

# **Vandalism**

## **The holistic approach**

Experiences from Europe

Paper presented in Glasgow,  
18 April 1991

Paul van Soomeren  
Bureau Criminaliteitspreventie  
Van Dijk en Van Soomeren BV  
Mariotteplein 9  
1098 NW Amsterdam

## **Introduction**

The word 'vandalism' appears to have first been used in 1794 by a French bishop of Blois, named Grégoire. He was alluding to the destruction caused during the French revolution by hooligans plundering his churches and cathedral (Houchon, 1982). Indirectly he referred to a very enterprising tribe of people: the Vandals. During the Migration Period this tribe wandered from present day Germany, through France and Spain to North Africa (Schreiber, 1981). In the year 435 they made from there a short trip to Rome, where they executed their most notorious plundering. Indeed ..... even then vandalism was already an European experience.

It is worth noting that the French bishop labelled the damage done to his churches as vandalism while the plundering during the religious wars of King Louis XIV were never labelled with this qualification.

The use of the word vandalism obviously contains an ideological component. I will not elaborate this ideological aspect (see Cohen, 1973 and Cohen, 1984) and limit myself to the following definition of vandalism:

"Vandalism is the committing of destructive acts to someone else's property, without this yielding any material advantage for the offender<sup>1</sup>."

Vandalism is a complex, multi-faceted problem requiring a range of responses for its solution. For the outsider the end result may look the same in many cases. A smashed window is a smashed window is a smashed window. However, the causal sequence resulting in a window being smashed may well be completely different. Hence each vandalism problem has unique features and consequently must be met by tailored responses. One should never search for the main cause for vandalism, the best response or the ultimate solution. Neither one nor the other will ever be found. A highly effective response in one neighbourhood may turn out to be a costly disaster in another neighbourhood.

This is not to say that there are no responses or solutions to tackle a given vandalism problem. On the contrary. There are numerous responses. Some well tried, documented and evaluated which have proved to be effective. But effectivity is not an absolute concept. There is always a relation to the situation in which a response is implemented or the offenders it is aimed at.

## **Volume and costs**

Because vandalism is often not reported to the police no one is able to present a complete picture of the volume and cost of vandalism.

To acquire some insight in the volume and costs of vandalism one has to rely mainly on victim surveys.

## **Private property**

Key findings from the first International Crime Survey (Van Dijk et al, 1991) showed a victimization rate for car vandalism in Europe of 7% in 1988.

The victimization rate was highest in Canada (9.8%), Australia (8.7%), West Germany (8.7%) and the Netherlands (8.2%). Relatively low rates were found

---

<sup>1</sup> The phrase 'without this yielding any material advantage for the offender' implies that damage as a 'by-product' of a burglary or the wrecking of a parking meter or public telephone to obtain money is not seen as vandalism. Note there are authors who refer to such cases as acquisitive vandalism.

in Finland (4.0%), Switzerland (4.1%), North Ireland (4.5%) and Norway (4.6%).

**Table 1: Victimization rates for car vandalism. Percentage victimized in 1988.**

| Country         | %          |
|-----------------|------------|
| Total           | 6.7        |
| <b>Europe</b>   | <b>7.0</b> |
| England & Wales | 6.8        |
| Scotland        | 6.5        |
| North Ireland   | 4.5        |
| Netherlands     | 8.2        |
| West Germany    | 8.7        |
| Switzerland     | 4.1        |
| Belgium         | 6.6        |
| France          | 6.5        |
| Spain           | 6.3        |
| Norway          | 4.6        |
| Finland         | 4.0        |
| USA             | 8.9        |
| Canada          | 9.8        |
| Australia       | 8.7        |

Source: Van Dijk et al, 1991.

In all countries, the majority of incidents of car vandalism were committed near home (approximately 50%), or elsewhere in the city or local area (about 33%). Obviously car vandalism is a common experience in the Common Market. About 15 out of a hundred people experience one or more acts of car vandalism a year. However, not only private cars are being scratched and smashed. Also other household properties - e.g. gardens, bicycles, houses - are vandalised<sup>2</sup>.

### **Business property**

The first nationwide business crime survey in the Netherlands (Van Hoek et al, 1990) showed a victimization rate of 23% for business establishments. Hence, about one out of each four business establishments experienced one or more incidents of vandalism in 1988. Vandalism proved to be the most prevalent type of crime experienced by businesses. Although costs per incident were relatively modest (about 250 pounds per incident) the sheer number of incidents resulted in a huge total damage.

The Dutch business victim survey uncovered for the first time the financial magnitude of the vandalism problem for businesses. Most businessmen focus on spectacular crimes like robbery and kidnapping. How awful these types of crime may be, financially speaking vandalism is a far larger problem.

<sup>2</sup> Victimization rate in the Netherlands is about 6%.

### Public property

Last - but certainly not least - there is the damage done to public goods and facilities. Schools, public transport and street furnishing in general (phone booths, lamp posts, traffic signs, trees/shrubs/plants, etc.)<sup>3</sup>.

In general all local research and all victim surveys (households as well as business) show that for vandalism the costs per incident are low. It is the number of incidents that causes the problem. It is like drizzling rain. One may laugh at the first drops, but one hour later one is soaked and if the rain keeps on falling the whole city may be flooded.

That is the vandalism problem in a nutshell.

### Offenders

There is one widely held misconception about offenders of vandalism. Very often the offenders are portrayed as a tribe of maladjusted and deprived young adults (aged around 18); male species from the lower working class who dropped out to drink beer all day on the doorstep of the deteriorated council estates they live in. This reassuring image has one obvious purpose. It is the clearly recognizable outsider who is wrecking our beautiful society. However, research contradicts this image. Extensive interviews with a total of 239 youngsters, aged 8-23, in Amsterdam<sup>4</sup> showed that half of the boys and girls admitted one or more vandalistic acts in the past year (proportion boys about 65% vandalism, girls 35%; Van Dijk, Van Soomeren and Walop, 1981).

**Table 2: Vandalism and age**

| Age          | Vandalism              | No vandalism     |
|--------------|------------------------|------------------|
| 8-10         | 32 (64%)               | 18 (36%)         |
| 11-12        | 32 (55% <sup>9</sup> ) | 26 (45%)         |
| 13-14        | 22 (57%)               | 17 (43%)         |
| 15-16        | 20 (47%)               | 23 (53%)         |
| 17-18        | 9 (30%)                | 21 (70%)         |
| 19-23        | 1 ( 6%)                | 18 (94%)         |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>116 (49%)</b>       | <b>123 (51%)</b> |

N = 239; random sample aged 8-23.

Source: Van Dijk, Van Soomeren and Walop, 1981.

Recently the second nationwide self report study among youths aged 12-18 in the Netherlands (Junger-Tas and Kruissink, 1990) showed lower percentages of youths admitting vandalism<sup>5</sup>; see table 3.

3 See A.B. Storstockholms Lokaltrafic, 1987; Bradet and Normandeau, 1987; Geason and Wilson, 1990; Levy-Leboyer, 1984; Plate et al, 1985; Van Soomeren and Stienstra, 1990.

4 Random sampling; proportion boys-girls 2:1. Semi structured interviews ( $\pm$  one hour) with three youth simultaneously. Interviews were taped and processed later.

5 This lower 'self report committing rate' might be explained by the method used: a structured interview with individual respondents at home. Several sources (Blauw and Kuiper, 1981; Van Dulleman and Hauber, 1981; Stainforth and Twyman, 1980) indicate that using a different method (in depth interviews/group discussions) yield more information. Obviously these methods are more time - and money consuming.

**Table 3**

| Offence          | Committed<br>ever | Committed<br>last year | Boys:Girls | Mean age<br>first<br>committed |
|------------------|-------------------|------------------------|------------|--------------------------------|
| Malicious damage | 25%               | 8%                     | 2.9 : 1    | 11.4                           |
| Graffiti         | 22%               | 10%                    | 1.2 : 1    | 13.1                           |
| Arson            | 15%               | 6%                     | 3.2 : 1    | 10.8                           |
| Burglary         | 3%                | 2%                     | 4.2 : 1    | 12.5                           |

N = 994; random sample aged 12-18, representing Dutch youth.  
Source: Junger Tas and Kruissink, 1990.

Earlier self report research in a northern city in the UK (584 boys aged 11-15) showed that minor vandalism is very widespread indeed (Gladstone, 1978). More serious forms of vandalism were also quite common. In the six months leading up to the survey, 40% of the boys had smashed things on a building site and 32% had broken a window in an occupied house; see table 4.

**Table 4: The prevalence of vandalism (in %)**

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Scratched desk at school               | 85 |
| Broken a bottle in the street          | 79 |
| Broken a window in an empty house      | 68 |
| Written on walls in the street         | 65 |
| Broken trees or flowers in a park      | 58 |
| Written on the seats or walls of buses | 55 |
| Broken the glass in a street lamp      | 48 |
| Scratched a car or lorry               | 42 |
| Smashed things on a building site      | 40 |
| Broken a window in an occupied house   | 32 |
| Broken the glass in a bus shelter      | 32 |
| Damaged park building                  | 31 |
| Broken furniture at school             | 29 |
| Broken a window in a public toilet     | 29 |
| Broken the glass of a telephone kiosk  | 28 |
| Broken a car radio aerial              | 28 |
| Damaged the tyres of a car             | 28 |
| Broken a window at school              | 27 |
| Slashed bus seats                      | 22 |
| Broken a seat in a public toilet       | 20 |
| Damaged telephone in a kiosk           | 20 |
| Put large objects on a railway line    | 19 |
| Broken a window in a club              | 16 |
| Slashed train seats                    | 12 |

(Percentages refer to the proportion of boys who admitted to having committed the specified act at least one in the previous six months.)  
Source: Gladstone, 1978.



The facts presented earlier on the volume and costs did already suggest that vandalism is a very widespread phenomenon. From the self report studies available, it now becomes abundantly clear that acts of vandalism can not be foisted on a small group of maladjusted or deprived young adults. On the contrary, vandalism is an integral part of the youth culture.

If one stops looking at vandalism as a disease only caught by deprived minorities and one sees vandalism as a result of a troublesome phase experienced by many youngsters in becoming a law abiding adult, things fall into perspective.

## Motives

A second common misconception is that vandalism is 'pointless' or without any motive. Research among young people (Van Dijk, Van Soomeren, Walop, 1982) has shown that there are clear motives for vandalism<sup>6</sup>.

Motives for vandalism differ for each age group.

For **children** (aged 8-12) vandalism is mainly a part of (playfully) exploring physical and social limits, i.e. 'Am I able to do this?' or 'Is this allowed?' It may also be an expression of anger and revenge.

**Adolescents** (13-16) carry out acts of vandalism to test themselves against adult authorities (parents, neighbours, teachers, police) and in order to impress their peer group friends. Daring to break the rules shows how tough you are - especially in the case of boys. And, although it may sound paradoxical, vandalism has an important *social* function for adolescents.

For **young adults** (17-23), the motives are more individual: the behaviour of these youths is usually an expression of dissatisfaction, caused, for example, by difficulties at school, unemployment, trouble at home and the like.

## Thresholds

The fact that such motives are at the root of vandalism does not mean, however, that the potential vandal just starts destroying things as soon as he feels motivated to do so. A potential vandal can be restrained from carrying out acts of vandalism by what one may call **thresholds**. Thresholds either in himself or in the situation.

There are **two** important **internal thresholds** which can induce the offender to desist.

The first internal threshold is the social norm which holds that the destruction of somebody else's property 'is not right'. This norm usually becomes blurred if young people are in a group. Amongst the young adults (from 17) the internal thresholds may however play an important role. Most young adults feel that vandalism is 'not done'. Not because it is a waste when damage is caused, but above all because vandalism has become **childish** to them. They see it as something for the 'teenies', something 'they have grown out of'. Or, as one of the youngsters in an interview stated: "I don't smash windows anymore ..... unless of course there is a Walkman or a pair of Nikes behind that window."

---

<sup>6</sup> See also Levy-Leboyer, 1984; Kube and Schuster, 1985; Geason and Wilson, 1990.

The second internal threshold is the involvement with the object: vandals do not vandalise what belongs to them or to their friends. Amenities to which they are favourably disposed (e.g. their own youth club) are also spared. The latter is especially the case if young people themselves have a say in such an amenity (active involvement).

There is one very important **external threshold** rooted more in the situation. The fear of being seen, being recognised or being caught or a combination of all three. The older a child becomes, the more this fear probably shifts in the direction of formal authorities, such as the police. Young children are often still afraid of their parents, neighbours, etc. Teenagers are much less so - if at all; they are, however, afraid of the police.

The external threshold refers to the degree to which formal or informal control is or can be **exercised** in a given situation. Particularly places which are not surveilled by dwellings are generally vulnerable to vandalism. Hence, building good surveillance possibilities into a neighbourhood is certainly recommendable from the point of view of preventing vandalism. Research<sup>7</sup> demonstrated that pure **physical** surveillance possibilities (e.g. the number of windows) has in itself quite an important influence, **because offenders (young people) apparently take this into account**. Not only do they take it into account in an absolute sense (by not carrying out acts of vandalism), they also switch their destructive behaviour to locations which are not so easily surveilled.

### **Responses: strategies and examples**

Based on these research findings a broad design for effective responses and solutions emerges. Responses can be classified on the basis of two dimensions. The first dimension is the distinction between:

- primary prevention; directed at the public at large or directed at youth in general;
- secondary prevention; directed at risk groups, neighbourhoods at risk, or specific types of building which are at risk;
- tertiary prevention; directed at apprehended offenders or demolished objects/places.

The second dimension distinguishes between an offender-oriented approach or a situation-oriented approach.

The combination of these two dimensions leads to a subdivision of vandalism prevention into 6 different types, as shown in table 5<sup>8</sup>.

---

<sup>7</sup> Van Dijk and Van Soomeren, 1980; Van Dijk, Van Soomeren and Walop, 1982.

<sup>8</sup> The classification is based on Van Dijk, 1990a. Van Dijk distinguished between offender-, situation- and victim oriented. The victim oriented approach yields little when applied to vandalism. Direct victims are the objects being demolished or at risk. Hence in the case of vandalism the situation oriented approach and the victim oriented approach overlap to a great extent.

**Table 5**

| Target group           | A p p r o a c h    |                   |
|------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
|                        | Situation-oriented | Offender-oriented |
| Primary (general)      | 1                  | 4                 |
| Secondary (risk)       | 2                  | 5                 |
| Tertiary (apprehended) | 3                  | 6                 |

### 1. Primary situation oriented

It is mainly design which is on trial here (Coleman, 1985; Newman, 1972; Van Soomeren, 1987). Target hardening and surveillance are the key concepts in this approach.

**Target hardening** may be considered as a good solution when the problem is caused as a byproduct of play activities, e.g. children playing football.

**Surveillance** is very effective in general. The Dutch research results mentioned earlier (see external threshold) imply that building design in itself - aside from the question of whether residents do indeed carry out surveillance - can have a strong preventive effect on vandalism.

One should keep in mind however that vandalism is not caused by badly designed environments. Altering design is altering an (external) threshold. The motives are still there. In this respect primary situation-oriented approaches slightly resemble a pressure cooker. Every pressure cooker needs a safety valve.

### 2. Secondary situation oriented

Gardens and small play areas directly surveilled by houses provide young children with an important opportunity to play with friends in a relatively safe and controlled environment. In several instances, vandalism rates have gone down after semi-public spaces surrounding high-rise blocks have been converted into private gardens (Poyner, 1985).

However, private gardens are much less interesting for young people in their teens. They need to have the opportunity to 'act out' in places outside the sphere of their parents' homes.

Hence, there should be sufficient **recreational areas and gathering places** for young people directly bordering on a neighbourhood. One of the essential characteristics of these locations for older and more independent young people is that they have to be **difficult** to survey (by adults). Places like that work as a safety valve on the 'pressure cooker' of a well surveilled neighbourhood<sup>9</sup>.

Young people, therefore, will concentrate on these places, and it is these places where vandalism will take place. Ensure, therefore, that the damage can be kept to a limit. Limit the number of potentially destructible objects, use sturdy materials and/or allow the 'dominant' young people in the group to select and maintain the place and the materials themselves.

### 3. Tertiary situation oriented

Damage and vandalism occurs. Prevention may diminish the problem but because vandalism must be seen as part of the process of growing up there will always be vandalism.

<sup>9</sup> One might call this approach a 'planned displacement policy'.



Therefore part of every response must inevitably be 'cleaning up the mess' as quickly as possible because an act of vandalism evokes more vandalism (often referred to as 'erosion-vandalism'). Maintenance thus is another key word. Practical experience shows that it is efficient and effective to combine the functions of maintenance and control e.g. a caretaker in an estate.

#### 4. Primary offender oriented

In this approach the population (of a neighbourhood, city or nation) as a whole forms the target group or parts of the population - youth in general, boys, etc. are addressed. **Publicity campaigns** are an example of this approach. It is often a pity those campaigns do not reckon with research findings summarised earlier. Overly moralizing campaigns being the result: 'thou will not destroy someone else's property!'. It is better to focus such a campaign on the motives and thresholds. An example of such a campaign was recently issued on Dutch television. Vandalism was presented as fun **but** essentially childish. After having wrecked a bicycle, a lamppost and a telephone booth the vandals leave the scene of the crime wearing napkins. However, combined campaigns (television, journals, posters) cost a fortune and seldom have a marked effect on the amount of vandalism committed<sup>10</sup>.

More positive results in changing the behaviour of potential offenders of vandalism were observed in Dutch **school projects**. In these projects an array of activities is implemented: lectures from the police or repair mechanics, pupils taking photographs of damaged objects as well as objects still intact, costs calculations are made, theatre performances, videos/movies, pupils adopt and maintain - or even design - public objects (playground, bus shelter), etc. etc. In 1982 school projects of this type were implemented in all schools in a neighbourhood (35.000 residents) in Amsterdam.

Evaluation research showed that the projects in schools achieved much, not only amongst the youngsters but also amongst parents<sup>11</sup>.

In elementary schools the projects had a marked effect on most pupils. It was only amongst pupils disliking school that little change could be detected. In secondary education the projects had the most marked effect when vandalism was presented as 'stupid' or 'childish'.

Because school projects (of the primary and secondary offender-oriented type) were at the core of this Amsterdam anti-vandalism programme, the school projects will have attributed greatly to the marked decrease of the amount of vandalism in the neighbourhood.

Vandalism decreased 25% in the neighbourhood; a decrease of 19% compared to the control area (rest of city). A cost-benefit analysis showed the total costs of the programme amounted to about £ 140,000 including direct costs (£ 20,000 for example for school materials, tools) and indirect costs (£ 120,000 for salary of researchers/coordinators, council employees and teaching staff devoting their time to vandalism prevention).

The material savings due to the programme were calculated at £ 240,000.

Hence, net profit amounted to £ 100,000.

School projects appear to present a good opening for setting up projects against vandalism (see also Carliez, 1987). The costs are limited, many youngsters can be reached by this method and the results have proved to be effective.

---

10 See Riley and Mayhew, 1980, for a summary of the debate on 'anti-vandalism television campaigns'.

11 The effects on pupils were measured through interviews with those who had participated in a vandalism project and with a control group. The interviews were held six months after the project; see Van Dijk, Van Soomeren, Walop, 1988; Walop, 1988.

## **5. Secondary offender oriented**

There is only a thin line between primary and secondary offender oriented approaches. Within the secondary approach two main streams can be distinguished:

- leisure activities;
- involvement/participation.

Leisure activities are often rather naively seen as good anti-vandalism medicine as such. However, one has to be conscious of the fact that the reasoning 'more leisure facilities = less vandalism' is often adhered to too quickly. After all, one must always ask oneself whether youth - or more precisely vandalising youth - **can** and **want** to make use of these leisure facilities.

Many leisure facilities are not, or partly not, accessible to certain youths. For example because entrance costs money, membership is necessary, etc.<sup>12</sup>.

A question that is just as important is whether youths **want** to make use of the facilities/activities. All too often facilities are created and activities organised without any consultation of the target groups. Without such a consultation the medicine of leisure activities quickly becomes a placebo which at best may keep youths a few hours from the streets. Gladstone (1978) already firmly warned that "Vandalism is not particularly time-consuming and can easily be undertaken while travelling between home and leisure facilities given that almost any urban route will pass by street lamps, phone boxes and other convenient targets."

The general approach of baldly organising activities and creating facilities which used to be very popular in France and Holland shifted in the eighties towards a more focused and grass-root approach. What resulted had a striking resemblance with the outreaching 'streetcorner work'. Only the worker nowadays wears a sport shirt. In Amsterdam for example 'square caretaker(s)' were appointed. Their home base is in one of the central squares of a residential neighbourhood. From there they try to involve loitering youths in sport activities, small maintenance work, etc. Their function is an outreaching one: learning to know the kids. But at the same time their role is to control their kids, to survey the public space, to keep - together with the boys - the sport equipment in good order. Leisure, control, surveillance and youth leadership combined at one focal point within the neighbourhood (Van Dijk and Horde, 1990).

## **6. Tertiary offender oriented**

Due to the dramatic increase of petty crime in the sixties and seventies the police and justice system in the Netherlands was no longer able to manage vandalism. Vandalistic offenses were, even when the offender was caught, seldom prosecuted. In the few cases in which the offender came into contact with the authorities, long periods of time elapsed between the offence and penalty. The penalty was inadequate; it consisted of a scolding by the prosecutor or, at best, of a fine eventually paid by the parents. In fact, juvenile vandals themselves hardly experienced any consequences of their destructive deeds at all. From this situation, the need for an adequate way of handling the apprehended offenders emerged. In 1981 the city of Rotterdam started a programme aimed at preventing and suppressing vandalism. In the programme municipality, police and judiciary work closely together (Kruissink, 1990). Part of the programme was the creation of a Halt bureau. Halt<sup>13</sup>, an acronym of

---

<sup>12</sup> Compare also 'Responses à la violence', part II, page 378/383.

<sup>13</sup> See Van Dijk, 1990b; Kruissink, 1990.

'the alternative', is meant as an alternative for prosecution of young vandalism offenders. In the average case, a youngster caught for damaging or destroying property and referred by the police to the Halt-bureau, is made to clean up or repair the damaged object during his or her free time. Eventually, this task is combined with paying for damages. If the boy or girl does not accept the offer by the Halt-bureau or does not fulfil the obligations as agreed upon in a contract, the informal police report is changed into an official report which is then submitted to the prosecutor. The advantage of the Halt-procedure is that a quick and informal action can be taken and that registration in the judicial documentation system is avoided. At the same time the necessary control function of the public prosecutor is maintained. Furthermore the kind of punishment is educative in itself. The responsibility of the youngster is emphasised, both by being held clearly accountable for the act and by working on the basis of an agreement. About 50 Halt-bureaus are now in operation in the Netherlands, some as local and other as regional institutions. Research showed that the group involved in the Halt-programs did not consist of just ordinary but unlucky kids who happen to run into a policeman. Self report data revealed them as far more delinquent than average Dutch youth, not only in terms of vandalism but also in relation to shoplifting, arson and burglary; obviously a selection of youngsters for whom a clear reaction to their behaviour is appropriate. The effects of the Halt-intervention are promising.

**Table 6: Effects on vandalism, based on relative difference scores**

| Effect        | Halt group |              | Control group |              |
|---------------|------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|
|               | number     | %            | number        | %            |
| Stopped       | 26         | 21.0         | 0             | 0.0          |
| Decreased     | 52         | 41.9         | 17            | 25.0         |
| No difference | 13         | 10.5         | 10            | 14.7         |
| Increased     | 33         | 26.6         | 41            | 60.3         |
| <b>Total</b>  | <b>124</b> | <b>100.0</b> | <b>68</b>     | <b>100.0</b> |

Chi<sup>2</sup> = 31.34; df = 3; p < 0.01  
Source: Kruissink, 1990.

Compared to a controlgroup of youngsters having committed similar offences in a city where no Halt-scheme was operating, the Halt-group showed, according to self report measures, a significant greater decrease in offending after intervention. A positive change in behaviour took place in more than 60% of the Halt-cases, compared to only 25% after a traditional handling by the police. Of the latter group, no one stopped offending. The effect is independent of age, school situation, family situation and the use of alcohol and soft drugs. From interviews it appeared that the boys and girls were very well aware of the moral element in the intervention, the fact that they are held responsible and have to 'make good' to the individual victims and the community.



## **Conclusion**

Vandalism is a widespread offence committed by quite ordinary youngsters in the agegroup 8-18. It is the volume of vandalism which is the problem.

Eventually most offenders grow out of it and looking back consider their former behaviour as childish. Growing older their urges towards vandalism fade away and the thresholds not to commit vandalism become stronger.

So one might say there is nothing to worry about, the problem is automatically solved. But this is obviously untrue. New cohorts of children are being born and - to put it bluntly - new cohorts of vandals are brought up. Hence, vandalism will never diminish if nothing is done.

However, responses must be differentiated according to the dimensions mentioned earlier. Responses can take the offender-orientation or the situation-orientation. The best way is to respond by applying both strategies at the same time.

Furthermore responses can be primary-targeted (at youth in general), secondary (aimed at risk groups or risk situations) or tertiary (e.g. apprehending and penalising the offenders). Again it is the combination of different approaches that will be most effective e.g. penalising the offenders by gently forcing them to quickly clean up the mess they have made.

Hence the best response to vandalism is first analyse the situation, the offence and the offender and then use a well-tailored approach along the 6 tracks presented in this paper.



## Bibliography

A.B. Storstockholms Lokaltrafik

1987 *Report from Stockholm on counteractions against graffiti and vandalism.* Stockholm.

Blauw, W. en H. Kuiper

1981 *Van de paal gerukt?*. Groningen.

Bradet, Cl. et A. Normandeau

1987 La criminalité et les transport public. In: *Déviance et Société*, vol. 11, no. 1, p. 105-122.

Carliez, L.

1987 *Faut il blinder les portes (ou du vandalisme dans les écoles)*. Revue de la Direction Générale de l'Organisation des études. Vol 21, no. 4, p. 3-22, Bruxelles.

Clarke, R.V.G. (ed.)

1978 *Tackling Vandalism*. Home Office Research Study nr. 47. HMSO, London.

Cohen, S.

1973 Property destruction: Motives and meanings. In: *Ward*, 1973.

Cohen, S.

1984 Sociological approaches to Vandalism. In: *Lévy-Leboyer*, 1984.

Coleman, A.

1985 *Utopia on trial*. London.

Dijk, B. van en P. van Soomeren

1980 *Vandalisme in Amsterdam*. Universiteit van Amsterdam.

Dijk, B. van, P. van Soomeren en M. Walop

(met A. van Assema en M. van IJendoorn)

1981 *Rapportage onderzoek Jeugdvandalisme, deel 3: Interviews met jongeren, schoolhoofden en jongerenwerkers*. Amsterdam.

Dijk, B. van, P. van Soomeren en M. Walop

(met A. van Assema en M. van IJendoorn)

1982 *Amsterdammertjes vernielen!? Achtergronden van jeugdvandalisme (rapportage onderzoek jeugdvandalisme deel 4)*. Gemeente Amsterdam.

Dijk, B. van en M. Horde

1990 *Preventie rond Amsterdamse pleinen (een voorbeeld van sociale vernieuwing)*. Bureau Criminaliteitspreventie/Gemeente Amsterdam.

Dijk, B. van, P. van Soomeren en M. Walop

1988 *Vandalismepreventie in de praktijk*. Koninklijke Vermande, Lelystad.

- Dijk, J.J.M. van  
1990a *A two-dimensional typology of crime prevention projects*. Ministry of Justice, The Hague.
- Dijk, J.J.M. van  
1990b *Crime reduction for the 90's: The Netherlands and European perspective*. Paper for the Korean Institute of Criminology. Ministry of Justice, The Hague.
- Dijk, J.J.M. van, P. Mayhew and M. Killias  
1991 *Experiences of Crime across the World*. Key findings from the 1989 International Crime Survey. Kluwer Law and Taxation Publishers, Deventer/Boston.
- Dulleman, H. van en A.R. Hauber  
1982 *Vernielende jongeren, wat bedoelen zij?* Rotterdam.
- Geason, S. and P.R. Wilson  
1990 *Preventing Graffiti and Vandalism*. Australian Institute of Criminology, Canberra.
- Gladstone, F.J.  
1978 Vandalism amongst adolescent schoolboys. In: *Clarke*, 1978.
- Hoek, A. van, P. de Savornin Lohman en P. van Soomeren  
1990 *Bedrijfsleven en Criminaliteit*. Eerste landelijke enquête naar slachtofferschap van criminaliteit in het Nederlandse bedrijfsleven. Amsterdam.
- Houchon, G.  
1982 *Criminologie du Vandalisme*. Paper presented at the International Colloquium on Vandalism. Paris.
- Junger-Tas, J. en M. Kruissink  
1990 *Ontwikkeling van de jeugdcriminaliteit 1980-1988*. WODC Onderzoek en Beleid nr. 100, Gouda Quint BV, Arnhem.
- Kruissink, M.  
1990 The Halt program: diversion of juvenile vandals. In: *Dutch penal law and policy*. Notes on criminological research from the Research and Documentation Centre. Ministry of Justice, The Hague, the Netherlands.
- Kube, E. en L. Schuster  
1985 *Vandalismus. Erkenntnisstand und Bekämpfungsansätze*. Bundeskriminalamt, Wiesbaden.
- Levy-Leboyer, C.  
1984 *Vandalism: behaviour and motivations*. Elseviers Science Publishers B.V., Amsterdam.
- Newman, O.  
1972 *Defensible Space: Crime Prevention Through Urban Design*. McMillan, New York (The Architectural Press, London, 1973).

Plate, M., U. Schwinges en R. Weiss

1985 *Strukturen der Kriminalistik in Solingen*. Wiesbaden.

Poyner, B.

1983 *Design against crime*. Buttersworth, London.

1977 *Réponses à la violence*. Rapport du comité d'études sur la violence, la criminalité et de la délinquance, présidé par Peyrifitte, A., Paris.

Riley, D. and P. Mayhew

1980 *Crime Prevention Publicity: an assessment*. Home Office Research Study no. 63, Home Office, London.

Schreiber, H.

1981 *De vandalen (zegetocht en ondergang van een Germaans volk)*. Amsterdam.

Soomeren, P. van

1987 *The Physical Urban Environment and Reduction of Urban Insecurity: a General Introduction*. Conference on the reduction of Urban Insecurity, Barcelona, november 1987. Council of Europe/City of Barcelona.

Soomeren, P. van en H. Stienstra

1990 *Beveiliging van gebouwen: deel 6 - Scholen*. Stichting Bouwresearch, Rotterdam.

Stainforth, S. en T. Twyman

1980 *Researching a complex social problem*. Vandalism in the UK, London.

Walop, M.

1988 *The development of an effective approach towards vandalism by means of action research*. International Symposium on Vandalism, Seattle.

Ward, C.

1973 *Vandalism*. London.