

---

## IAS Factsheet

Produced by the Institute of Alcohol Studies,  
1 The Quay,  
St Ives,  
Cambs.,  
PE27 5AR

Tel: 01480 466766  
Fax: 01480 497583  
Email: [info@ias.org.uk](mailto:info@ias.org.uk)  
Website: <http://www.ias.org.uk>

# CONTENTS

---

Definitions	3
Available information	5
The burden of alcohol-related crime	6
The scale of the problem	7
Drunkenness offenders in the UK	8
Drunkenness offenders in Scotland	9
Studies of people arrested by police	10
Anti-social behaviour and disorder	12

## Definitions

'Alcohol-related crime' is a popular rather than a legal term. Normally, it is used to refer to two main categories of offences:

- Alcohol-defined offences such as drunkenness offences or driving with excess alcohol.
- Offences in which the consumption of alcohol is thought to have played a role of some kind in the committing of the offence, usually in the sense that the offender was under the influence of alcohol at the time. Examples of offences which are often committed by people under the influence are assault, breach of the peace, criminal damage and other public order offences.

The Government states: *Alcohol related crime and disorder has a major impact on the quality of life of many people.*

*It is associated with a wide range of offences ranging from minor public order offences, which are anti-social by nature, through traffic offences, minor assaults, serious assaults to murder.*

*The Government is determined to assist crime and disorder reduction partnerships in tackling these alcohol-related problems by giving the police and local authorities the support and powers required.*

*In launching the Government's Action Plan in August 2000, Home Office Minister Charles Clarke said: 'Public drunkenness can give rise to serious problems of disorderly conduct, nuisance, criminal damage and alcohol-related assaults, particularly in the proximity of licensed premises at closing time. In addition, it can increase fear of crime and so reduce the quality of life for many people. This is clearly unacceptable.'*

*Alcohol-related crime featured prominently in over 70% of Crime and Disorder Strategies.<sup>1</sup>*

In regard to the offences committed 'under the influence', the implication is that they would either not have happened or would not have reached the level of seriousness that they actually did if the offender had been sober. This is of course difficult territory. Normally, in relation to individual offences alcohol is best regarded as being one link in the causal chain rather than the sole operating cause. Clearly, for example, there is not an automatic relationship between alcohol and violence. Whether or not the one gives rise to the other depends on a range of factors, personal, inter-personal, situational and cultural.

The complexities involved in establishing the causes of individual offences allow those minded to do so to attack the whole concept of 'alcohol-related' crime as misleading or used so inconsistently as to be largely meaningless. In the report produced for the alcohol industry's Portman Group,<sup>2</sup> Dr Peter Marsh attacks the very concept of alcohol-related crime and disorder. He concludes that due to inconsistent definitions and inaccurate and unreliable sources of data, claims such as 70% - 80% of late night violence in town centres being attributable to alcohol consumption cannot be empirically substantiated

Another report commissioned by the Portman Group<sup>3</sup> concluded that 'there is no evidence that alcohol is a major factor in crime and no general link between alcohol and crime has been found' and a Home Office report also states 'There is no evidence that various types of crime are actually caused by alcohol consumption.'<sup>4</sup>

These are surprising conclusions for a number of reasons.

- They flatly contradict the whole basis of government policy as outlined in statements such as the one quoted above
- They fly in the face of the face of a mass of evidence from many countries showing that alcohol is indeed a major factor in some kinds of crime, as well as a range of other social problems.

- They are difficult to square with the keen advocacy of both the Government and the Portman Group of longer drinking hours in order allegedly to reduce binge drinking and so bring about a reduction in crime and disorder. If alcohol does not cause crime, why should reducing binge drinking make any difference?

However, for what may be considered the main purpose in relation to town centre management, discouraging crime and disorder, the question of whether or not an individual offence is causally attributable to alcohol is hardly the central issue. The causal role of alcohol is an interesting and important question scientifically, and it may also be a highly relevant one in relation to the management of an individual offender by the court, for example in relation to appropriate sentencing or deciding on a treatment programme.

But from the perspective of the local resident, the would-be visitor, or the crime and disorder partnership, what matters most is simply that offences would not be occurring in the range and numbers that they actually do, and at the times and places that they do, if it were not for the institutionalised sale and consumption of alcohol. Generally, increases in the number of licensed premises and in their total capacities are accompanied by rises in assaults and public order offences.<sup>5</sup> What proportion of these offences are 'caused' by alcohol is of secondary importance compared with the fact that in most town and city centres, the majority of hot-spots for violence and public disorder are located in the areas containing concentrations of licensed premises. For example, in 2001 in the City of Bath, levels of crime and disorder were far higher in Abbey Ward, which contains the night-club zone, than in any other ward of Bath and North East Somerset.<sup>6</sup>

	<b>District Average</b>	<b>Abbey Ward</b>
Violent crimes Per 1,000	6	46
Disorder/nuisance Per 1,000	33	231
Criminal damage Per km <sup>2</sup>	6	242

For these reasons, possibly the most realistic and appropriate definition of 'alcohol-related' is offences generated or committed within the context of the sale and consumption of alcohol, particularly in relation to the evening and night-time economy.

In April 2005, a survey<sup>7</sup> was carried out for the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames of residents and businesses in the central areas of Richmond and Twickenham. The survey was to assess the impact of the licensed economy. The main findings were:

- *Almost three-quarters of respondents from both towns have regularly experienced crime, disorder, nuisance and /or anti-social behaviour they believe is linked to the licensed economy.*
- *54% of Richmond and 54% of Twickenham respondents are deterred from using the facilities in the town centres at night because they regularly encounter crime, disorder, nuisance and /or anti-social behaviour. The main explanations for their non-use were; 'due to groups'; 'feelings of intimidation'; 'due to the drunkenness of others' and 'general unpleasant[ness of the environment']*
- *The most regularly encountered types of crime, disorder, nuisance and /or anti-social behaviour experienced by respondents in Richmond and Twickenham were 'littering' and 'excess noise'. However, over half the respondents in both towns also regularly experience 'fighting', 'swearing', 'vandalism', 'urination' and 'criminal damage'.*
- *Of the types of behaviour that respondents had experienced, they mostly encountered them weekly, except excess 'noise' which was most commonly occurring on a twice-weekly basis and 'littering', which was most common on a daily basis. 'Criminal damage' was the least frequently occurring behaviour, with most*

respondents saying that it occurred monthly or less frequently.

- The respondents were asked to justify their remarks. Most respondents (25%) said that they witnessed the behaviour directly, that is, they saw it or heard it and could link it to licensed premises. The next most common justification was that it was 'linked to times' when licensed premises were open (i.e. primarily at night) (24%). For example, they found evidence of urination (i.e. often dried on to the wall) next to their house when they woke up the next morning. The next most common explanation for linking the behaviour to the licensed economy was that the behaviour was 'in the vicinity of the [licensed] premises' (23%). For example, they found pools of vomit outside the premises when walking to work or similar.
- While there are some small indications that gender and age affect people's responses, there does not appear to be a firm link between the distance respondents live from licensed premises and the answers they give.

### Available Information

Statistics of alcohol-defined offences are collected and are available from Government sources, normally the Home Office.

Statistics of other alcohol-related offences are not collected per se. Offences such as assault are recorded statistically, but the involvement if any of alcohol in them is not routinely investigated or recorded.

A major problem in assessing the scale of violence in general or alcohol-related violence in particular is the large number of cases that are unreported. Less than a quarter of violent offences that result in treatment at Accident and Emergency Departments are known to police.<sup>8</sup> Police figures therefore represent a very substantial under-estimate of the size of the problem.

Reliable or indeed any statistics relating to offences such of breach of the peace are difficult to obtain because, firstly, policies in regard to prosecutions are particularly variable from one area to another and over time, and, secondly, because even if they are recorded such offences are not centrally collated.

Special research programmes are sometimes undertaken into alcohol involvement in particular kinds of offences, and these provide a basis for estimates to be made of the proportions of assaults or whatever that are 'alcohol-related'. (see below 'Studies of People Arrested by Police')

### Incidents of violence In or Around Licensed Premises (England & Wales 2003-2004)<sup>9</sup>

Police force area	Violent offences committed
Avon and Somerset	2,574
Bedfordshire	762
Cambridgeshire	750
Cheshire	806
Cleveland	1,615
Cumbria	600
Derbyshire	n/a
Devon and Cornwall	3,580
Dorset	752
Durham	n/a
Dyfed-Powys	816
Essex	1,756
Gloucestershire	864
Greater Manchester	1,620
Gwent	791
Hampshire	2,417

Hertfordshire	1,005
Humberside	1,007
Kent	813
Lancashire	3,910
Leicestershire	1,323
Lincolnshire	607
London City of	151
Merseyside	n/a
Metropolitan Police	n/a
Norfolk	540
Northamptonshire	1,043
Northumbria	1,767
North Wales	1,767
North Yorkshire	1,124
Nottinghamshire	n/a
South Wales	2,895
South Yorkshire	1,581
Staffordshire	2,424
Suffolk	993
Surrey	794
Sussex	n/a
Thames Valley	2,146
Warwickshire	n/a
West Mercia	882
West Midlands	4,140
West Yorkshire	2,017
Wiltshire	373
<b>Total</b>	<b>52,205</b>

However, it should be noted that these are police figures and these are known substantially to underestimate the scale of the problem. Less than a quarter of violent offences resulting in treatment at an Accident and Emergency Department are reported to police.<sup>10</sup>  
*Statistics of drink driving convictions are given in IAS Fact Sheet 'Drinking and Driving'.*

### **The Burden of Alcohol-Related Crime**

Alcohol-related crime and drunken offenders place a huge burden on the police and other public services:<sup>11</sup>

- from approximately 10.30pm to 3.00am the majority of arrests are for alcohol-related offences
- there is the potential for routine incidents of public nuisance to escalate to more serious, especially violent, offence
- dealing with intoxicated offenders can be difficult and time consuming. For example, they may have to be kept in cells long enough to sober up; while they are there the police have a duty of care and have to ensure the offender does not come to harm by choking on their own vomit. The offender may have to be checked every 15 minutes. Medical attention may be necessary. Female offenders need female police officers to attend certain procedures who may have to be taken off other duties.
- intoxicated prisoners can be disruptive, uncooperative and may present severe hygiene problems, urinating or defecating in their clothing during or after arrest.

## The Scale of the Problem

### Persons found guilty or cautioned for offences of drunkenness by sex, 1995-2005, England & Wales<sup>12</sup>

	Found guilty			Cautioned			Found guilty or cautioned		
	All persons	Males	Females	All persons	Males	Females	All Persons	Males	Females
1995	19,792	18,486	1,306	22,889	20,518	2,371	42,681	39,004	3,677
1996	24,229	22,523	1,706	25,903	22,976	2,927	50,132	45,499	4,633
1997	28,795	26,674	2,121	25,680	22,436	3,244	54,475	49,110	5,365
1998	30,834	28,426	2,408	22,753	19,402	3,351	53,587	47,828	5,759
1999	28,680	26,101	2,579	20,340	17,033	3,307	49,020	43,134	5,886
2000	27,182	24,549	2,633	18,052	14,762	3,290	45,234	39,311	5,923
2001	26,246	23,741	2,505	16,639	13,452	3,187	42,885	37,193	5,692
2002	26,898	24,148	2,750	16,231	12,935	3,296	43,129	37,083	6,046
2003	27,697	24,686	3,011	18,134	14,392	3,742	45,831	39,078	6,753
2004*	21,133	18,658	2,475	13,486	10,390	3,096	34,619	29,048	5,571
2005*	16,068	13,927	2,141	8,589	6,301	2,288	24,657	20,228	4,429

\* The Penalty Notice for Disorder scheme, introduced in England and Wales in 2004, covers offences of drunkenness

### Number of persons found guilty or cautioned for offences of drunkenness by sex, per 100,000 population\*, 1995-2005, England & Wales<sup>12</sup>

	All persons	Males	Females
1995	101	189	17
1996	118	221	21
1997	128	237	25
1998	125	229	26
1999	114	205	27
2000	104	186	27
2001	100	174	26
2002	100	177	27
2003	106	186	30
2004	79	137	25
2005	56	95	20

\* Based on the population aged 14 and over as the number of offenders aged under 14 is small

### Drunkenness offenders in the UK<sup>13</sup>

(Sources: Home Office, Scottish Executive Justice Department and the Northern Ireland Office)

Year	England & Wales	Scotland	Northern Ireland	Total	Rate Total	Per 10,000 15 & over
1964	73,299	10,778	1,731	85,808	15.9	20.7
1965	69,138	10,380	1,451	80,969	14.9	19.4
1966	66,701	10,620	1,371	78,692	14.9	18.8
1967	71,774	10,490	1,368	83,632	15.2	19.9
1968	75,341	10,937	1,275	87,553	15.9	20.8
1969	77,180	10,327	743	88,250	15.9	20.9
1970	79,004	10,594	1,305	90,903	16.3	21.5
1971	83,251	10,898	815	94,964	17.0	22.4
1972	88,621	11,664	216	100,501	17.9	23.6
1973	97,308	13,516	241	111,065	19.8	26.0
1974	98,392	14,683	250	113,325	20.2	26.4
1975	100,150	14,999	308	115,457	20.5	26.8
1976	103,720	14,156	385	118,261	21.0	27.3
1977	103,811	12,346	311	116,468	20.7	26.7
1978	101,283	12,643	360	114,286	20.3	26.1
1979	106,209	13,628	354	121,191	21.4	27.2
1980	110,211	13,795	374	124,380	22.1	27.9
1981	97,890	11,328	284	109,502	19.4	24.5
1982	97,251	9,730	259	107,240	19.1	23.9
1983	98,301	8,080	317	106,698	18.9	23.6
(a)1984	81,669	6,618	322	88,609	15.7	19.5
1985	75,324	5,099	274	80,697	14.3	17.7
1986	67,567	3,660	244	71,471	12.6	15.6
1987	83,036	3,625	189	86,850	15.3	18.8
1988	93,891	3,357	282	97,530	17.1	21.1
1989	92,822	2,961	227	96,010	16.8	20.7
1990	86,392	2,833	127	89,352	15.6	19.3
1991	75,350	2,275	138	77,763	13.5	16.7
1992	68,770	2,161	120	71,051	12.3	15.3
1993	59,907	1,735	114	61,756	10.7	13.3
1994	57,890	1,429	94	59,413	10.3	12.8
1995	42,681	1,313	90	44,084	7.6	9.4
1996	50,132	1,103	81	51,316	8.8	11.0
1997	54,475	928	116	55,519	9.5	11.8
1998	53,587	725	112	54,424	9.3	11.5
1999	49,020	478	139	49,637	8.5	10.5
2000	45,234	434	75	45,743	7.8	9.6
2001	42,885	371	62	43,318	7.3	9.0
2002	43,129	384	32	43,545	7.3	9.0
2003	45,831	411	29	46,271	7.8	9.5
2004	34,619	246	37	34,902	5.8	7.1

(a) Since 1984 the figure for England and Wales, and Scotland include cautions and convictions

These figures reflect changes in police practice rather than changes in the actual incidence of drunkenness. This is particularly clear from the Scottish figures, the most recent of which if taken at face value imply that drunkenness has virtually disappeared north of the border. In reality, convictions for drunkenness have fallen as the incidence of drunkenness has increased.

### Drunkenness offenders in Scotland<sup>13</sup>

(Source: Scottish Executive Justice Department)

Year	Total	Male	Female	Rate	per 10,000
	(a)			Total	15 & over
1964	10,778	9,822	956	20.7	27.8
1965	10,380	9,444	936	19.9	26.8
1966	10,620	9,710	910	20.4	27.5
1967	10,490	9,616	874	20.2	27.3
1968	10,937	9,932	1,005	21.0	28.5
1969	10,327	9,370	957	19.8	27.0
1970	10,594	9,582	1,012	20.3	27.6
1971	10,898	9,738	1,160	20.9	28.4
1972	11,664	10,367	1,297	22.4	30.2
1973	13,516	12,031	1,485	25.9	34.9
1974	14,683	13,189	1,494	28.1	37.8
1975	14,999	13,203	1,796	28.8	38.3
1976	14,156	12,546	1,610	27.2	36.1
1977	12,346	10,822	1,524	23.8	31.3
1978	12,643	11,149	1,494	24.4	31.8
1979	13,628	12,106	1,522	26.4	34.1
1980	13,795	12,118	1,677	26.8	34.4
1981	11,328	9,852	1,476	21.9	28.1
1982	9,730	8,550	1,180	18.8	23.8
1983	8,080	7,197	883	15.7	19.7
1984	6,618	5,897	721	12.9	16.1
1985	5,099	4,453	646	9.9	12.3
1986	3,660	3,209	451	7.2	8.9
1987	3,625	3,276	349	7.1	8.8
(b)1988	3,357	2,945	410	6.6	8.1
1989	2,961	2,608	353	5.8	7.2
1990	2,833	2,548	285	5.6	6.9
1991	2,275	2,032	243	4.5	5.5
1992	2,161	1,930	231	4.2	5.2
1993	1,735	1,538	197	3.4	4.2
1994	1,429	1,297	132	2.8	3.5
1995	1,313	1,176	137	2.6	3.2
1996	1,103	1,013	90	2.2	2.7
1997	928	831	97	1.8	2.2
1998	725	661	64	1.4	1.8
1999	478	436	42	0.9	1.2
2000	434	386	48	0.9	1.0
2001	371	345	26	0.7	0.9
2002	384	339	45	0.8	0.9
2003	411	373	38	0.8	1.0
(c)2004	246	211	35	0.5	0.6

(a) From 1964 to 1978 numbers found guilty or convicted of drunkenness; thereafter persons with a main charge proved for drunkenness

(b) From 1988 the total includes a number of cases where the sex of the offender was not documented

(c) Figures relate to financial year 2004-5

The Government explains that "Enforcement of legislation on drunk and disorderly behaviour has dropped sharply over the last 10 years. This reflects not only falling priority but also, crucially, the sheer practicalities of policing large numbers of drunk people. Arresting some one for drunk and disorderly behaviour and taking them to the custody suite can take two hours or more – during which the officer is effectively off the streets".<sup>14</sup>

**Persons found guilty or cautioned for offences involving under age drinking under the Licensing Act 1964, 1995-2005, England & Wales<sup>12</sup>**

	Persons under 18 buying intoxicating liquor (a)			Selling intoxicating liquor to persons under 18(b)		
	Found guilty	Cautioned	Found guilty or cautioned	Found guilty	Cautioned	Found guilty or cautioned
1995	15	336	351	108	161	269
1996	19	336	355	119	178	297
1997	24	252	276	125	171	296
1998	24	143	167	157	76	233
1999	21	94	115	115	69	184
2000	21	80	101	56	53	109
2001	14	47	61	53	48	101
2002	9	24	33	103	59	162
2003	22	31	53	416	63	479
2004	12	38	50	590	101	691
2005	15	21	36	744	97	841

(a) Section 169(2) Licensing Act 1964

(b) Section 169(1) Licensing Act 1964

**Studies of People Arrested By Police**

Surveys<sup>13</sup> carried out for the Home Office in six English cities in 1996 and 1999 found varying but significant proportions of arrestees tested positive for alcohol for a range of offences:-

**1996**

- aggravated bodily harm/grievous bodily harm 32%
- robbery 32%
- burglary 24%
- joyriding 36%
- criminal damage 46%
- breach of the peace 75%

**1999**

- assault 32%
- robbery 75%
- criminal damage 29%
- breach of the peace 61%
- theft of/taking vehicle 30%

A high proportion of arrestees also tested positive for other drugs.

The 2000 British Crime Survey (BCS)<sup>15</sup> a large-scale survey asking people about their experience of victimisation, found that in 40% of all violent incidents the victim described the assailant as being under the influence of alcohol at the time of the assault. In relation to the different kinds or locations of violent offences, the proportions of assailants described as under the influence were:

Domestic Violence	44%
Mugging	17%
Stranger Violence	53%
Aquaintance Violence	36%
<b>All Violence</b>	<b>40</b>

Data for the 2001/2002 BCS show victims believed offenders to be under the influence of alcohol in almost half (47%) of violent incidents and under the influence of other drugs in 21% of cases.

**Whether offender/s under the influence of drink or drugs in violent incidents**

Percentages					BCS
	All violence	Domestic	Mugging	Stranger	Acquaintance
<b>Under influence of drink</b>					
<b>Yes</b>	47	45	19	58	51
<b>No</b>	44	49	62	31	43
<b>Don't know</b>	9	5	18	10	6
<b>Under influence of drugs</b>					
<b>Yes</b>	21	17	14	20	27
<b>NO</b>	56	74	55	42	58
<b>Don't know</b>	23	9	31	38	15

1 Source 2001/2002 BCS interviews

2 Not asked if offender identified as under school age. There was one incident of stranger violence where the offender was said to be under school age.

## Anti-Social Behaviour and Disorder

The terms 'anti-social behaviour' and 'disorder' are often used inter-changeably. The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 defined anti-social behaviour as acting 'in a manner that caused or was likely to cause harassment, alarm or distress'.

On 10 September 2003 a census of anti-social behaviour in England and Wales was carried out, police, local authorities and other agencies being instructed to count the number of anti-social incidents occurring over a 24 hour period.

<b>One day count of anti-social behaviour<sup>16</sup></b>			
<b>10 September 2003</b>		<b>Estimated costs to agencies</b>	
	<b>Reports</b>	<b>Per day (£ 000s)</b>	<b>Per year £</b>
Litter/rubbish	10,686	1,866	466 million
Criminal damage/vandalism	7,855	2,667	667 million
Vehicle-related nuisance	7,782	1,361	340 million
Nuisance behaviour	7,660	1,420	355 million
Intimidation/harassment	5,415	1,983	496 million
Noise	5,374	994	249 million
Rowdy behaviour	5,339	665	249 million
Abandoned vehicles	4,994	360	90 million
Street drinking and begging	3,239	504	126 million
Drug misuse and dealing	2,920	527	132 million
Animal-related problems	2,546	458	114 million
Hoax calls	1,286	198	49 million
Prostitution, kerb-crawling, sexual acts	1,011	167	49 million
<b>Total</b>	<b>66,107</b>	<b>13,500</b>	<b>3,375 billion</b>

Over the year, these figures translate into 16 million such offences, costing an estimated £3.5 billion

According to the 2008/09 British Crime Survey, 26 per cent of people thought that people being drunk or rowdy in public places was a very big or fairly big problem in their area. There was no significant change compared with 2007/08.

Of those people who thought drunk/rowdy behaviour was a problem, Varying percentages identified specific causes for complaint:

**Nature of behaviours experienced by those who perceive people being drunk or rowdy to be a problem in their local area<sup>17</sup>**

<b>Type of behaviour experienced</b>	<b>%</b>
Noise from people in the streets when they have been drinking	76
Cans and bottles left on the streets or thrown into gardens	69
Young people drinking in local streets/parks and other public places	57
People being abusive when they have been drinking	56
Fast-food wrapping left on the streets or thrown into gardens	55
People being intimidating when they have been drinking	49
Fighting within or between groups	37
People urinating in public places	37
Being kept awake by drunken and rowdy behaviour	36
Vomit on the pavements	34
Violence/people being assaulted by drunks	23
Drink-related theft or vandalism	22
Homeless people and alcoholics drinking in local streets/parks and public places	16
Drunk people begging	9
Other behaviour	1
Nothing in particular	2

Unweighted base 2,535

(Based on adults who perceived fairly or very big problem in their local area with people being drunk or rowdy in public places. Figures add to more than 100 as more than one response possible)

The proportions of acts of vandalism etc. that are alcohol-related in the 'under-the-influence' sense are unknown. However, because anti-social behaviour or its effects are often conspicuous around licensed premises, particularly where there are concentrations of them, what little information there is available is of interest.

For England and Wales, respondents to the BCS are asked about types of disorder that they see as being 'very' or 'fairly' big problems locally:

### Anti-social behaviour indicators, 2004 to 2006 BCS<sup>18</sup>

<i>Percentage saying very/fairly big problem in their area</i>	BCS		
	Interviews in Oct 2004 to Sept 2005	Interviews in Oct 2005 to Sept 2006	Statistically significant change <sup>(1)</sup>
High level of perceived anti-social behaviour <sup>(2)</sup>	17	18	
Abandoned or burnt-out cars	11	9	**↓
Noisy neighbours or loud parties	9	10	**↑
People being drunk or rowdy in public places	23	25	**↑
People using or dealing drugs	26	28	**↑
Teenagers hanging around on the streets	31	33	**↑
Rubbish or litter lying around	30	31	
Vandalism, graffiti and other deliberate damage to property	29	29	

1. Statistical significance of changes is indicated by a single asterisk for significance at the 10% level, or a double asterisk at the 5% level (two tail tests). See Notes for an explanation of statistical significance.

2. This measure is derived from responses to the seven individual anti-social behaviour strands reported in the table. In bulletins prior to the April 2003 to March 2004 report, the overall anti-social behaviour measure was derived from five strands: teenagers hanging around on the streets; vandalism, graffiti and other deliberate damage to property; people being attacked/harassed because of their race/colour; people using or dealing drugs; and people being drunk or rowdy in public places.

The National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal, produced by the Social Exclusion Unit, stated that successfully measuring anti-social behaviour is hampered by under-reporting. Many visitors do not report incidents to the police with vandalism being one of the least likely offences to be reported. Reasons for non-reporting include fear of recriminations, believing the incident to be too trivial to report and lack of confidence in the authorities.

The report also states that there appears generally to be an upward trend in anti-social behaviour in recent years.

**Institute of Alcohol Studies  
25 November 2009**

### References

- <sup>1</sup> Crime reduction Toolkits: Alcohol Related Crime <http://www.crimereduction.gov.uk/toolkits/ar00.htm>
- <sup>2</sup> Marsh P, Fox Kibby K: Drinking and Public Disorder. Pub. The Portman Group, 1992
- <sup>3</sup> Summer M, Parker H: Low in Alcohol. Commissioned by The Portman Group, 1995
- <sup>4</sup> Deehan and Saville, Crime and Disorder Partnerships: Alcohol-Related Crime and Disorder in Audit and Strategy Documents. Home Office Briefing Note, November 2000
- <sup>5</sup> Hadfield P: Application for Variation of the Public Entertainment Licence in Respect of Bar Soho, 23-25 Old Compton Street, London W1. Summary of Area Case Study/Site Visit
- <sup>6</sup> Bath and North East Somerset Crime and Disorder Audit
- <sup>7</sup> Independently and Objectively Assessing the Need for a Cumulative Impact Policy for Richmond and Twickenham, Erskine Corporation, May 2005

---

<sup>8</sup> Warburton AL, Shepherd JP, An evaluation of the effectiveness of new policies designed to prevent and manage violence through an interagency approach. A final report for WORD (Grant number R/98/037), February 2004

<sup>9</sup> Hazel Blears in answer to PQ [212059] from Don Foster, Hansard 8 February 2005

<sup>10</sup> Prof. JP Shepherd, Alcohol, Physical Assault and Injury, and Practical Measures to Prevent Them, a presentation given at the Royal College of Physicians/British Society of Gastroenterology conference, Alcohol related Harm – A Growing Crisis, Time for Action, 26 January 2005

<sup>11</sup> Deehan A et al: Drunks and Disorder: processing intoxicated arrestees in two city-centre custody suites. Police Research Series. Paper 150, Home Office 2002

<sup>12</sup> Home Office Statistical Bulletin 19/06 – Criminal Statistics 2005 – England & Wales, published November 2006

<sup>13</sup> British Beer & Pub Association Statistical Handbook 2006

<sup>14</sup> Alcohol Harm Reduction Strategy. Cabinet Office Strategy Unit. Strategy for England 2004

<sup>15</sup> The British Crime Survey 2000

<sup>16</sup> The Anti-social Behaviour Unit of the Home Office, One day count of anti-social behaviour in England and Wales, 10 September 2003

<sup>17</sup> British Crime Survey 2008/9 – Home Office

<sup>18</sup> Crime in England & Wales – Quarterly Update to September 2006: Home Office Statistical Bulletin, 25 January 2007