VANDALISM IN LAUNCESTON

Romy Winter
Ron Frey
Ron Mason
Kaylene Bentley

SUMMARY REPORT

2022

Tasmanian Institute of Law Enforcement Studies (TILES) is committed to excellence in law enforcement research. Collaborative research that links academics with practitioners is a hallmark of that research. The Institute focuses on four strategic priorities namely research, teaching, communication, and professionalism.

TILES Vision | To achieve an international reputation for excellence in law enforcement research.

TILES Mission | To conduct and promote evidence-based research to improve the quality of law enforcement and enhance community safety.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COUNTRY

We acknowledge, with deep respect, the traditional owners of the lands on which we work and live.

The Tasmanian Institute of Law Enforcement Studies is sited on *lutruwita* (Tasmania) Aboriginal land, sea and waterways, and our scholars work across the lands of the *muwinina* people of *nipaluna* (Hobart), and the *palawa* peoples of *palanwina lurini kanamaluka* (Launceston) and *pataway* (Cradle Coast).

The muwinina and palawa peoples belong to the oldest continuing cultures in the world. They cared and protected Country for thousands of years. They knew this land, they lived on the land and they died on these lands.

We honour them.

We acknowledge that it is a privilege to stand on Country and walk in the footsteps of those before us. Beneath the mountains, along the river banks, among the gums and waterways that continue to run through the veins of the Tasmanian Aboriginal community.

We pay our respects to elders past and present and to the many Aboriginal people that did not make elder status and to the Tasmanian Aboriginal community that continue to care for Country.

We recognise a history of truth which acknowledges the impacts of invasion and colonisation upon Aboriginal people resulting in the forcible removal from their lands.

Our Island is deeply unique, with spectacular landscapes with our cities and towns surrounded by bushland, wilderness, mountain ranges and beaches.

We stand for a future that profoundly respects and acknowledges Aboriginal perspectives, culture, language and history. And a continued effort to fight for Aboriginal justice and rights paving the way for a strong future.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BACKGROUND

Policy makers and researchers describe vandalism as a 'wicked' problem, meaning a social problem which seems to be resistant to solutions. Some other examples of this type of problem might be family violence and climate change. In this report, researchers from the Tasmanian Institute of Law Enforcement Studies have responded to the City of Launceston's interest in curbing vandalism, with a focus on seven suburbs in the broader local government area.

The purpose of this report is to better understand the prevalence of vandalism; to better understand the theoretical approaches to vandalism and to explore potential strategies for responding to vandalism. A multi-method approach was adopted which included a quantitative analysis of data provided by Tasmania Police and Council; a wide-ranging literature review; and a collation of interventions for vandalism, mostly at the local government level.

UNDERSTANDING THE PREVALENCE OF VANDALISM

The objectives of this section were to better understand the prevalence of vandalism, including:

a. Identified hot-spots in the Northern Suburbs;

b. Rates of incidences per type of vandalism;

c. Perpetrators of the different types of vandalism;

d. Consequences of acts of vandalism to the perpetrator, if they are apprehended; and

e. Apprehension rates for perpetrators.

The data provided by both Tasmania Police the City of Launceston proved problematic for the purpose of answering the evaluation questions. Both datasets were created for purposes other than understanding the prevalence and patterns of vandalism. Council data was sourced from records designed for allocating workloads and missing the Inclusion of clear categories which would enable analysis of sites, targets, suburbs or significance of damage. Police data lacked the level of detail that might assist in understanding hotspots, perpetrators and motives. We found that different types of vandalism were reported to police and Council. In general, people tended to report vandalism of private property to police, and of public property to Council.

Police data

Data for this report was sourced from the Police Offence Reporting System #2 which spanned the period July 2016 to end of June 2021. The dataset comprised 1600 reports covering the areas of Ravenswood, Invermay, Newnham, Newnham and Mowbray. There was no police data provided relating to the suburban locations of Rocherlea, Waverley or St Leonards. There was no street or block level data to enable identification of hotspots. There appears to be very little graffiti reported to police in the suburban areas of interest (2.3% of dataset) The damage reported to police largely related to damage to private property (83%) and arson (10.5%). In this respect our findings echo the work of Abernethy in 2002.

Analysis of trends over the data period shows that property offences increased between 2016 and 2021, while arson decreased. Ravenswood (27.4%) and Invermay (23.6%) recorded the highest

number of property offences. Arson was more prevalent in Mayfield and Ravenswood overall, but all suburbs showed decreases in incidence of arson over the years. While there is a bit of fluctuation in offence types between suburbs over the years these rates were not significant. This is related to sample size. Frequently the number of incidents was too low or there was a large difference in sample sizes between suburbs.

A large proportion of offences reported to police related to residential properties, either a house, unit or associated outbuildings. There was no indication in the dataset of the type of damage (unless categorised as arson), the severity of the damage or likely cost of reparation.

With respect to understanding the perpetrators of vandalism, two-thirds of offences reported to the police remain uncleared as at November 2021, with offender(s) unknown. Where data Is available, in three quarters of cases the offender is male and younger males account for a large *number* of offences (18–34-year-olds account for over half of all property offences). While the literature tends to focus on adolescents as the main offenders in cases of vandalism, the police data provided suggests that it is older age groups that commit offences against residences[1], while younger people are over represented in relation to offences against educational facilities. However, sizeable proportions of all ages have committed offences against residences. The literature also discusses the propensity for vandalism to be perpetrated by multiple offenders; our data, however we found only 24 reports (where offender identified) involved multiples. This represented less than five per cent of the dataset.

Data was provided for the time of day that the Incident was reported. It appears that the younger age group (10-14, 15-17) are more active between 4 and 8pm while the 18–24-year age group appeared to be active at most times. In so far as the midnight hours are concerned the 18–34-year age group were the most active.

A large proportion of resolved incidents resulted in court cases (very little diversion or community conferencing). A large percentage of cases remain not resolved (more than 1000) which has impacted on provision of detailed analysis of age and gender of offenders.

Detailed tables relating to these summary points are provided in the main report.

---

[1] The authors have significant experience in family violence research. We note these offences against property by young adult males are indicative of intimidation tactics commonly used by family violence offenders as a recognised pattern of abuse towards current and former partners. As such, we suggest the categorisation of vandalism/property damage for these offences in a residential setting may be too narrow.

Council data

Data provided by council represented records of 808 instances of damage reported between June 2014 and September 2021. The analysis of this data found that the majority of reports to council related to property damage or graffiti to target areas in the city (CBD and city parks) or northern suburbs - accounting for two thirds of all reports logged.

	City	North		East	South	West	Unknown	Total	
	Count	Count		Count	Count	Count	Count	Count	%
CBD	253	0		0	0	0	0	253	31.3%
Invermay	0	73		0	0	0	0	73	9.0%
Royal Park	37	0		0	0	0	0	37	4.6%
Ravenswood	0	30		0	0	0	0	30	3.7%
Newnham	0	24		0	0	0	0	24	3.0%
Mowbray	0	21		0	0	0	0	21	2.6%
Unknown	0	0		0	0	0	20	20	2.5%
Mayfield	0	18		0	0	0	0	18	2.2%
Waverley	0	0		18	0	0	0	18	2.2%
Rocherlea	0	15		0	0	0	0	15	1.9%
St Leonards	0	0		13	0	0	0	13	1.6%
Brickfields Park	4	0		0	0	0	0	4	0.5%
Total- all areas	306	209		65	117	88	20	808	100.0%
%	38%	26%		8%	14%	11%	2%	100%	

Reports for the city area increased significantly over the period of review followed by the northern suburbs which remained steady at around 30% of all reports.

Infrastructure[2] (25%) toilets (18%) and walls (16%) were the most frequent targets for vandalism. In ten percent of data on the targets, the description was insufficent to determine what was damaged. The most frequently damaged type of infrastructure was signage (21%), followed by signal cabinets (15%) and bridges (10%). The location of many of the walls being vandalised Is concentrated around the river, with the majority being levee walls as a target of graffiti.

Graffiti and a general category of 'damage/vandalism' were the most frequently reported to Council, accounting for 81% of all reports and there was an increase in these reports over the period of review. There were small numbers of reports of rubbish dumping, fire damage, theft of public property and damage caused by vehicles (most often to parks and nature strips). Reports on damage to buildings decreased over the period of review, while damage to infrastructure increased, with reports for vandalised walls remaining fairly steady between 2014 and 2021. Costs

---

[2] Bridges, roads, footpaths, jetties, fountains, light poles, signage, seating, steps, underpasses, signal cabinets, waste centres

associated with damage/ vandalism remained steady over the data period, while costs for cleaning up graffiti increased. However, costs in recent years were lower than costs reported in 2014. Highest costs were associated with damage/vandalism to bins followed by infrastructure, buildings and toilets. The costs of dealing with graffiti was highest on infrastructure, buildings and toilets but costs were not as high as for damage/vandalism.

Detailed tables relating to these summary points are provided in the main report. We do not have any data which allows us to comment on who the offenders are in the cases of reports to council as there is no reliable way to link those reports with police data, which also lacks details of offenders in two-thirds of reported offences.

UNDERSTANDING THE DRIVERS OF VANDALISM

The objectives of this section were to better understand evidence-based theories of vandalism, particularly in relation to:

   a. Why people vandalise property;

   b. Why some areas are more likely to have increased rates of vandalism; and

   c. Potential areas of intervention to decrease vandalism rates.

A variety of social science literature was accessed which involved relationships of vandalism to, largely adolescent, criminal behaviour; including vandal motivation; life course theories; social equity theories; and attachment theories of boys and groups of boys. We could also describe this literature as fragmented. Much writing on the drivers and enablers of vandalism remains reliant on theoretical discourses that are quite mature; with the foundational work of researchers such as Cohen (1971, 1973), and Matza (1964) retaining currency. This underscores the notion of vandalism being a wicked and resistant problem and needs to be approached through a lens of complexity.

The literature on vandalism does not present a cohesive body of information. Much of the literature focuses on only one type of vandalism and does not appear to have broader applicability, such as graffiti (Assaf-Zakharov & Schnetgoeke, 2021; Dean, 2016), the desecration of public monuments as political actions (Durdiyeva, 2020; Lai, 2019), specific hate crimes (Morewitz, 2019), the damage of public accessories such as picnic tables (Samdahl & Christensen, 1985), street trees (Richardson & Shackleton, 2014) or the use of 'tagging' as a means of communication by gang members (O'Deane 2018; Stodolska, Berdychevsky & Shinew, 2019). There is a significant focus on the personal characteristics of the vandal in the psychology literature, and social conditions which accompany vandalism and other anti-social behaviour in the sociology and criminology literature. It is acknowledged widely that vandalism cannot be addressed as a simple issue as there are many drivers and enablers.

Necessary Preconditions

Our main observation of the drivers of vandalism in this report is that each of the different types of vandalism has a set of necessary pre-conditions, which individually are insufficient to cause acts of vandalism. Collectively, the pre-conditions lead to the commission of the specific type of vandalism. What makes vandalism a complex and enduring social problem is that each of the

necessary conditions calls for an independent response, and even if each of these necessary conditions are addressed successfully, they are unlikely to eliminate all categories of vandalism, because some types will have a different set of necessary conditions. A necessary condition, is defined here as a condition without which an act of vandalism cannot occur, but without the presence of other necessary conditions, is unlikely to lead in itself to an act of vandalism.

Necessary condition One: A suitable target

The existence of an inviting target of vandalism is one of the necessary conditions for vandalism (e.g., an abandoned building, or an under-utilised and isolated toilet block), but it is not a sufficient condition in and of itself – many toilet blocks and deserted buildings do not become vandalised. Bates (2014) argued that vandalism is best understood 'as a crime of place, not property'. In other words, environmental and social conditions signal to potential vandals that this target, and not some other target, would be the best to vandalise. The target of vandalism plays a necessary but insufficient role in each act of vandalism. Targets can be chosen for a number of reasons, each of which must be considered when contemplating interventions such as making the target more resistant to vandal activities. These can include:

- The symbolic meaning of the target (public buildings, monuments, schools)
- The repair and condition of the target (does it suggest that no one really cares whether this target is vandalised, or further vandalised, or not?)
- The 'aesthetics' of the target (for example, the way windows shatter in unexpected and attention-grabbing ways).

Necessary condition Two: Motivation for vandalism

In addition to a target, there is a necessary condition of persons with motivations to cause damage before an actual act of vandalism occurs. Stanley Cohen, writing in the 1970s, suggested motivation can be summarised into six main categories:

1. Acquisitive. An example is vandalising a vending machine for cash, stripping copper piping for resale or general looting.

2. Tactical. An example might be vandalising forestry machinery in an environmental protest.
3. Ideological. An example might be political or hate speech graffiti.
4. Vindictive or hate-based. This overlaps somewhat with ideological vandalism. A good example might be vandalising a mosque or premises owned by LGBTIQ persons.

5. Play, also called flow or fusion vandalism. In this category the vandal believes they improving the aesthetics by their graffiti or receive gratification from responding to the challenge of avoiding detection or opportunity to display a skill.
6. Malicious. This is when vandalism is performed as an expression of rage or frustration. A recent example is the arson at Old Parliament House in Canberra by anti-vaxxers and right-wing extremists in a hijacking of a smoking ceremony being performed by the Aboriginal tent embassy.

Subsequent writing on motivations follows similar categorisation e.g., Coffield (1991) has four categories to describe vandalism amongst adolescents: financial gain, group or peer pressure, pleasure and excitement.

There is a further literature in the field of developmental criminology which looks at vandalism as a 'coming of age' transitional behaviour of adolescents. Some will go on to commit additional crimes to the level of becoming career criminals and others will desist as they mature.

Further motivation can be explained by social inequity theory where vandalism is considered to be more likely to occur in situations where a person sees a systemic lack of opportunities ('unfairness') coupled with a lack of ability to adjust this imbalance. The goal of vandalism is equity restoration. 'The vandal attempts to restore equity by responding to one type of perceived rule-breaking (i.e., perceived violations of norms of fairness in social environmental arrangements) by breaking another set of rules regarding the sanctity of property rights' (DeMore, Fisher & Baron, 1988).

> 'Criminality is actually a very rational activity for many people excluded from the good things in life and invariably alienated from a society that spawns such inequality' (Long & Hopkins-Burke, 2015, p. 109).

Necessary condition Three: Male peer groups

There is strong evidence that vandalism is a gendered crime, mostly committed by males, singly or in groups. The presence of male peer groups in a community is neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition for vandalism to occur. Nevertheless, it is often observed that acts of vandalism are associated with adolescent male peer groups. These groups may or may not be formally constituted as 'gangs' in the American sense of the term), but could be friendship and peer groups which are relatively cohesive over time. The literature (but interestingly not the police data which we obtained) suggests that both types of vandalism offenders, the adolescent-limited and the longer-term and more diverse offenders are more likely to commit vandalism offences in groups of other males (sometimes mixed gender groups).

There is a large collection of literature which discusses these groups in terms of adolescent-limited vandalism. It is sometimes also suggested that background factors and life-course pathways are similar between genders in all patterns of vandalism when it occurs, even if far fewer young females follow the same life-course pattern as do males. Scandinavian research also suggests girls who commit vandalism as part of a criminal pathways' life course are more likely to display more serious conduct problems overall than a matched group of boys (Storvoll, Wichstrom & Pepe, 2002). We can also observe that males in Anglo cultures have greater cultural permission to use violence to achieve instrumental and psychological ends than females. There is also the suggestion that male children have more freedom from supervision and thus more opportunity for criminal activity.

There is on-going discussion in the literature about the possibility that boys' neurodevelopment may be more sensitive to environmental insults such as experienced in living in situations of social deprivation than girls (Smallbone, 2006; Schore, 2019). Some of the social equity research suggests that males have a keener sense of inequity than females, whilst simultaneously feeling less able to change their situation than females (DeMore, Fisher & Baron, 1988), which could lead to greater levels of frustration at their social conditions. When experience of concrete disadvantage combines with unrealistic cultural expectations of what it means to be a successful male, this can create a heightened sense of anger and frustration, amplified even beyond what might be expected from growing in communities and situations of disadvantage.

In summary, through being abused, and witnessing the abuse of others at home, living in dangerous neighbourhoods and attending unsafe and under-funded schools, there is a group of children in our community who are consistently being given the message that they matter to no one. Boys at the same time receive a contradictory message that they are entitled to goods and resources their environment appears to withhold and are also entitled to compel the attention of those around them if these are not forthcoming. Underpinning these assumptions is a complex physiology of both gender and trauma which is still unclear and still controversial.

Discussion has focused on why males commit these acts in groups and the following speculations emerge:

1. Improvement in the status of one person with the group by demonstrating daring and in some instances, skill. Failure to engage in vandalism can lead to a loss of status and perhaps even shame over one's masculine gender identity.
2. Gang members are often directed to commit acts of vandalism and other criminal acts, and can sometimes achieve some status without having to commit more overt criminal acts, such as acts of interpersonal violence (Stodolska et al, 2019).

3. the anonymity of the group releases members from constraints of behaviour. Fisher & Baron, (1982, p. 194) suggest that 'the influence of a group on a potential vandal's actions become progressively more important as we move towards the more expressive extreme types of vandalism (e.g., acts of the "malicious" variety).

4. Violence may be the group norm where 'to destroy is normative behaviour, and to restrain oneself is deviant.' (Fisher & Baron, 1982, p. 194).

5. Role of alcohol consumption in male adolescent socialising seems to play a contributing role to many acts of vandalism.

6. Social mimicry of life course persistent vandals in the group's environment and who seem to successfully obtain important goals & rewards (either because they dropped out of school and are now earning money through work or illegal activities).

Attachment and vandalism

We suggest a further model, which focuses on the quality of a young person's attachments to their family and community, and the neurological and developmental impacts when these attachments are destroyed by external events, including the degradation of the larger community. We extend the trope of attachment to immediate caregivers to the communities and environments where a person lives (Szalavitz & Perry, 2010). When these connections are not encouraged, or when they are undermined or destroyed, people have less commitment to maintain the quality of the area in which they live.

This approach re-interprets aspects of the 'broken windows' theory as well as the social inequity models. It also can incorporate what is known about the developmental pathways which form persistent criminal offenders such as childhood abuse and neglect, and family violence, not only impact on current and future family relationships, as is already well known, but on relationships to the wider community as well. Adverse childhood events have a negative impact on all an individual's potential attachments. Without consistent demonstration that people care about them, children grow up not to care about other people and particularly not about concepts as remote from their lives as the general community and civil society. 'In effect, vandalism says, "If I don't get any respect, I won't give you any either."' (Fisher & Baron 1982, p. 186)

Our alternate understanding of the 'broken windows theory' from an attachment perspective is that vandalism attacks and devalues people's attachments to their communities and failure to respond swiftly to vandalism indicates a civic devaluation of a neighbourhood community and its residents, giving them the message that people from their area are not worth protecting and are undeserving of a safe and clean environment. Due to what is sometimes called 'postcode' shame

(certainly readily observable across Tasmania), residents themselves come to adopt a similar view of the worthiness or otherwise of their communities.

In order to adopt a preventive approach which engages young people who are at risk of turning to vandalism we suggest the following has potential to drive long term change:

- Encourage young people to have a sense of ownership of and pride in their community, particularly its public spaces
- Encourage young people to feel they are making a valued contribution to their community, and have a stake in its future
- Address the level of boredom amongst the youth of the community.
- Provide activities which allow for a legal release of adrenaline and promote a sense of 'flow' (Csikszentmihalyi, 1992)
- It has been repeatedly stated in the literature, that one of the best approaches to crime is early intervention with children at risk (Basto-Pereira & Farrington, 2020; National Crime Prevention, 1999). As Weatherburn & Grabosky, 1999 predicted (p. 84), 'A 10 per cent reduction in the level of child neglect in New South Wales would reduce the level of juvenile participation in crime by 5 per cent.'

For young people who are already committing vandalism

- Consider programs of restorative justice
- There is a particular need to re-connect a practicing vandal with his neighbourhood and community.

Although this analysis complicates the management of vandalism considerably, it also suggests that a variety of interventions of varying ranges of social and fiscal investment, are likely to have some impact on the rates of vandalism in a community, and taking disparate measures targeting a range of necessary conditions together is likely to have a very significant impact. However, we argue that vandalism is not something that is intrinsic to the adolescent but a sign of community failure to include sections of the community in meaningful ways. Our community ethos is private property based and those who do not share ownership are angry and marginalised. Many vandals lash out because they feel excluded from the success that is normalised in popular culture. However, public property vandalism is also a part of the private property ethos because the vandal sees the property of belonging to no-one rather than a community resource or asset. As an illustration, much of the vandalism described in our data does not relate to textbook vandals (youths) as we find behaviours such as rubbish dumping in reserves, vehicle damage to nature strips, bollards, gates etc. and much of the arson and damage to property reported to the police

(where the offender is known) was found to be committed by young and early-middle-aged adults.

STRATEGIES FOR DEALING WITH VANDALISM

This component of the research project aimed to better understand potential strategies or programs to decrease vandalism, including:

a. Case studies for other comparable regions, including a range of different response types (punitive through to empowerment approaches); and

b. Lessons learned - what worked, what didn't and why?

In the full report, we present over 60 case studies which provide examples of dealing with vandalism in small cities, most examples chosen because they have some similarity to Launceston in terms of population size, rurality, economic profile etc. Many relate to creative ways to handle graffiti and damage to public property. There are several exciting examples of community involvement and also those that involve partnerships between councils, police and the community. For example, we commend the strategies employed by Kamloops, a small rural city in Canada that shares many characteristics with Launceston and has a good suite of interventions.

We have categorised the case studies as addressing a variety of drivers and enablers of vandalism, as suggested by the literature review of drivers of vandalism, being initiatives and strategies that address:

- Individual motivations
- Behavioural adjustment strategies
- Education
- Fear of detection
- Creating physical barriers and deterrents.
- Social drivers of vandalism
- Economic drivers
- Community programs to address vandalism, and
- Cross agency partnerships.

The case studies include interventions for management of graffiti, including several examples of graffiti management plans. There are technological interventions ranging from CCTV to the provision of easy-to-use reporting applications via council websites and electronically locked access zones. There are examples of community events like street art festivals and clean up days

and examples of mobilising communities via volunteers. There are examples of revamped Neighbourhood Watch programs and engaging families in community action. There are also case studies around the management of vandalism of parks and recreational areas. Examples of partnerships between councils, police, community members and local organisations have also been included.

Bearing in mind that successful initiatives to thwart vandalism involve more than a single dimension of intervention and many examples provided use multiple tactics. These can include:

- Use of physical discouragers such as surveillance cameras, fencing vulnerable properties, creating graffiti resistant surfaces
- Identification of needs vandals meet through vandalism which may be met in other ways (such as the creation of spaces for public displays of graffiti artists)
- Repair and repaint immediately. Factor in damage repair into civic budgets as part of creating and maintaining a safe and happy community.
- Give the community the message that its members are valued through the development of civic pride and community connections which include all community members, adults and young people

Some of the options described involve investment in technology but the best examples also involve community action.

Our overarching conclusion is that a collective impact style of intervention is most likely to achieve significant inroads into the complex drivers of vandalism. Collective Impact has proven to be more effective than situations where agencies address similar issues without collaboration or co-ordination, leading to the availability of only limited resources and knowledge, duplication in services, gaps in service delivery and competition for scarce resources (Centre for Community Child Health, 2018). This is true for approaches to vandalism where often multiple agencies and services, such as councils, schools and police, deal with similar problems caused by often the same group of vandals but fail to collaborate towards solutions.

There Is no blueprint for a CI intervention, however the following elements are considered to be best practice in establishing a CI approach:

- Centralised infrastructure; independent staff dedicated to the coordination of the work (often referred to a 'backbone organisation', and takes the responsibility for the direction, data collection, and communication within the CI project).
- Setting a common agenda

- A shared system of measurement. in the case of addressing vandalism in Launceston, existing data collection has proved problematic, so a new data collection strategy will need to be devised, Including measurement tools, data protocols and ownership.
- Continuous communication which creates rapid learning and a developmental evaluation in which goals and strategies are revised continuously.
- Mutually reinforcing activities, preferably long-term, across different sectors, which target a specific social problem or problems, and which engage actors beyond the any specific sector (government, NGO, etc).

The strategies of the City of Kamloops in rural Canada provided in the case study collection are based on a collective impact model. Also worthy of consideration is the model used by the community of Clarence Plains in southern Tasmania. Collective Impact programs are not always easily developed and much of the literature on collective impact contains cautionary tales (Dolamore & Kline, 2020; Ennis & Tofa, 2020; LeChasseur, 2018; Mayan et al, 2019; O'Neill, 2020; Sagrestano & Finerman, 2018). However, for a reasonably narrowly targeted program which already enjoys community support and community 'buy in', such as addressing instances of vandalism in the northern suburbs of Launceston, where the council is in an ideal position to form a stakeholders' group and continue its consultations with the community, CI has the potential to prove a very effective solution (or set of solutions).

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Approach the problem with multiple strategies, focused both on the potential vandal and the target environment.

2. View anti-vandalism as a long-term strategy which involves improving the quality of living for neighbourhoods and communities susceptible to vandals, and giving clear messages to these communities and neighbourhoods that they hold value to the larger Launceston community.

3. Ally with as many stakeholders as possible, including schools, police, neighbourhood groups.

4. Develop strategies which are sustainable at the council level, and not dependent on the energy and time of any one person.

5. Expect that vandalism will require a regular commitment of funding both in terms of repairs and in terms of anti-vandalism measures and programs.

6. Develop a wide range of measures for success and expect that change will take time.

7. Develop a community sense of shared public assets such as bus shelters, parks, etc as a challenge to the attitude that because these are not private property, they belong to no one.

8. Have a system of clear penalties for vandalism, and make these known throughout the community.

9. Demonstrate the value of a community by repairing and restoring vandalised areas as quickly as possible.

10. Where possible, involve vandals in opportunities to repair damage, restore property and otherwise contribute to the beautification of the community.

11. Consider and implement ways of re-connecting marginalised young people to their communities.

12. Consider ways of encouraging use of public spaces to that they become sources of community responsibility and pride and also ensure the natural surveillance of public spaces provided when people use them regularly.

REFERENCES

Assaf-Zakharov, K. & Schentgoeke, T. (2021) Reading the illegible: Can law understand graffiti? *Connecticut Law Review, 53* (1), 117-153)

Bates, E. (2014) Vandalism: a crime of place? Dissertation, University of Edinburgh, 2014.

Basto-Pereira & Farrington, D. (2020) Lifelong conviction pathways and self-reported offending towards a deeper comprehension of criminal career development. *British Journal of Criminology, 60*, 285-302.

Centre for Community Child Health (2018) Place-based collective impact: an Australian response to childhood vulnerability. Policy Briefing Number 30. Murdoch Children's Research Institute/The Royal Children's Hospital, Parkville, Victoria. https://doi.org./10.25374/MCRI.6444395

Coffield, F. (1991) *Vandalism and Graffiti: The state of the art.* London, Calouste Gubbenkian Foundation.

Cohen, S. (1971) Direction for research on adolescent school violence and vandalism. *British Journal of Criminology, 9*, 319-349.

Cohen, S. (1973) Property destruction: Motive and meanings. In C. Ward, Ed. *Vandalism.* London, The Architectural Press.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1992) *Flow: The psychology of happiness.* Sydney, Rider.

Dean, N. (2016) Grey matter and graffiti: what graffiti says about us. *BrainWorld Magazine*, Summer, 2016 (19-21)

DeMore, S., Fisher, J. & Baron, R. (1988) The equity-control model as a predictor of vandalism among college students. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 18*, 80-91. Reprinted in A. Goldstein (1996) The Psychology of Vandalism (171-181)**.** New York, Plenum Press.

Dolamore, S. & Kline, A. (2020) Strengthening community-based health and human services in the shadow of structural inequality: A critical case study of the collective impact model. *Journal of Health and Human Services Administration, 43* (2), 196-217

Durdiyeva, S. (2021) Memory production, vandalism violence: Civil society and lessons from a short life of a monument to Stalin. *Constellations, 28*, 207-220.

Ennis, G. & Matalena, T. (2020) Collective impact: a review of the peer-reviewed research. *Australian Social Work, 73* (1), 32-47.

Fisher, J. & Baron, R. (1982) An equity-based model of vandalism. *Population and Environment, 5*(3), 182-200.

Lai, T. (2020) Political vandalism as counter-speech: A defense of defacing and destroying tainted monuments. *European Journal of Philosophy, 28*, 602-616.

LeChasseur, K. (2018) Re-examining power and privilege in collective impact. In N. Walzer, L. Weaver, & C. McGuire, Eds. *Collective Impact and Community Development Issues* (70-85). Routledge.

Long, M. & Hopkins-Burke, R. (2015) *Vandalism and Antisocial Behaviour.* Palgrave Macmillan.

Matza, D. (1964) *Delinquency and Drift.* New York, Wiley.

Mayan, M., Pauchuto, A., Gillespie, D., Misita, D. & Mejia, T. (2019) The promise of collective impact partnerships. *Community Development Journal, 55* (3), 515-532.

Morewitz, S. (2019) Cemetery damage and vandalism. In S. Morewitz, *Clinical and Psychological Perspectives on Foul Play* (249-265). Springer

National Crime Prevention (1999*) Pathways to Prevention: Developmental and early intervention approaches to crime in Australia*. Canberra, National Crime Prevention, Attorney-General's Department.

O'Deane, M. (2018) Vandalism. In Birsor, M. & Robertson, C., Eds. *Introduction to Criminal Investigation* (127-153). Routledge.

O'Neill, M. (2020) Increasing community engagement in collective impact approaches to advance social change. *Community Development 51* (1), 17-35.

Richardson, E. & Shackleton, C. (2014) The extent and perceptions of vandalism as a cause of street tree damage in small towns in the Eastern Cape, South Africa. ScienceDirect, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ufug.2014.04.03

Sagrestano, L. & Finerman, J. (2018) Collective impact model implementation: promise and reality. *Journal of Health and Human Service Administration*, Summer, 2018, 88-123.

Samdahl, D. & Christensen, H. (1985) Environmental cues and vandalism: An exploratory study of picnic table carving. *Environment and Behaviour, 17*(4), 445-458.

Schore, A. (2019) All our sons: the developmental neurobiology and neuroendocrinology of boys at risk. In A. Schore, *The Development of the Unconscious Mind* (84-154). New York, W.W. Norton & Company.

Smallbone, S. (2005) An attachment-theoretical revision of Marshall and Barbaree's Integrated Theory of etiology of sexual offending. In W. Marshall, Y. Ferandez, I. Marshall & G. Serrans, Eds. *Sexual Offender Treatment: Controversial Issues* (93-108). John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

Stodolska, M., Berdychevsky, L., & Shinew, K. (2019) Gangs and deviant leisure. *Leisure Sciences, 41* (4), 278-293.

Storvoll, E., Wichstrom, L., & Pepe, H. (2002) Gender differences in the association between conduct problems and other problems among adolescents. *Journal of Scandinavian Studies in Criminology and Crime Prevention*, 5 (2), 194-209

Szalavitz, M. & Perry, B. (2010) *Born for Love*. William Morrow, HarperCollins.

Weatherburn D. & Grabosky, P. (1999) Strategic approaches to property crime control. *Policing and Society, 9*, 71-95

Wilson, J. & Kelling, G. (1982) Broken windows. *Atlantic Monthly* (March), 29-38.

TASMANIAN INSTITUTE OF LAW ENFORCEMENT STUDIES

Innovative, Collaborative & Interdisciplinary Research