impact? What are the ingredients for this success? These are considered in the next section.

Making an Impact

16.20 Drawing on the earlier Chapters a number of factors can be identified that seem to be related to the effectiveness of the warden schemes. Underpinning these is the effectiveness of management. Interestingly management has not figured directly as a significant factor in the consultations. Why this should be may reflect the fact that management is generally seen as being good, albeit that the wardens’ survey did identify the quality of management as an issue for a minority of respondents (Table 15.2).

16.21 So what are the ingredients that make up good management in the running of warden schemes? The key ones seem to be:-

• Having the inter-personal skills to:-
  • Establish good relationships with external agencies at the appropriate levels needed to ensure such things as information sharing and joint working;
  • Manage a work force that is predominantly blue collar, with the challenges this may pose for those more used to dealing with professional staff; and
  • Act as a champion for the wardens, publicising their activities and achievements to the wider community;
• Having the flexibility to respond to demands as they arise. This might mean, for example, changing wardens’ deployment on a temporal, seasonal or spatial basis when problems are identified;
Having the strength to establish the wardens as independent of other agencies, such as the police, so that they are able to develop good relationships with their local communities, especially with young people; 

Ensuring that the wardens are deployed in such a way that the community not only sees them but sees them taking action to solve problems that are of general concern to local residents; and 

Ensuring that adequate and appropriate training is provided to help the wardens deal effectively with whatever problems they are likely to encounter.

16.22 Many of the other factors associated with “success” draw on these management strengths. We would identify:-

- Appointing wardens who have good inter-personal skills so that they can relate to a cross section of the community, in particular young people (often the cause of antisocial behaviour) and the elderly (who may feel that they are disproportionately affected by it); 
- Working closely with other agencies to:- 
  - Share information and intelligence; and 
  - Work together jointly when this brings mutual benefits; 
- Ensuring that the wardens are a visible presence within their patrol areas. This ranges from dressing them in a way that makes them stand out, as most schemes do, through engaging with the community by attending meetings and events, to deploying them in those areas where it is likely that there will be incidents; 
- Deploying the wardens pro-actively. This may mean targeting “hot spots”, varying patrols if there is evidence that antisocial activities are avoiding patrol times and areas and undertaking community consultations to identify concerns and then responding to these; 
- Actively promoting the warden service in a way that emphasises its remit as well as its limitations. This is a way of managing expectations that, in some areas, may have been raised unrealistically; 
- Working in a didactic way with young people whenever this is appropriate. This involves explaining the impact on others of their antisocial actions rather than operating in a more authoritarian way; 
- Being even handed in their approach so that accusations that they go for “easy targets” cannot be made. This is all part of enhancing community credibility; and 
- Finally it seems important that, if the wardens are to make a lasting impact, they engage with young children. It is only by doing this that it seems likely that behaviour modification can be effected.

16.23 Undoubtedly there are other ingredients in the recipe for success. Those given above do, however, seem to be the key ones.

---

51 The implication of this is that giving the wardens enforcement powers should be considered very carefully as they may then, in some people’s eyes, be seen as an extension of the police. 
52 It does need to be acknowledged that the Aberdeen scheme (which is managed by the police) does not seem to have suffered because of this link. Other managers, however, felt that being seen to be too close to the police would be detrimental to community relationships, especially with young people.
Recommendations

16.24 In the light of the analysis in the earlier Chapters, a number of recommendations can be made.

The Future of the Warden schemes

16.25 The evidence given above indicates that the warden schemes are having an impact upon antisocial behaviour and crime. If the Executive, therefore, decides to provide additional support to the warden schemes we would recommend that:

- The allocation of funds be more closely linked than it currently is to the severity of crime and antisocial behaviour problems; and
- Discussions are held to see if community wardens are the appropriate initiatives to put in place in those areas where crime and antisocial behaviour problems are limited in absolute and relative terms. For example, the analysis of the 24 month templates showed that the wardens in some remote rural and island areas were undertaking a community development and home help role and were hardly involved in dealing with crime or antisocial behaviour. Whilst undoubtedly valuable, this was not the type of role envisaged by the Executive in its original guidance.

Monitoring and Evaluation

16.26 Some of the biggest disappointments with the warden schemes relate to monitoring and evaluation. At the start the Executive established an outcome agreement, in all but name, for the schemes. In the event very few schemes gathered the information needed to enable the agreements to be used. For most, providing monitoring information to the Executive seems to have been seen as an imposition that bore little relevance to the schemes’ implementation. One consequence was the difficulty experienced trying to access data. Accordingly we would recommend that, for any future schemes:

- Financial allocations should be conditional on the submission of complete monitoring and evaluation data. This should be linked to the preparation of an outline action plan setting out what will be done if targets are not being met;
- Advice should be given as to setting appropriate and meaningful baselines, targets and comparators;
- For future wardens’ initiatives, monitoring should be integrated into the antisocial behaviour outcome agreements;
- For schemes such as the wardens, that are Scotland-wide, at least one indicator should be selected by all schemes. This would make it far easier to assess the overall impact of interventions as well as local variations;
- A limit should be set on the number of monitoring indicators, given that there is likely to be redundancy above a certain number. Six would seem to be a manageable upper limit;
- The final selection of indicators should be done 6 months into a scheme’s life. By this stage there should be a degree of clarity about what is achievable;
- For remote and sparsely populated rural areas, indicators need to be selected that reflect their unique characteristics;
• When initiatives intend to undertake their own surveys, guidance should be given on appropriate methodologies; and
• When setting up new initiatives all managers should be required to attend monitoring and evaluation training. This would stress its importance and clarify the various concepts and how these are defined.

Staffing

16.27 The analysis identified 2 main issues related to staffing: training and retention. Training has been a perennial concern, emerging in all of the template reports as an issue. Staff retention has also been an issue and is now increasing in importance as the schemes near the end of their funding. Accordingly a number of recommendations can be made:

• At the start of any scheme the training needs of staff should be assessed and appropriate training provided;
• Training should cover health and safety issues as well as interpersonal skills, such as mediation, conflict resolution and community engagement;
• For Scotland-wide initiatives the Executive should provide guidance on salaries, career development and working conditions. Guidance on salaries, in particular, would stop the poaching of staff that was a concern in the early stages of the scheme’s development; and
• For national schemes, collaboration and staff exchanges to share experiences and good practices should be considered, facilitated by the Executive.

Economic Impact of Community Wardens

16.28 As mentioned in paragraph 2.9, an economic evaluation of the community wardens schemes was being undertaken separately as part of the Scottish Executive commissioned Evaluation of Antisocial Behaviour Strategies at Neighbourhood Level. This evaluation is still underway but a first draft (which examines not only community wardens but also other selected antisocial behaviour interventions) has been submitted. The following is a summary of the findings in relation to the community wardens that was prepared in by the Neighbourhood Studies economist and the SE project manager.

16.29 The economic evaluation was undertaken in 4 case study areas (Edinburgh; Fife; North Lanarkshire; and Scottish Borders) and adopts a cost consequences approach. This approach does not combine costs and benefits into a single measure. Instead, it identifies all relevant costs and the consequences associated with the intervention and leaves decision makers to draw their own conclusions about value for money.

16.30 In terms of the community wardens schemes, the annual costs that were identified were associated with recruitment, salaries, premises, equipment and overheads. The economist also considered the possible costs to other agencies as a result of the identification of problems that would otherwise go unnoticed. It was concluded (after examining the economic analysis undertaken in the evaluation of Neighbourhood Wardens in England and Wales, (Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, 2004)) that the overall impact on the workloads of other agencies would be
neutral (because wardens were more likely to affect the timing rather than the actual workloads and that they would also play an important preventative role).

16.31 Although the benefits of the warden scheme will include non-quantifiable (improved quality of life, reduced fear of crime etc.) as well quantifiable outcomes, no attempt was made to assign a monetary value to the former. Instead the analysis focused on the cost savings associated with reductions in antisocial behaviour and crime. Quantifying those reductions was not possible for all the reasons already outlined in this - the GEN Consulting - report (lack of comparative data, changes in patterns of reporting). Nevertheless, the economist concluded that the evidence from neighbourhood-level case studies suggests overall that the wardens are having a positive impact on reducing antisocial behaviour.

16.32 Other published estimates of the unit costs of antisocial behaviour and crime (e.g. those collated by Whitehead et al (2003) and Home Office (2005) estimates of the economic and social costs of crime against individuals and households) were used to estimate a value for the output of wardens. The report also highlights other possible benefits associated with not losing rental income from properties that would otherwise have been void and savings associated with not having to board up these properties.

16.33 The economist concludes that, given the relatively modest costs associated with the warden schemes and the high costs associated with many of the criminal and antisocial incidents that they are likely to have prevented (plus the less tangible benefits to quality of life), they represent good value for money. The full analysis is due to be published in the Evaluation of Antisocial Behaviour Strategies at Neighbourhood Level in summer 2007.
CHAPTER SEVENTEEN  GOOD PRACTICES

Introduction

17.1 This final Chapter presents an overview of good practices illustrated by
different schemes. It draws on information gained from scheme managers,
stakeholders, and the local community and considers practices from both case study
areas and other Scottish schemes.

17.2 Good practice is a management term which can be applied to techniques,
methods, processes, activities, incentives or rewards considered effective in delivering
particular outcomes. In this instance the term “good practice” is preferred to “best
practice” due to the diversity of management structures and delivery models that exist
across warden schemes in Scotland, the scale and nature of issues faced by different
localities and the priorities of local communities. Whilst every effort has been made to
report in an objective manner, it is important to note that good practice is a highly
subjective concept. In the absence of conclusive, quantitative data it has been
necessary to draw conclusions based on dialogue with scheme managers and
consultation with local people.

17.3 The Chapter is structured around 5 themes:-

- Processes;
- Technology;
- Visibility and Flexibility;
- Community Initiatives; and
- Education.

Processes

17.4 Research revealed a number of processes and approaches which, in the
opinion of scheme managers and stakeholders, have aided the implementation,
delivery and sustainability of the warden schemes.

17.5 Establishment of strong working relationships with partner agencies
and the integration of warden teams with other service providers emerged as an important
theme throughout the study. However, the mobile and afterhours nature of the
wardens’ work may make this problematic. As such, co-location of scheme
management and administration with partners may be useful. This has occurred in
Perth, for example, where the scheme’s management recently relocated to the same
office as the Antisocial Noise Team.

17.6 Similarly, in East Renfrewshire wardens are located with the CCTV Unit,
Antisocial Behaviour Team and the Strathclyde Police-Local Authority Liaison
Officer. This is believed to engender a close working relationship, avoiding
duplication of effort and ensuring the efficient sharing of information.

17.7 Good practice in information sharing was also in evidence in Dundee where
community safety wardens, noise wardens and antisocial behaviour teams have
developed a shared database allowing efficient communications and information sharing. This information can be accessed by the police, who in turn provide the wardens with the minutes of their morning meeting on a daily basis. The police share uncensored information readily with the wardens as a trusting working relationship has now developed. On occasion senior wardens also attend police meetings.

17.8 Good working relationships between the wardens and the police in Orkney have been developed through informal contacts, as it was planned that the wardens would take their breaks in police stations. This has resulted in the establishment of good personal and professional relationships between the wardens and the local police.

17.9 The problem solving approach utilised by the scheme’s management in South Lanarkshire was also found to be conducive to partnership working. The approach brings together key partners, including the wardens, to plan activity to address antisocial behaviour in the area. This involved collating the findings from crime statistics, reports to the council, police or fire and rescue services and the Community Intelligence Report53. Information is presented geographically, so that the wardens can be deployed to the places with the greatest levels of crime or antisocial behaviour. This approach makes effective use of the data and builds on the expertise of partners to develop collaborative solutions to dealing with crime and antisocial behaviour. However, whilst this process may greatly improve the efficiency of the service, care should be taken to ensure that it is not at the expense of community engagement and relations.

17.10 In Dundee the community development approach appears to have been successful in building both community and professional working relationships, to the extent that other service providers now use the wardens to engage with the local community. Agencies, such as social work, which are sometimes viewed with suspicion by young people, have used the wardens to make introductions. Young people trust the wardens and feel less threatened or intimidated by a person introduced to them by the wardens.

17.11 The development of processes to aid crime reduction, efficiency and information sharing can be seen in Aberdeenshire where wardens introduced a scheme to distribute forms to retailers. They are used to record descriptions of offenders in an effort to improve detection rates and assist in gathering evidence to enforce Antisocial Behaviour Orders against shoplifters.

17.12 The development of recording processes has also aided wardens in Inverclyde, where the scheme management redesigned the wardens' logs to streamline the reporting process. Wardens now record details of their patrol on tick box sheets which gather a large amount of information for minimal time and effort. This allows the wardens to spend more time on the streets and also aids management in the monitoring and evaluation of the scheme.

53 The Community Intelligence Report (CIR) is compiled by wardens from information obtained during patrols.
17.13 Some managers have developed **information exchanges between schemes**, as in Scottish Borders, Fife and Perth and Kinross. Wardens from Scottish Borders and Fife have visited the Perth scheme whilst wardens in Perth spent time on patrol with counterparts in Scottish Borders and Fife. Scheme managers consider this good practice as it allows wardens to see the operations of alternative schemes and has helped develop, in the wardens, a sense that they are part of a nationwide service rather than acting as isolated units. Similar activity has been undertaken in Inverclyde and Renfrewshire, where wardens are involved in joint training.

17.14 The use of **New Deal wardens** in Edinburgh and Inverclyde is also considered to be good practice, contributing to economic and social development. Recruitment difficulties, due to the buoyancy of the Edinburgh labour market, led the scheme to employ around 14 New Deal wardens. The scheme manager considers the initiative to have been a success as turnover of New Deal wardens has been low and the appointed candidates are considered to be very suitable. New Deal wardens have also been deployed in Inverclyde, where 4 wardens have been awarded a 9 month contract. The council hopes to create permanent posts for 2 of them.

17.15 The **distribution of community feedback surveys**, which involve local people in the monitoring and evaluation of the scheme and allow scheme managers to respond to issues raised by service users, is a further area of good practice. Processes which facilitate community participation are believed to contribute to the development and sustainability of the scheme. At present community feedback surveys are distributed by a number of schemes including Inverclyde and Perth and Kinross.

17.16 A further area of good practice, highlighted through consultation with scheme managers, wardens, and police representatives, is the role of wardens in Inverclyde as **professional witnesses**. When the warden schemes were established in Scotland, wardens were intended to act as professional witnesses, however (perhaps because of local issues), the concept has been most fully embraced in Inverclyde. Consultation has suggested that, whilst wardens in other schemes are prepared to stand as professional witnesses if necessary, they may be wary of the impact that becoming more closely associated with the police would have on community relations. As a result, it may be possible for schemes to gain some useful learning and understanding through consideration of the Inverclyde scheme.

**Technology**

17.17 The use of technology assists the wardens in 3 main ways:

- Improved efficiency;
- Crime prevention; and.
- Information Sharing.

---

54 New Deal is a government programme to give unemployed people the help and support they need to get into work. Funding for wardens recruited under New Deal is therefore additional to that received from the Scottish Executive.
17.18 The piloting of a **digital recording system** using digitised notepaper in Edinburgh, greatly improved efficiency and data capture. Each warden employed by the Edinburgh scheme has been issued with a notepad of digitised paper which can be written on using a computerised pen. The pen links with the mobile phones carried by the wardens, allowing information recorded whilst on patrol to be sent directly to the scheme headquarters. This results in time and efficiency savings as wardens do not need to return to the office to pass on information or log incidents. The information can also be sent directly to the police and other council departments. During the system’s pilot data capture increased by 60%.

17.19 In Aberdeen **technology has been deployed as a crime prevention measure.** Smartwater, a colourless liquid containing a unique code number, is applied by wardens to the property of local residents to act as a deterrent to thieves. Residents whose property is protected by Smartwater display a sticker in their windows to inform and deter potential thieves. In the event that property is stolen, it may be recovered more easily by being able to trace the unique code. More than 2,000 homes within the Aberdeen patrol areas are to be protected, with the marking and registration process being carried out by the wardens. Research undertaken on behalf of the company that produces Smartwater, claims that residents are 5 times less likely to be burgled in protected areas.

17.20 The Aberdeen scheme has also taken advantage of a **radio link system**, piloted between wardens and retailers, to alert one another to shoplifters. This technology is considered an improvement on the previous “phone round” method. In addition to crime prevention, the radio link has facilitated the sharing of information and improved the efficiency of the wardens.

17.21 The sharing of information through the use of technology was also evident in Dundee where wardens have begun to issue a **bi-monthly e-briefing** to councillors, updating them on the sorts of incidents dealt with in their area.

**Visibility and Flexibility**

17.22 Whilst high visibility in the community is a characteristic of all wardens’ services, some schemes have developed innovative approaches to this. The Inverclyde service has attempted to develop a **brand image for the wardens** making use of slogans such as “You talk, we listen”. The use of such slogans in the community increases visibility and promotes the wardens as a friendly and approachable local service, developing positive associations in the mind of the local community. Inverclyde wardens also regularly attend the surgeries of local councillors, making themselves known in the community and familiarising themselves with local concerns.

17.23 In East Renfrewshire, scheme managers have placed **television monitors** in several libraries to promote the warden service to the local community. In East Dunbartonshire, the local youth theatre and school pupils have been involved in the production of a **video** to explain and promote the work of wardens and address antisocial behaviour issues.
In addition to visibility, it is important for schemes to operate with a **degree of flexibility**, ensuring that wardens are visible in the right places at the right times. In consultation with community representatives, the willingness of wardens to adapt their patrols and duties in line with community concerns is important in demonstrating their responsiveness.

Wardens in Dundee maintain high visibility in the local community by **targeting some of their patrols on sensitive areas**. Wardens are regularly present to escort older residents home when the local bingo hall closes, building relationships with the local community whilst providing reassurance and reducing fear of crime. Similarly, wardens in Inverclyde patrol areas with a high proportion of elderly residents at regular times, allowing residents to plan outings to coincide with patrols. Wardens have also accompanied young people home from youth groups in several areas, thereby ensuring the safety of the young people whilst preventing them from acting in an antisocial manner and making older people feel insecure.

The Edinburgh scheme displayed a degree of **spatial flexibility** in its patrol deployment. As a result the outer boundaries of the wardens’ patrol areas have remained fluid, enabling wardens to address new issues and work within slightly different boundaries as hotspots of antisocial behaviour and environmental problems arise. At times this means that the wardens respond to complaints of antisocial behaviour that occur outside of their designated patrol areas.

**Spatial, seasonal and temporal flexibility** was also evident in Inverclyde. In conjunction with the fire and rescue service, wardens in Inverclyde patrolled known fire raising spots to deter potential arsonists. This patrol may be extended or altered to incorporate new areas as they are identified. During the school holiday period, the patrol area in Inverclyde was extended to allow monitoring of all schools across Greenock, Port Glasgow and Gourock. It was anticipated that the presence of wardens would deter vandalism and antisocial behaviour around vacant school premises. A further example of flexibility in the Inverclyde scheme was illustrated by the willingness of wardens, and scheme management, to alter shift patterns should it be deemed necessary. Following recognition that there was considerable gang tension and fighting during school lunch breaks, the shift pattern was altered to allow 2 wardens to commence their shift early thereby preventing lunchtime fighting.

**Flexibility and the extension of patrol areas** to include school premises during the holiday period are also seen in South Lanarkshire and Dumfries where wardens monitored an exclusion zone around local schools throughout the holidays. In Clackmannanshire the HMI Education report praised the “Schools Out” initiative and its success in reducing the cost of vandalism, a reduction amounting to £11,000 during one summer holiday period.

In Eilean Siar wardens provided transport, when necessary, for vulnerable residents living in rural areas enabling them to visit the doctor, post office or local shop in comfort and safety: an example of flexibility in the scheme in responding to local needs.

In the Dicks Hill and Belmont scheme in Dumfries and Galloway, wardens have displayed a flexible approach to ensure visibility and enhance community
engagement. One warden has been co-opted onto a school board, whilst at other schools the wardens provided surgery sessions for parents.

**Community Initiatives**

17.31 Whilst **community engagement** is considered a prerequisite for a successful scheme, some have developed community engagement initiatives which are, in the opinion of the scheme managers, more proactive, productive, innovative or sustainable than others. As a result such initiatives can be considered “good practice” which scheme managers may wish to replicate should local social, economic and environmental circumstances allow.

17.32 In Dundee the **Community Safety Wardens Advisory Group** brings together 2 community representatives from each of the areas covered by the warden scheme. They have a twofold role: to make the wardens and other partners aware of community concerns and to feedback information to their local areas. This type of formal structure would seem to have much to recommend it.

17.33 The **total communities approach** to service development by police in Torry, Aberdeen is an example of grassroots community engagement in the development of local services. The overarching aim of the initiative is to enhance provision by putting more police on the streets supported by wardens. Key partners involved in the initiative include the police, the community, housing, community planning staff, NHS Grampian and voluntary sector organisations. The approach is intended to gauge the needs of local communities through participation in the planning process then deliver services in the way wanted by local service users. This approach was considered successful in engaging the local community in service provision and aligning issues of crime and antisocial behaviour with wider health, environment and regeneration priorities.

17.34 In Angus, attendance at a resident’s association meeting highlighted to wardens that a group of young people were unable to take part in organised leisure activities as their parents were unable to afford the costs. As a result the wardens identified a funding source to the association, which enabled the young people to attend these activities.

17.35 Initiatives targeted at various sections of the local community are evident across all schemes. However, the involvement of Inverclyde wardens in the “Greenock World Cup” is notable for its attempt to address the territorial tensions perceived by many to be among the underlying causes of antisocial behaviour in the area. The “World Cup” brought together youths from different warden schemes to play football in a fun, yet structured setting, with the objective of breaking down the barriers that had traditionally existed between youths from different areas.

17.36 Football training, coaching and competition, sporting and other leisure activities have been organised and supervised by wardens in a number of schemes including: Clackmannanshire; North West Dumfries; East Dunbartonshire; East Lothian; Moray; North Ayrshire; Scottish Borders; and South Ayrshire. Its ubiquity no doubt reflects the fact that it is one of the few suitable ways of engaging with large numbers of young people.
17.37 In the Dicks Hill and Bellmont Scheme, in Dumfries and Galloway, wardens proactively engaged with the local community to find a mutually agreeable solution to the problem of young people playing ball games in the street. Parents wanted children to play near their homes, whilst householders did not want them playing there because of risk of damage to their property. The wardens worked with the council’s leisure and sports department to co-ordinate free access to multi-use games areas for local children. They then worked with local youth workers to guide children into these facilities.

17.38 Wardens in Dundee are also being proactive in getting young people involved in diversionary activities and have begun downloading event listings from the Dundee pages of the Young Scot website. Wardens carry listings with them on patrol, enabling them to direct young people to activities that may interest them in an attempt to move them off the streets.

17.39 Young people were also the focus of an innovative scheme in Dumfries which promoted personal safety by facilitating the purchase of bicycle lamps for young people. “Be Bright, Get a Light” was developed by the wardens in partnership with local shops to enable young people to take advantage of reduced prices when purchasing bicycle lamps. Similarly, in promoting cycle safety to young people in Angus, wardens provided cycle proficiency training to Primary 7 children, helping to develop confidence in the wardens and the service they provide. Comparable activity has been undertaken in Orkney where wardens delivered the Scottish Cycle Training Scheme to local schools due to a lack of suitably qualified trainers on the island.

17.40 Given the remit of community wardens to reduce fear of crime, it is understandable that much activity is focused on engagement with older people. Notable activity included the “Van Man” in North West Dumfries and the Vulnerable Adult Initiative in Perth and Kinross.

17.41 The Van Man is a service that enables elderly and vulnerable residents to have their home security inspected free of charge, reassuring residents that they can feel safe whilst in their homes. In addition, wardens in North West Dumfries identify and refer vulnerable older people to the Help the Aged Senior Safety Scheme, which they are eligible to use for no charge. The service offers home security in the form of door and window locks, door chains, smoker detectors, spy holes, light bulb changing and floorboard and carpet repairs.

17.42 The Vulnerable Adults Initiative in Perth and Kinross involves wardens visiting victims of crime and antisocial behaviour for a period of time following the incident to provide reassurance and reduce fear of crime.

Education

17.43 The role of wardens in educating the public, particularly young children, emerged as an important issue during the community focus groups. It was shown that young children responded better to the intervention of wardens when they clearly explained why they wished young people to act in a particular manner.
Recognition of this issue is evident in the Edinburgh scheme. Working in partnership with the fire and rescue service, wardens were involved in organising and delivering the “Cool Down Crew”: a series of projects which gave young people the chance to engage with members of the fire and rescue service, teaching them about fire safety and deterring antisocial and criminal behaviour such as fire setting and assaulting fire crews. Wardens in Edinburgh also work with young people to deliver projects with visible community benefits, such as cleaning local streams or parks and removing graffiti.

Environmental initiatives, such as those seen in Edinburgh, were common across a number of schemes including: East Lothian; Orkney; Scottish Borders; South Ayrshire; and West Dunbartonshire. Such initiatives have been expanded in Perth where a Junior Wardens Programme has been established. This 6 week programme, based on a model developed in Fife, teaches school children about the role of community wardens and gets them involved in environmental and community activity.

Focus group research, carried out with young people, revealed an important role for wardens in community safety education, especially amongst young children. In Dundee, primary school children spoke confidently about their actions should they discover a hypodermic needle. The children have been taught by the wardens not to touch the needle and to immediately report the incident to a warden or another responsible adult.

Community education appears to permeate the role of wardens in Dundee. There is now a Community Fire Safety Officer and Home Safety Officer seconded to the Community Safety Team for one day each week. The Community Safety Partnership has produced a “Stay Safe Pack” for young people, which offers a range of personal safety advice. There are activities in the pack which can be used by professionals, such as teachers and youth workers, and information is available on the Young Scot website. Wardens are now working, with other partners, to produce a calendar for older people, that contains personal safety messages.

The “Top 10 Project” involved Community Intelligence Unit partners in Dundee targeting the top 10 addresses for rubbish. A phased warning approach is taken, with each partner having a role to play at the stage most relevant to them. The fire and rescue service carries out an initial fire risk assessment and writes to residents explaining the risks of leaving the rubbish where it is. They provide information on how to remove the rubbish and give the residents 7 days to do so. Wardens monitor the situation and re-issue warning letters as necessary. If no action is taken after several warnings the matter is passed to the Environmental Team to take enforcement action. Further inaction results in escalation of the situation to the antisocial behaviour team who would pursue an Antisocial Behaviour Order. The results have been impressive with most addresses dealing with the rubbish on receipt of their first notification. This phased and integrated approach to enforcement is considered good practice as it educates residents about the dangers of their actions, giving them the opportunity to modify their behaviour before sanctions are taken.

Similar practice was a seen in Edinburgh and East Dunbartonshire. The “Just Rewards” scheme supported by the wardens in Edinburgh is a further example of
good practice in community education. Under the scheme, tenants are rewarded for being good neighbours. Wardens recommend tenants whom they believe deserve recognition, such as those without rent arrears or those who do not behave in a manner perceived to be antisocial. These tenants then receive some form of reward, or gift, such as free stair cleaning, or bonus bonds to use at local shops. The scheme is considered innovative in that it not only encourages, and rewards, neighbourliness but also educates local people on how, and why, it is important to act in a manner that is socially accepted.

17.50 Wardens in East Dunbartonshire have developed a unique approach to dealing with identified repeat young offenders by means of an informal “family conference”. The conference allows wardens to outline the nature of complaints received to the alleged offender. The young person then has the opportunity to respond to questions in the presence of his or her parents. Parents are frequently unaware of their child’s involvement in unacceptable behaviour and are appreciative of the opportunity to remedy the situation before it escalates.

17.51 Undoubtedly there are many other examples of good and innovative practices that could readily be replicated. However, those outlined above give a flavour of the range and diversity of activities that the wardens are involved in across Scotland.
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APPENDIX ONE  BASE AND ENDLINE INTERVIEWEES’ PROFILE CHARACTERISTICS

TABLE A1.1  Respondents’ Gender  (Column Percentages)

| Gender     | Case Studies | | | Control | | |
|------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|            | Baseline     | Endline     | Baseline    | Endline     |
| Male       | 38           | 38          | 33          | 42          |
| Female     | 62           | 62          | 67          | 58          |
| TOTAL      | 100          | 100         | 100         | 100         |

TABLE A1.2  Respondents’ Housing Tenure  (Column Percentages)

| Tenure                                | Case Studies | | | Control | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                                       | Baseline     | Endline     | Baseline    | Endline     |
| Owner occupier                        | 48           | 41          | 52          | 50          |
| Council tenant                        | 39           | 49          | 34          | 40          |
| Housing association tenant           | 5            | 5           | 4           | 4           |
| Renting from private landlord        | 4            | 1           | 7           | 2           |
| Living with parents                  | 1            | 2           | 1           | 3           |
| Other                                 | 3            | 2           | 2           | 1           |
| TOTAL                                 | 100          | 100         | 100         | 100         |
### TABLE A1.3  
**Respondents’ Economic Status**  
*(Column Percentages)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic status</th>
<th>Case Studies</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working full time</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working part time</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanently sick or disabled</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking after home/family</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE A1.4  
**Time Lived in the Area**

*(Column Percentages)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Case Studies Endline</th>
<th>Control Endline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 months</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 6 months but less than 1 year</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 3 years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 years</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:  
1. This question was not asked in the Baseline Survey.
### TABLE A1.5  
**Dependent Children**  
(Column Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Case Studies</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE A1.6  
**Respondents’ Economic Status**  
(Column Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>Case Studies</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX TWO  BASE AND ENDLINE SURVEY  
**TABULATIONS**

#### TABLE A2.1  Rating of Neighbourhood as a Place to Live  
*(Column Percentages)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Case Studies</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly good</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly poor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
<td><strong>99</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:--*
1. Columns do not always total to 100 due to rounding.

#### TABLE A2.2  Community Involvement  
*(Column Percentages)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Case Studies</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Great Deal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Fair Amount</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Very Much</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not At All</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>99</strong></td>
<td><strong>97</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:--*
1. Columns do not always total to 100 due to rounding.

#### TABLE A2.3  Safety Walking Alone After Dark  
*(Column Percentages)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Case Studies</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Safe</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly Safe</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A bit Unsafe</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Unsafe</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>99</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:--*
1. Columns do not always total to 100 due to rounding.
### TABLE A2.4  Safety in Home Alone After Dark
*(Column Percentages)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Case Studies</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Safe</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly Safe</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A bit Unsafe</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Unsafe</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:-**
1. Columns do not always total to 100 due to rounding.

### TABLE A2.5  How Common are Noisy Neighbours or Regular Loud Parties?
*(Column Percentages)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Case Studies</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Common/Fairly Common</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Very Common/Not at all Common</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>102</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:-**
1. Columns do not always total to 100 due to rounding.

### TABLE A2.6  Over the Last 12 Months Has the Occurrence of Noisy Neighbours or Regular Loud Parties Changed
*(Column Percentages)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Case Studies Endline</th>
<th>Control Endline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More Common</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Common</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayed the Same</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/Cannot Say</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:-**
1. Columns do not always total to 100 due to rounding.
TABLE A2.7 If Less Common Have Wardens Been Responsible for the Reduction?  
(Column Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Case Studies Endline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 35

TABLE A2.8 How Common are Vandalism, Graffiti or Deliberate Damage to Property?  
(Column Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Case Studies</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Common/ Fairly Common</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Very Common/ Not at all Common</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td><strong>99</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:-  
1. Columns do not always total to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE A2.9 Over the Last 12 Months Has the Occurrence of Vandalism, Graffiti or Deliberate Damage to Property Changed?  
(Column Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Case Studies</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Endline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Common</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Common</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayed the Same</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/Cannot Say</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:-  
1. Columns do not always total to 100 due to rounding.
### TABLE A2.10  If Less Common Have Wardens Been Responsible for the Reduction?
(Column Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Case Studies</th>
<th>Endline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 54

### TABLE A2.11  How Common are Groups or Individuals Intimidating and Harassing Others?
(Column Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Case Studies Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
<th>Control Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Common</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly Common</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Very Common</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not At All Common</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>99</strong></td>
<td><strong>99</strong></td>
<td><strong>102</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:-
1. Columns do not always total to 100 due to rounding.

### TABLE A2.12  Over the Last 12 Months Has the Occurrence of Groups or Individuals Intimidating and Harassing Others Changed?
(Column Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Case Studies Endline</th>
<th>Control Endline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More Common</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Common</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayed the Same</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/Cannot Say</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:-
1. Columns do not always total to 100 due to rounding.
### TABLE A2.13  If Less Common Have Wardens Been Responsible for the Reduction?  
(Column Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Case Studies</th>
<th>Endline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 30

### TABLE A2.14  How Common are Drug Misuse or Dealing?  
(Column Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Case Studies</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Common/ Fairly Common</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Very Common/ Not at all Common</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:-
1. Columns do not always total to 100 due to rounding.

### TABLE A2.15  Over the Last 12 Months Has the Occurrence of Drug Misuse or Dealing Changed?  
(Column Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Case Studies Endline</th>
<th>Control Endline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More Common</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Common</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayed the Same</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/Cannot Say</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>99</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:-
1. Columns do not always total to 100 due to rounding.
### TABLE A2.16  If Less Common Have Wardens Been Responsible for the Reduction?  
(Column Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Case Studies</th>
<th>Endline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>99</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 14  
Note:-  
1. Columns do not always total to 100 due to rounding.

### TABLE A2.17  How Common are Rubbish or Litter Lying Around?  
(Column Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Case Studies</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Common/ Fairly Common</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Very Common/ Not at all Common</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE A2.18  Over the Last 12 Months Has the Amount of Rubbish or Litter Lying Around Changed?  
(Column Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Case Studies Endline</th>
<th>Control Endline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More Common</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Common</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayed the Same</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/Cannot Say</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:-  
1. Columns do not always total to 100 due to rounding.
### TABLE A2.19  If Less Common Have Wardens Been Responsible for the Reduction?  
(Column Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Case Studies Endline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N = 60</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE A2.20  How Common is Rowdy Behaviour, such as Drunkenness, Hooliganism or Loutish Behaviour?  
(Column Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Case Studies</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Common/ Fairly Common</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Very Common/ Not at all Common</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:-** 1. Columns do not always total to 100 due to rounding.

### TABLE A2.21  Over the Last 12 Months Has the Occurrence of Rowdy Behaviour, such as Drunkenness, Hooliganism or Loutish Behaviour Changed?  
(Column Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Case Studies Endline</th>
<th>Control Endline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More Common</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Common</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayed the Same</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/Cannot Say</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE A2.22  If Less Common Have Wardens Been Responsible for the Reduction?  
(Column Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Case Studies Endline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 41

TABLE A2.23  Awareness of Warden  (Column Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Case Studies</th>
<th>Control Endline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE A2.24  How Respondents Became Aware of the Wardens  
(Column Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Case Studies Endline</th>
<th>Control Endline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saw them</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heard about them</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read about them</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoke to them</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot remember</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE A2.25  Could Wardens Improve the Quality of Life in Your Neighbourhood?  
(Column Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Case Studies</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Endline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, considerably</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, a little</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not much</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>99</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:-
1. Columns do not always total to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE A2.26  Have Community Wardens Improved the Quality of Life in your Neighbourhood?  
(Column Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Case Studies</th>
<th>Endline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, considerably</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, a little</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not much</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX THREE CASE STUDY OVERVIEWS

Introduction

Chapter 2 outlined the process that was gone through to select the 9 case studies and the methodology used to monitor their progress. The purpose of this Appendix is to give a brief descriptive outline of each of the case studies, highlighting the main characteristics that distinguish them from other schemes and to provide an overview of the evidence of impact that was collected as part of the evaluation. Each of these short outlines begins with a number of bullet points that highlight the main characteristics of the scheme.

ABERDEEN CITY

The main characteristics of the Aberdeen City scheme are:-

- Management by the police on a day to day basis with support from the City Council;
- The wardens are supported by 10 neighbourhood wardens: former traffic wardens funded by Grampian Police;
- Relationships with key partners are good, but there is a feeling that the wardens are not tasked as effectively by council departments as they could be. This results in the police organising much of their activity;
- The wardens are being integrated into the total communities approach in Aberdeen. This is based on key partners working with local residents to identify key issues and organise service delivery around these needs;
- Views on satisfaction with the scheme are mixed. The local authority is pleased with how the scheme has developed. The police, however, feel that a clearer strategy needs to be put in place to ensure that the wardens’ potential is maximised;
- Local communities appreciate the benefits that wardens can bring, with older people being particularly satisfied and feeling safer as a result of the wardens; and
- The wardens are to have powers to issue fixed penalty notices for such things as dog fouling and littering, although the expectation is that these powers will be used sparingly.

Overview

The Aberdeen City warden scheme is different from the other case studies as it is managed by Grampian Police rather than the local authority. The local authority does, however, give strong support to the police, although day-to-day line management is through the police. As a result of being managed by the police the scheme has a clear crime and antisocial behaviour focus. The scheme also differs from the other 8 in that, by the end of 2006, the wardens will have powers to issue fixed penalty notices for things such as dog fouling or littering.
**Coverage**

The scheme covers 6 areas: Heathryfold and Middlefield, Northfield and Cummings Park, Tillydrone and Woodside, Torry, Mastrick and Seaton and Old Aberdeen and Powmis. It is supported by Neighbourhood Wardens (former traffic wardens funded by Grampian Police) in each area in addition to 4 community wardens. Should there be no vacancies, there are 10 Neighbourhood Wardens and 30 community wardens, 40 in total.

**Areas of Focus**

The target areas were selected from neighbourhood community action plans which were produced for the 12 regeneration areas in the city. The neighbourhood wardens were already operating in these areas and so provided an obvious focus for expansion.

**Objectives**

The scheme aims to promote community safety and reduce antisocial behaviour and crime, focusing on such things as: breach of the peace, drunk and incapable, urinating in public, racially aggravated conduct, wilful fire raising and vandalism. In doing this it aims to improve the quality of life for residents.

**Activities**

The wardens are managed by the police and are to focus on crime and antisocial behaviour. They operate by carrying out high visibility patrols in designated areas, working with the police on joint operations and acting as professional witnesses. They also collect information which is fed directly into the Grampian Criminal Intelligence database. The scheme also includes joint work with partners around leaflet drops and working with the community on crime prevention.

As the wardens do not compile activity logs it is difficult to classify the work they do, although evidence from visits to the schemes and discussions with wardens suggests that the focus is on crime. The granting of powers to issue fixed penalty notice further supports their crime and antisocial behaviour role.

**Management**

The wardens are managed from the Community Policing Department of Grampian Police, who have day-to-day responsibility for the operation and management of the scheme. Aberdeen City Council’s Community Services Department provides strategic leadership to the wardens and jointly tasks them in partnership with the police.

**Key Partners**

The main links with council departments are with housing, although there are also links with the environmental and cleansing departments and the fire and rescue service. The wardens also work closely with local communities, elected members and youth projects.
**Staffing**

The scheme currently has 27 staff and 3 vacancies. The full complement of staff is 30 community wardens supported by 10 neighbourhood wardens. The current annual turnover rate is 54%, with a number of staff moving on to other posts, in particular other council departments.

**Funding**

The Aberdeen scheme received £500,000 in the first year which funded 20 community wardens. The second round allocation of £250,000 funded a further 10 wardens.

**Evidence of Impact**

The proportion of residents that considered loud neighbours/loud parties and intimidation and harassment to be ‘very’ or ‘fairly’ common declined. The proportion who considered vandalism and particularly drug misuse and dealing to be ‘very’ or ‘fairly’ common increased. There was no change for rubbish/litter. However, when compared with changes in perceptions in the wider area, as measured by the Scottish Household survey, it seemed that the Aberdeen warded areas had experienced relative increases in the perception of the prevalence of all 5 of these forms of antisocial behaviour.

When the indicators that were selected to measure the impact of Aberdeen warden scheme were examined, there was very little evidence of impact.

**DUMFRIES**

The main characteristics of the North West Dumfries scheme are:-

- It is one of the smallest case study areas with a total of 5 staff;
- The wardens spend roughly equal amounts of their time dealing with antisocial behaviour and environmental issues; and
- They have adopted a pro-active approach to community engagement through regular attendance at community events.

**Overview**

Operating with 5 community wardens, the Dumfries warden scheme is small in comparison to others selected as case studies. It is managed by Dumfries and Galloway Council and is based within the Combined Services Department. In terms of focus, approximately 50% of wardens’ time is spent on tackling antisocial behaviour and 50% on environmental issues.

**Coverage**

The scheme operates in 6 patrol areas: Lochside, Lincluden, Stakeford, Summerville, Irongray Industrial Estate and Palmerston. Five of the areas are residential areas.
identified for housing regeneration. The total population served by the wardens is around 14,000.

Areas of Focus

North-West Dumfries rates high on the index of multiple deprivation resulting in a number of associated social problems. The warden scheme was developed to address issues such as breach of the peace, neighbourhood disputes, house breaking, drug related crime, shoplifting, vandalism, the discarding of needles, malicious calls to the emergency services and fire raising in those areas identified as being most deprived.

Objectives

The key objectives of the community wardens in North-West Dumfries are to reduce crime, fear of crime and antisocial behaviour and enhance the local environment. The aim is to make life safer and the environment more attractive for local residents.

Activities

The wardens carry out high visibility patrols in vans or on foot in designated areas. They report incidents to the police, other council departments and the fire and rescue service. If required, they will act as professional witnesses (however this has not happened to date).

Following concerns that the wardens were becoming overly reactive in their activities, many duties now involve working with community groups in a proactive way to address issues that are affecting residents. They regularly attend community groups and schools, involving themselves in the community and increasing understanding of their role. In addition they provide security services, including security marking and organise and supervise a number of activities for local youths.

The Dumfries wardens do not possess any enforcement powers, a situation that the wardens themselves are happy with as they wish to be seen as part of the community, acting as a link between residents, the police and fire and rescue services.

Management

Following restructuring, the wardens are managed from within the Combined Services Directorate of Dumfries and Galloway Council from the Council’s Lincluden Depot.

Key Partners

As a result of the management structure, the wardens have a good working relationship with other council departments, including housing and environmental services. They also work in partnership with the police and fire and rescue services, with whom they maintain almost daily contact. There are, however, no formal

55 Combined Services covers land based services such as parks, environmental services and community safety.
protocols for engagement between the wardens, the police and the fire and rescue service.

Wardens also work in partnership with elected members and housing associations, including Home in Scotland and the Dumfries and Galloway Housing Partnership (DGHP) and the local community.

**Staffing**

The scheme operates with 5 staff: 1 senior warden and 2 teams of 2 wardens. Around 7 wardens have left since the scheme became operational. One left to join the police force, another to become an elected member and others to take up alternative posts within the council.

**Funding**

The Dumfries scheme received £150,000 in the first year which funded all 5 wardens. The second round allocation of funding was identical at £150,000. This has been used to maintain the scheme at full complement as opposed to recruiting extra wardens.

**Evidence of Impact**

The proportion of residents that considered noisy neighbours/loud parties; intimidation and harassment; vandalism and rubbish/litter lying around to be ‘very’ or ‘fairly’ common declined. There was no change for drug misuse and dealing. When compared with changes in perceptions in the wider area, as measured by the Scottish Household survey, it seemed that the Dumfries and Galloway wardened areas had experienced relative increases in the perception of 2 of these forms of antisocial behaviour (intimidation/harassment and drug misuse/dealing) and relative decreases in 3.

When the indicators that were selected to measure the impact of the Dumfries and Galloway warden scheme were examined, there was no evidence of impact. However, there was some doubt about whether the indicators that were selected were the right ones.

**DUNDEE CITY**

The main characteristics of the Dundee scheme are:-

- It operates in 6 Warden patrol areas covering 8 of Dundee’s 32 Council Wards;
- The scheme is underpinned by an ethos of partnership working, which is formalised through the Community Intelligence Unit, where partners come together to share information;
- Joint initiatives developed by the Community Intelligence Unit partners have included tackling fire raising around Guy Fawkes night and targeting closes where dumped rubbish poses a fire hazard;
The Scheme’s Community Learning and Development focus means that relationships with young people are good, which is believed to help prevent antisocial behaviour;

Community Safety Wardens, Noise Wardens and the Anti-Social Behaviour Team have developed a shared database, to which the Police also have access; and

The Police provide the wardens with an uncensored copy of the minute of their daily briefings, and information is shared readily between the 2 bodies.

Overview

Dundee is one of the larger community warden schemes in Scotland. It has a strong community learning and development focus, which is believed to have helped create good relationships with the young people in the areas where wardens patrol. Collaborative working is also strong. What is particularly notable is the extent to which the police freely share information with the wardens and rely on their support to help them do their own job more effectively.

Coverage

The scheme operates in 6 warden patrol areas, covering 8 of Dundee’s 32 council wards. The total population served by the wardens is 39,309, ranging from around 3,500 in the smallest area to 10,000 in the largest.

Areas of Focus

The 6 warden patrol areas were chosen based on levels of deprivation, antisocial behaviour activity levels and crime statistics. The 8 wards that are covered by the scheme were chosen by selecting those ranked by the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SMID) as being in the worst 15%.

Objectives

The scheme aims to reduce crime, tackle antisocial behaviour, reduce fear of crime, improve fire safety, build community confidence and enhance the quality of life. The wardens have no enforcement powers and see this as strength as people are more willing to approach them.

Activities

The wardens’ main activities include operating patrols to deter vandalism and antisocial behaviour, reporting vandalism, damage and arranging repairs, proactively developing links with the community, police and other agencies, and identifying potential improvements in the area. The scheme is founded on a very strong ethos of community development therefore a great deal of emphasis is placed on engaging with local people, especially the young.

Management
The wardens are part of the Community Safety section, and both the wardens and senior wardens report to the Community Safety Section Leader. Community Safety is part of the Leisure and Communities Department within the Council.

**Key Partners**

The community wardens have very close links with the police, the antisocial behaviour team, waste management, environmental health (noise wardens) and the fire and rescue service through the community intelligence unit (CIU)^56^. They also have close links with youth services and social landlords.

**Staffing**

The scheme is currently fully staffed, with 1 manager, 7 seniors, 24 wardens, 4 support team (who are deployed as required to cover sickness and other absences) and 6 mobile wardens who supplement the core wardens’ team as required. In total there are 42 staff.

**Funding**

From 2005-2008 Dundee has received £3,033,023 from the Scottish Executive to fund the Scheme. This has been their sole source of funding. This figure is broken down as £1,233,023 for 2005/6 and £950,000 for both 2006/7 and 2007/8.

**Evidence of Impact**

The proportion of residents that considered noisy neighbours/loud parties and intimidation and harassment to be ‘very’ of ‘fairly’ common declined. The proportion who considered vandalism, drug misuse and dealing and; litter/rubbish lying around to be ‘very’ of ‘fairly’ common increased. When compared with changes in perceptions in the wider area, as measured by the Scottish Household survey, it seemed that the Dundee wardened areas had experienced relative increases in the perception of 4 of these forms of antisocial behaviour and a relative decrease in only noisy neighbours/loud parties.

When the indicators that were selected to measure the impact of the Dundee warden scheme were examined, there was no evidence of impact. However, there was some doubt about whether the indicators that were selected were the right ones.

**EAST RENFREWSHIRE**

The main characteristics of the East Renfrewshire scheme are:-

- Recruitment and retention issues were initially a problem. However, they now appear to have been addressed and the resultant under-spend has been used to fund a mobile patrol;

56 The Community Intelligence Unit sits within the Council’s Antisocial Behaviour Team and collates community intelligence from a range of partners including the police, the wardens, environmental services and the fire service.
• Co-location with their antisocial behaviour partners allows the wardens to provide intelligence from their patrols that can assist their colleagues in their duties;
• The scheme has an environmental focus and issues identified during their patrol are reported to Environmental Services or the Housing Department;
• The wardens, Antisocial Behaviour Team, and CCTV Control Room Team each have their own database and they each select the appropriate information to share with one another in the form of regular reports; and
• Localised and targeted joint clean up initiatives organised with the Waste Management team and the wardens are helping to reinvigorate local communities.

Overview

The community wardens scheme in East Renfrewshire is environmentally focused, and as such a large part of the wardens’ role is to report to environmental services or the housing department such issues as dumped rubbish, graffiti, housing repairs or lighting faults that they come across, or have reported to them, during their patrols. The wardens also work with the CCTV unit, Antisocial Behaviour Team and the police to assist in the prevention and reduction of antisocial behaviour through the provision of information. Being “on the ground” on a daily basis results means that the wardens are seen as a very useful source of intelligence to the Antisocial Behaviour Team and the Police. Having no powers, the wardens are instructed not to get involved in antisocial behaviour incidents. However, they will often be the first on the scene following notification of an incident by the CCTV team. They will observe from a safe distance, take notes and provide the Police with a report.

Coverage

The scheme covers the 3 areas of Neilston, Barrhead (and Auchenback) and part of Thornliebank. The population in these 3 areas is around 25,000. Recruitment and retention issues have meant that the warden patrols have focused on Barrhead (population 17,000) and neighbouring Neilston (population 5,000), with Thornliebank (population 2,500) relying mainly on a mobile patrol.

The warden service is currently provided in designated areas within the authority. Being the most deprived areas of the authority, they have the usual associated anti social behaviour problems which affect the quality of life of residents. Part of the of area also has a high number of void properties which attracts local youths and causes high instances of fire raising and under age drinking, leading to vandalism and youth disorder.

Objectives

The scheme is committed to ensuring that residents may enjoy their homes and the surrounding environment. They do this by providing a visible patrolling deterrent to certain forms of low level nuisance and antisocial behaviour, pro-actively responding to certain environmental issues and generally building relationships with local communities.
Activities

The main activities of the East Renfrewshire wardens include reporting instances of dumped rubbish, faulty lighting or housing repairs, patrolling void properties and council buildings out of hours to deter vandalism, attending community meetings, gala days, and other community events, monitoring properties under investigation by the Antisocial Behaviour Team or problem areas on behalf of the police and contacting the CCTV room to report situations that they should monitor. The CCTV room may also dispatch wardens to check situations that have been seen on camera, which it is suspected may develop into a problem. The wardens would not get involved themselves but would confirm whether or not a police presence was required, keeping a safe distance, taking notes and providing a report if necessary.

Management

Since August 2005 Environmental Services and Community Safety have come together under the banner of Community Services in the Council. The community wardens are based within community safety and, along with the CCTV control room staff, Antisocial Behaviour Investigation Team and other community safety staff report to the Community Safety Manager (Operations), who in turn reports to the Community Resources Manager (Community Safety). The local authority-Strathclyde Police Liaison Officer (LALO) is also part of the team, reporting directly to the Community Resources Manager (Community Safety) and providing a strong link with the community police.

Key Partners

Being part of the same team and working in the same location engenders close working between the wardens, Antisocial Behaviour Investigation team, CCTV control room team, and the local authority-Strathclyde Police Liaison Officer. They are now developing better links with other police teams and have recently started receiving an edited version of the police briefing report. The wardens also have strong links with waste management and housing. The Antisocial Behaviour Team, wardens and CCTV control room each have their own database and they each select the information that is appropriate for the other teams to know and provide each other with regular reports.

Staffing

East Renfrewshire’s 8 Community Wardens are managed strategically by the Community Resources Manager (Community Safety) and operationally by the Community Safety Manager (Operations). Recruitment and retention issues have meant that the scheme has often run with either 4 or 6 Wardens; rarely with its full complement of 8.

Funding

The Local Authority has received £496,000 for all antisocial behaviour work, so wardens were allocated £194,800 per year of this by the Council. Staffing difficulties resulted in an under spend on wardens, therefore, in agreement with the Scottish
Executive, 2 additional wardens were recruited to be deployed on a flexible, evidence and time led basis to cover all parts of the local authority area.

**Evidence of Impact**

The proportion of residents that considered noisy neighbours/loud parties; intimidation and harassment; vandalism etc.; drug misuse and dealing and; litter/rubbish lying around to be ‘very’ of ‘fairly’ common all declined. When compared with changes in perceptions in the wider area, as measured by the Scottish Household survey, it seemed that the East Renfrewshire wardened areas had also experienced relative decreases in the perception of all forms of antisocial behaviour.

When the indicators that were selected to measure the impact of the East Renfrewshire warden scheme were examined, the lack of comparative data meant that no conclusions could be drawn.

**EDINBURGH CITY**

The main characteristics of the Edinburgh scheme are:-

- The wardens were initially managed as part of the Housing Services department of Edinburgh City Council. They are now managed as part of Services for Communities department;
- The scheme began with a focus on environmental issues. However, over time antisocial behaviour has become the wardens’ main focus;
- There are close links between the wardens and other agencies, particularly the fire and rescue service;
- Edinburgh has piloted an innovative digital recording system for wardens to record incidents. This has improved data capture by around 60%
- Wardens have been deployed on a flexible basis to provide a more targeted response to antisocial behaviour incidents; and
- Despite this, antisocial behaviour has remained a challenge.

**Overview**

The Community Safety Concierge (CSC) scheme (the City’s name for their wardens) in Edinburgh was initially designed to be environmentally focused. However, over the course of the scheme, the focus has moved more towards dealing with antisocial behaviour. As such, the concierges in Edinburgh get involved in a wide variety of activities. They undertake environmental clean ups themselves (rather than contacting environmental services) and respond directly to reports of antisocial behaviour. Close links have developed between the concierges and external agencies such as the police and fire and rescue services (with whom protocols exist) and with the community.

**Coverage**

The Edinburgh concierges operate in 5 localities across the city: the central, west, east, north and south area teams. The south area scheme (the focus of the case study)
has been operational since April 2004 and was the last of the Edinburgh schemes to be implemented. Five wardens cover an area with a population of 19,000.

**Areas of Focus**

At the outset, there were a wide variety of environmental problems which the concierges were charged with addressing. These included rubbish, bonfires, and unkempt garden areas. The concierges were also to deal with antisocial behaviour as, and when, they encountered it. They were also expected to develop links with residents. In many areas there was limited community infrastructure so the wardens have had to start to develop structures to facilitate involvement.

**Objectives**

The scheme as a whole is focused on environmental and antisocial behaviour issues and community capacity building. The balance of time spent on each of these activities varies between the sub areas.

**Activities**

The scheme has had a mixed focus, particularly with regard to environmental issues and antisocial behaviour. Dealing with fly-tipping was a common activity, as was clearing up gardens and common areas. Although they do not concentrate on one type of antisocial behaviour, vehicle related incidents figured on numerous occasions in the wardens’ logs. However, it is also clear that there are seasonal variations in the work undertaken. In the summer, there is a heavy focus on high visibility patrolling, and concierges have to attend a relatively high number of incidents. Indeed, joyriding and illegal motorcycle use are big problems. School holidays are particularly busy, and school buildings are watched more closely. In the winter there is less emphasis on patrols which are shorter. The weather is not as good and people are indoors more. Patrols are more observational in winter, that is the wardens look for lights left off and do such things as undertake stairwell checks, rather than attending incidents. Concierges also try to do more work with the youth clubs.

**Management**

The scheme sits within the Services for Communities department, having previously been in Housing Services. However, the vote against the housing stock transfer in Edinburgh means that there is uncertainty as to where the concierge service will sit within the Council in the future. At the time of writing, this was still unresolved. However the emphasis has moved from treating housing, environmental problems and antisocial behaviour as separate issues. The focus is now upon treating these as reinforcing problems that need to be dealt with in a holistic way. As such it may be that the wardens will remain where they currently are.

**Key Partners**

The concierges work closely with external organisations such as the police (in particular the youth action team and the safer communities unit in the south area), and
the fire and rescue service. They also work closely with internal council departments such as Environmental Services and local housing offices.

**Staffing**

There were 49 concierges spread across the 5 area teams as of July 2006.

**Funding**

The 5 area teams have, over the course of their development, received funding from a number of different sources reflecting the different times that they were established. Since 2001/02 the scheme has received £1.6m from the Quality of Life fund and the Housing Revenue Account. It has also received £1.25m through BSSAC.

**Evidence of Impact**

The proportion of residents that considered vandalism, intimidation and harassment to be ‘very’ of ‘fairly’ common declined. The proportion who considered noisy neighbours/loud parties; drug misuse and dealing and; litter/rubbish lying around to be ‘very’ of ‘fairly’ common increased. When compared with changes in perceptions in the wider area, as measured by the Scottish Household survey, it seemed that the Edinburgh wardened areas had experienced relative increases in the perception of 4 of these forms of antisocial behaviour and a relative decline in only vandalism.

When the indicators that were selected to measure the impact of the Edinburgh warden scheme were examined, there was some evidence of impact.

**INVERCLYDE**

The main characteristics of the Inverclyde scheme are:-

- It is one of the largest case study areas in terms of population and the number of wardens;
- It makes use of New Deal to fund 4 wardens posts;
- The scale and severity of antisocial behaviour problems in Inverclyde means the wardens spend around 70% of their time on these issues;
- It is the only case study area to frequently use wardens as “professional witnesses” in court; and
- There is a difficult relationship with young people in some wardened areas, but a generally pro-active approach to community engagement.

**Overview**

The Inverclyde community warden scheme has been in place for just over 2 years. During this time, the scheme has developed steadily to the current position where wardens are seen by local residents as a key component of the antisocial behaviour strategy. Managed and delivered by the local authority, the dual focus of the scheme
is on tackling antisocial behaviour (which accounts for around 70% of the wardens’ time) and addressing environmental issues which accounts for the remainder.

**Coverage**

The scheme operates across 6 localities in Inverclyde within the urban areas of Greenock, Port Glasgow and Gourock. The estimated population of the areas covered by wardens is 40,000. In total, there are 33 community wardens.

**Areas of Focus**

Initially the scheme was established in 2 areas in Inverclyde. However, within a year of the scheme starting wardens had been rolled out to the 6 areas in which they now operate. The scheme areas were decided by an antisocial behaviour working group which had been established by the local authority to scope out which areas the wardens should patrol. The main problems which wardens were intended to address can be described as “low level antisocial behaviour”. This includes youth annoyance and disturbance, vandalism, fire-raising and various other forms of non-criminal antisocial behaviour. The Inverclyde wardens also play an important role in tackling boredom amongst youths by setting up diversionary activities for young people in their patrol areas.

**Objectives**

The key objectives of the scheme are to reduce crime and improve community safety and the environment. This is done by maintaining a visible presence, reporting incidents and environmental issues to partner agencies and by listening to the community. The ethos of the Inverclyde wardens is to act as the “eyes and ears” of the community.

**Activities**

In common with most of the other warden schemes, the Inverclyde community wardens currently have no enforcement powers. Therefore the main thrust of their work is around engaging the residents of the local community. The activities undertaken include:-

- Regular high visibility patrols of the neighbourhood;
- Reporting environmental issues to ensure they are attended to promptly;
- Routine examination of void properties and local schools in order to minimise crime and vandalism;
- Working in partnership with police, other council departments, social landlords and the community to tackle antisocial behaviour and environmental issues; and
- Acting as professional witnesses if required.

**Management**

The scheme sits within the Environmental and Consumer Services section of Inverclyde Council. Within this, wardens are part of the Social Protection Team.
which also includes the Mediation and Street Mediation Teams. Wardens also work in
conjunction with the Problem Solving Unit which aims to tackle wider antisocial
behaviour problems such as noisy or disruptive neighbours. In this way, the work of
the community wardens is co-ordinated with other antisocial behaviour interventions.

Key Partners

These include, Strathclyde Police, Strathclyde Fire and Rescue, housing services,
environmental services, Inverclyde Council’s Legal Department and local registered
social landlords (RSLs).

Staffing

The scheme is currently operating at full complement with 33 staff in total made up
of: one wardens’ manager; 4 senior wardens; 24 wardens; and 4 New Deal wardens.
The New Deal wardens have been taken on through JobcentrePlus for 9 months with
the aim of offering contracted posts to those who are suitable.

Funding

The scheme received £1.7 million from the Scottish Executive, equally phased over
each of the 3 years of the pilot.

Evidence of Impact

The proportion of residents that considered noisy neighbours/loud parties;
intimidation and harassment; drug misuse and dealing and; litter/rubbish lying around
to be ‘very’ of ‘fairly’ common all declined. The proportion who considered
vandalism to be ‘very’ of ‘fairly’ common increased. When compared with changes in
perceptions in the wider area, as measured by the Scottish Household survey, it
seemed that the Inverclyde wardened areas had experienced relative increases in the
perception of vandalism and intimidation/harassment and a relative decline in the
other 3.

When the indicators that were selected to measure the impact of the Inverclyde
warden scheme were examined, the lack of comparative data meant that no
conclusions could be drawn.

ORKNEY

The main characteristics of the Orkney scheme are:-

• It is the smallest case study scheme with only 4 wardens;
• The nature and scale of anti-social behaviour and environmental problems
  handled in Orkney is less severe than in the other case study areas;
• The wardens undertake a wide range of duties including traffic control and
catching stray dogs; and
• There are good formal and informal relationships with partners and the local
  community due to close knit nature of the islands.
Overview

Orkney is the smallest of the case study areas with a total of 4 wardens. The scheme originated as a year long pilot run by the Environmental Health Department of Orkney Islands Council and as such the wardens retain a focus on improving the environment. The scheme in Orkney is unique in that it is the only one of the case study areas that can be considered to have a “mixed” focus. This is due to the scale and volume of problems in Orkney in comparison to other areas. The wardens’ time is not dominated by either antisocial behaviour or environmental issues, rather they undertake a wider range duties in comparison to other areas including traffic control and even catching stray dogs.

Coverage

The community wardens patrol the main town of Kirkwall, the second town of Stromness and the smaller settlements on the mainland including Finstown and St. Margarets Hope. The combined population of the settlements patrolled is in the region of 10,000. The wardens spend around 75% of their time in Kirkwall, 10% in Stromness and the remainder across the other areas. However, theoretically their “beat” is all of the islands, a population of 20,000.

Areas of Focus

The community wardens have carried on the duties of the piloted environmental wardens. This involves dealing with public concerns around dog fouling (which is considered a problem on the island), litter, graffiti and fly-tipping. Although antisocial behaviour is not a major problem, the general feel in the community is that is on the increase. Wardens deal with any reports of low level antisocial behaviour as well as maintaining regular patrols of public areas and Kirkwall town centre.

Objectives

In common with other schemes, the main objectives in Orkney are to promote community safety, reduce crime and antisocial behaviour and impact positively on environmental issues. This is achieved through high visibility regular patrols and proactive engagement with the community.

Activities

Wardens travel between the main settlements on Orkney by van. Duties undertaken centre around preventing and addressing antisocial behaviour as well as tackling environmental issues. Typical activities are patrolling around the school at lunchtime to deter littering by school children, checking public buildings and spaces across the island including parks and toilets and targeting antisocial behaviour hotspots where there have been previous reports of disturbances.

Management

The day-to-day tasking and management of wardens is undertaken by the Antisocial Behaviour Co-ordinator (ASBC) who reports to the Community Safety Officer.
(CSO). The management and the wardens are employees of Orkney Islands Council. However, the budget for community wardens and responsibility for recruitment and disciplinary matters resides with the Environmental Health (EH) department. The reason for this split is historical. As wardens started as a pilot within EH, the department has retained budgetary control. Decisions on recruitment are made by a panel comprising the ASBC, CSO and EH representatives.

Key Partners

Due to the size of the community in Orkney, the wardens are visible and well known to the other public services on the island. Their relationship to EH means they have a close working relationship with this department. In addition, they have work closely with the largest registered social landlord on the island, Orkney Housing Association Limited. Wardens also work closely with the police (with shift breaks being taken within Kirkwall police station) and a dedicated local authority liaison officer (LALO) seconded by the police to the council.

Staffing

The wardens in Orkney are at full complement with 4 wardens and no vacancies. The scheme has lost and replaced 2 wardens since its inception. Two part-time wardens were recruited early on in the scheme’s life to help with cover for holidays and sickness. However, this did not work out as it was hard for the part-time wardens to balance their other commitments with their role as a warden.

Funding

The annual budget for wardens is in the region of £100,000. This funds the salary costs for the 4 wardens and a proportion of the ASBC and CSO salaries. The budget is held by the Environmental Health department.

Evidence of Impact

The proportion of residents that considered litter/rubbish lying around to be ‘very’ of ‘fairly’ common declined. The proportion who considered noisy neighbours/loud parties; vandalism; intimidation and harassment and; drug misuse and dealing to be ‘very’ of ‘fairly’ common increased. When compared with changes in perceptions in the wider area, as measured by the Scottish Household survey, it seemed that the Orkney wardened areas had experienced relative increases in the perception of intimidation/harassment and drug misuse/dealing and a relative decline in the other 3.

When the indicators that were selected to measure the impact of the Orkney warden scheme were examined, the lack of comparative data meant that no conclusions could be drawn.

PERTH AND KINROSS

The main characteristics of the Perth scheme are:-
• It is one of the smallest case study areas with a total of 5 staff covering a population of 10,800;
• The wardens spend roughly equal amounts of their time dealing with antisocial behaviour and environmental issues;
• All patrols are carried out in the warded areas on foot;
• Community wardens sit alongside anti-social behaviour investigators and noise wardens and form part of the Perth and Kinross Council’s wider approach to tackling anti-social behaviour; and
• There are good relationships with Tayside Police and an information sharing protocol in place.

Overview

The scheme in Perth is one of the smallest of the case study areas with 5 wardens. It is focused on the 2 neighbouring areas of Letham and Hillyland. Having been in place for just over 2 years, the Perth scheme has concentrated on tackling problems of antisocial behaviour within the patrol areas. Although antisocial behaviour has been the main focus within the scheme, tackling of environmental issues, with the help of partner agencies, has also featured high on the agenda.

Coverage

Letham and Hillyland have a combined population of around 10,800. The wardens operate almost exclusively within these areas, but will deal with issues elsewhere on occasions.

Areas of Focus

The areas of Letham and Hillyland were selected to receive community wardens following a community safety audit undertaken in Autumn 2002. The key problems which wardens were expected to deal with are a mix of antisocial behaviour and environmental issues and cover: young people congregating and causing annoyance, vandalism and graffiti, litter and fly tipping, poor close cleaning, overgrown garden areas, abandoned cars, garage sites and noisy neighbours.

Objectives

The key objective of the warden scheme in Perth was to increase local residents’ feelings of safety in their own areas. Allied to this, wardens were to play their part in reducing antisocial behaviour and improving the environmental quality of patrol areas.

Activities

All wardens’ patrols are carried out on foot. The main duties involve maintaining high visibility patrols in Letham and Hillyland, dealing with reported incidents of low level antisocial behaviour (including youth loitering and under-age drinking) checking the stairwells of high rise flats for evidence of drug misuse and helping to provide diversionary activities such as street football for local youths in the area.
Management

The warden scheme is managed by the Antisocial Behaviour Co-ordinator (ASBC). This individual sits within the Estates Management Department of the Housing and Community Care Directorate of Perth and Kinross Council (PKC). Wardens are one part of PKC’s wider approach to antisocial behaviour and sit alongside a team of antisocial behaviour investigators and noise wardens.

Key Partners

The antisocial behaviour focus of Perth’s community wardens means that, in common with other scheme areas, their principal partner is the police. Working relationships between the police and wardens were described as good with well established information sharing protocols in place. Other key partners include the area housing department, environmental services and Perth Housing Association.

Staffing

The scheme employs 5 wardens on a full-time basis. The scheme has been one of the most successful in retaining its staff having not lost a single warden in the 2 years it has been operational. The small number of wardens has meant that cover for sickness and holidays has been challenging at times and has led to temporary reductions of the full service on occasions.

Funding

The funding for community wardens has been in the region of £165,000 per annum between 2004 and 2008. This has been used to fund the ASBC and 5 community wardens including associated costs.

Evidence of Impact

The proportion of residents that considered noisy neighbours/loud parties; intimidation and harassment; vandalism; drug misuse and dealing and; litter/rubbish lying around to be ‘very’ of ‘fairly’ common all declined. When compared with changes in perceptions in the wider area, as measured by the Scottish Household survey, it seemed that the Perth and Kinross wardened areas had also experienced relative decreases in the perception of all forms of antisocial behaviour.

When the indicators that were selected to measure the impact of the Perth and Kinross warden scheme were examined, there was reasonable evidence of impact.

SOUTH LANARKSHIRE

The main characteristics of the South Lanarkshire scheme are:-

- South Lanarkshire operates an intelligence led approach to the use of community wardens based on their problem solving approach and involving
the key partners working together to develop co-ordinated strategies for
dealing with crime and antisocial behaviour;

- The wardens operate in the areas with the highest levels of recorded crime, which are also the areas of highest deprivation. However, they can be deployed flexibly to emerging crime or antisocial behaviour hotspot areas;
- South Lanarkshire has developed a series of targeted initiatives that are designed to tackle specific issues at key points in the year. This includes a bonfire initiative and school estate patrols in the summer;
- The warden scheme operates as the “eyes and ears” of the community rather than as a police force and works to tackle crime, antisocial behaviour and environmental issues;
- The wardens operate in partnership with police and fire and rescue services, along with other local authority departments. Relationships have developed over time, especially with the police who were sceptical of the service at its introduction but now see the value of the wardens; and
- Consultation evidence suggests that the wardens are having a positive impact on their patrol areas on crime, antisocial behaviour and environmental issues.

Overview

South Lanarkshire is one of the larger warden schemes in Scotland. It is seen as the “eyes and ears” of the council. The wardens’ presence has been designed to reassure the community and tackle key crime, antisocial behaviour and environmental issues. The South Lanarkshire scheme is notable as half the wardens are funded by the local authority from the Housing Revenue Account.

Coverage

The scheme operates 7 warden patrol areas, covering Blantyre, Cambuslang, East Kilbride, Hamilton, Clydesdale, Larkhall and Rutherglen. Despite operating in the 7 designated areas the scheme also operates flexibly, with wardens being deployed in areas other than their core areas when needed. The patrol areas have a total population of 306,300 (the entire South Lanarkshire local authority population).

Areas of Focus

The warden areas were selected based on tactical assessment of areas with the highest levels of crime which were mapped using STORM software. The areas also came out as being the most deprived in South Lanarkshire based on the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation 2004. As such the assessments are used on an ongoing basis to direct the wardens to the areas of greatest need within their patrol areas.

Objectives

The scheme aims to reduce levels of crime and antisocial behaviour, secondary fire raising, vandalism and graffiti and perceptions of fear of crime. As a consequence of these reductions the hope is that there will be improved resident satisfaction with the areas they live in.

Activities
The wardens’ activities are monitored using “beat sheets” which track the activities of wardens on a weekly basis. Evidence from the past 24 months shows that the main issues logged relate to estates management, which accounted for 61% of all the issues identified. Fly tipping is the second main issue accounting for 9% of all issues logged. This is followed by rubbish, vandalism (including property damage) and graffiti. The wardens also work on focused initiatives and gather intelligence using community intelligence reports, which are collated and analysed by the police.

**Management**

The wardens are part of the Area Services Section of the Housing and Technical Resources Department. They therefore sit within the local housing office in the area in which they patrol and are managed by the local Antisocial Behaviour Team. Management uses a problem solving approach which collates key data sources from the local authority, police and fire services to identify the problem areas to which wardens should be deployed.

**Key Partners**

The wardens have very close links within the council, working with housing services, community services, education and social work. They also work with local communities and outreach workers as well as the police and fire and rescue services. The main interactions come through the problem solving approach which brings all the key partners together to plan service delivery in each local area.

**Staffing**

The scheme currently has 35 staff and 1 vacancy. The full complement of staff includes 32 wardens, 4 supervisors and 2 team leaders. The current level of turnover is 38%, with a number of staff moving on to other promoted posts in the local authority.

**Funding**

The South Lanarkshire scheme received £447,571 in the first year but no allocation from the second round funding which was used to fund Noise Wardens.

**Evidence of Impact**

The proportion of residents that considered litter/rubbish lying around and drug misuse/dealing to be ‘very’ of ‘fairly’ common declined. The proportion who considered noisy neighbours/loud parties; vandalism and; intimidation and harassment to be ‘very’ of ‘fairly’ common increased. When compared with changes in perceptions in the wider area, as measured by the Scottish Household survey, it seemed that the South Lanarkshire warded areas had experienced relative increases in the perception of 4 of these forms of antisocial behaviour and a relative decline in only rubbish/litter lying around.
When the indicators that were selected to measure the impact of the South Lanarkshire warden scheme were examined, most confirmed to the Rise and fall theory. Although the lack of comparative data meant that it was not possible to say why there had been an initial rise, the activities of the wardens suggest that this was because of increases in reporting.
## APPENDIX FOUR

### SUMMARY OF CASE STUDY INDICATOR CHANGES

**TABLE A4.1**  
Summary of Case Study Indicator Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Aberdeen</th>
<th>Dumfries and Galloway</th>
<th>Dundee</th>
<th>East Renfrewshire</th>
<th>Edinburgh</th>
<th>Inverclyde</th>
<th>Orkney</th>
<th>Perth and Kinross</th>
<th>South Lanarkshire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vandalism</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greater increase in the warded areas than local authority. Police say increased detection rates but residents’ perceptions of prevalence also increased. NO CONCLUSION</td>
<td>Slight increase compared to slight decline across local authority. Perceived prevalence increased. RISE NEGATIVE</td>
<td>Greater increase in the warded areas than the local authority. RISE NEGATIVE</td>
<td>Increase then decline but overall increase. No LA comparative data. NO CONCLUSION</td>
<td>Greater increase in the warded areas than the local authority but perception data suggests vandalism declined. RISE POSITIVE.</td>
<td>Increase then fall. Overall increase. No local authority data. NO CONCLUSION.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Breach of Peace</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Large increase while small reduction across the local authority. RISE NEGATIVE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fire-raising incidents</strong></td>
<td>Declined but no local authority comparator data. NO CONCLUSION</td>
<td>Declined but data incomplete. NO CONCLUSION</td>
<td>Declined but increased across local authority POSITIVE INTERVENTION.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Dumfries and Galloway</td>
<td>Dundee</td>
<td>East Renfrewshire</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Inverclyde</td>
<td>Orkney</td>
<td>Perth and Kinross</td>
<td>South Lanarkshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints of antisocial behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased but no comparative data. NO CONCLUSION.</td>
<td>Declined then increased but decline overall. No local authority data but perception data suggest antisocial behaviour is reducing. RISE POSITIVE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housebreakings</td>
<td></td>
<td>Large increase while small reduction across the local authority. RISE NEGATIVE.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Steady decrease while increase in the local authority. POSITIVE INTERVENTION.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malicious false alarm calls</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased but figures are small and no local authority comparator data. NO CONCLUSION.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Declined then increased but overall decline. No local authority comparator data. NO CONCLUSION.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of antisocial behaviour to council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Street Cleanliness.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased then declined. Score lower in the local authority. POSITIVE INTERVENTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Case study area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detection rates for vandalism</td>
<td>Declined. No local authority comparator data. Perception data shows an increase. NO CONCLUSION.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detection rates for disorderly conduct</td>
<td>Slight increase but no local authority comparator data. NO CONCLUSION.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issuing of restorative warnings</td>
<td>Increased but no local authority comparator data. NO CONCLUSION.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drunk and incapable</td>
<td>Smaller increase than in the local authority and decline in 2nd year. RISE POSITIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street drinking</td>
<td>Large increase but no local authority comparator data. NO CONCLUSION.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racially aggravated incidents</td>
<td>Declined. No local authority comparator data. NO CONCLUSION.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of persistent offenders</td>
<td>Fallen but no local authority comparator data. NO CONCLUSION.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aberdeen</th>
<th>Dumfries and Galloway</th>
<th>Dundee</th>
<th>East Renfrewshire</th>
<th>Edinburgh</th>
<th>Inverclyde</th>
<th>Orkney</th>
<th>Perth and Kinross</th>
<th>South Lanarkshire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Aberdeen</th>
<th>Dumfries and Galloway</th>
<th>Dundee</th>
<th>East Renfrewshire</th>
<th>Edinburgh</th>
<th>Inverclyde</th>
<th>Orkney</th>
<th>Perth and Kinross</th>
<th>South Lanarkshire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urinating in public</td>
<td>Increase greater than in the local authority but based on small figures. Could also be due to increased detection.</td>
<td>NO CONCLUSION.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood disputes</td>
<td>Decline but no local authority comparator data.</td>
<td>NO CONCLUSION.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assaults</td>
<td>Large increase while small reduction across the local authority.</td>
<td>RISE NEGATIVE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoplifting</td>
<td>Large increase while small reduction across the local authority.</td>
<td>RISE NEGATIVE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malicious incidents attended</td>
<td>Declined then increased but overall decline. No local authority comparator data.</td>
<td>NO CONCLUSION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Dumfries and Galloway</td>
<td>Dundee</td>
<td>East Renfrewshire</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Inverclyde</td>
<td>Orkney</td>
<td>Perth and Kinross</td>
<td>South Lanarkshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidents reported for malicious intent</td>
<td>Declined then increased but overall decline. No local authority comparator data. NO CONCLUSION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Disturbance calls</td>
<td>Declined in parallel with decline across the local authority. NEUTRAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise-related calls</td>
<td>Slight increase. Local authority data incomplete and confounded by introduction of noise wardens across LA. NO CONCLUSION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Dumfries and Galloway</td>
<td>Dundee</td>
<td>East Renfrewshire</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Inverclyde</td>
<td>Orkney</td>
<td>Perth and Kinross</td>
<td>South Lanarkshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break-ins to motor vehicles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slight increase while decline across the local authority. <strong>RISE NEGATIVE.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thefts of motor vehicles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slight increase while decline across the local authority <strong>RISE NEGATIVE.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism to void properties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steady decline. No local authority comparator data. <strong>NO CONCLUSION.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal requests for graffiti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steady decline. No local authority comparator data. <strong>NO CONCLUSION.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Case study area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>Dumfries and Galloway</td>
<td>Dundee</td>
<td>East Renfrewshire</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Inverclyde</td>
<td>Orkney</td>
<td>Perth and Kinross</td>
<td>South Lanarkshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports of graffiti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased then decreased but increased overall. No local authority comparator data NO CONCLUSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fly-tipping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase then fall. Overall increase. No local authority comparator data. NO CONCLUSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall pattern across case study area</td>
<td>Very limited evidence of impact. However, residents’ perception surveys show that neighbourhood quality has increased and the wardens are felt to have had an impact.</td>
<td>No evidence of impact but has to question whether wardens could have impacted on some of the variables. This is reinforced by positive perceptions from the survey of residents.</td>
<td>No evidence of impact from the crime statistics although there is from the perception surveys. Have to question whether wardens could have impacted on some of the variables.</td>
<td>Absence of comparative data means no firm conclusions can be drawn. However, perception surveys show positive changes.</td>
<td>Some evidence of impact. Perceptions of incidence of vandalism have improved.</td>
<td>Lack of local authority comparator data means firm conclusions cannot be drawn. However, residents’ rating of the neighbourhood has increased.</td>
<td>Mixed picture but lack of comparative data means no conclusions can be drawn. Perception surveys show that antisocial behaviour is felt to have got worse.</td>
<td>Reasonable evidence of impact which is backed up by the perception surveys.</td>
<td>Most indicators conform to Rise and Fall pattern but lack of local authority comparator data means that it is not possible to say if the Confidence or Misplaced Confidence theories apply. Activities of wardens tend to suggest the former. This is backed up by improvements in residents’ perceptions of neighbourhood quality.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>