

**TITLE: FACE THE YOUNG PEOPLE CONSULTATION RESULTS
2008**

**AUTHOR: RACHEL BEARD, COMMUNITIES COORDINATOR, SAFER
MIDDLESBROUGH PARTNERSHIP.**

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 During January and February 2008 four Face the Young People sessions took place across the four Problem Solving Group areas, at a youth centre in the area. These meetings were a follow on from the Face the People sessions that took place in October 2007.
- 1.2 An interactive consultation session using IML equipment was used in each session, to determine young peoples priorities in terms of Crime, Anti social behaviour and drug misuse, this information would be used to inform the Community Safety Plan.
- 1.3 Roughly 142 young people took part in the consultation session, these were split up as follows- PSG1 – 34, PSG2 – 45, PSG3 – 35, PSG4 – 27
- 1.4 The events were publicised via MBC youth service and other young peoples organisations such as West Middlesbrough Neighbourhood Trust, Safe in Tees Valley Youth Inclusion Project and Directions. The event was twinned with the Criminal Damage Road show, an MC/ DJ event at which young people performed songs relating to Criminal damage.

2 RESULTS




Partnership Priorities

- 2.1 Young people were asked to choose the three main areas of anti social behaviour which they felt that partners should concentrate on during 2008/2009, with the following options:
 - Noisy neighbours and loud parties
 - Teenagers hanging around the streets
 - Vandalism, graffiti, deliberate damage and deliberate fires
 - Drug use
 - People being drunk or rowdy in a public place
 - Rubbish or litter lying around
 - Off road motorbikes, including quad bikes
 - Begging
 - Prostitution and kerb crawling
- 2.2 Across the whole Middlesbrough area the top three priorities were 'teenagers hanging around the streets' (20%), 'drug use' (19%) and

'vandalism, damage, fires' (16%). The priorities remained roughly the same across all four areas, with the top three being in the top three for all areas, although in different orders. The only exception to this was in PSG3 where begging was joint third with 14%. Table 2.2 below shows the full results of this question:

Table 2.2 Young peoples Anti social behaviour priorities for 2008/2009

	Percentage (%)				
	All	PSG1	PSG2	PSG3	PSG4
Teenagers hanging around	20	26	18	14	23
Drug use	19	20	24	15	21
Vandalism/damage/fires	16	14	17	16	15
Noisy neighbours/parties	11	10	12	10	10
Litter	9	6	10	9	10
Off road bikes	7	7	5	9	7
Drunk/ rowdy behaviour	7	11	8	4	6
Begging	7	5	4	14	4
Prostitution/kerb crawling	4	1	2	9	4

 1st priority
 2nd priority
 3rd priority

2.3 Attendees were then asked to explain why they thought the ASB priorities they had chose were indeed a priority. Overall the top two choices were, 'I have seen ASB taking place' (20%) and 'I have been a victim' (26%). This was echoed in two of the four areas. Other second choices included 'word on the street/ local gossip' and 'heard about it in the media'. Third choice differed again with three out of four areas recording 'someone I know has been a victim'. Table 2.3 below shows the full results of this question.

Table 2.3 Attendees choice as to why they think ASB a problem

	Percentage (%)				
	All	PSG1	PSG2	PSG3	PSG4
I have been a victim	26	34	27	25	14
I have seen ASB taking place	20	19	25	9	26
Someone I know has been a victim	17	14	23	15	14
Word on the street/ gossip	11	19	5	6	18
Agencies ineffective	10	6	7	5	14
Media	8	0	11	18	0
ASB not a problem here	6	8	2	15	14

1st choice
 2nd choice
 3rd choice

2.4 Attendees were then asked to repeat this process for three main areas of Crime which they felt that partners should concentrate on during 2008/2009, with the following options:

- Vehicle Crime
- House Burglary
- Theft from a person/ pick pockets
- Shop lifting
- Criminal damage/ damage to property and vehicles
- Violent crime
- Shed/ garage burglary
- Drug dealing

2.5 Across the whole Middlesbrough area the top three crime priorities were drug dealing (20%) vehicle crime (18%) and Criminal damage (17%). The priorities remained roughly the same across all four areas, with drug dealing being in the top three for all of the PSG areas and vehicle crime and criminal damage being in the top three in all but one PSG areas. In PSG 4 house burglary was the top priority. Table 2.5 below shows the full results of this question.

Table 2.5 Crime priorities for 2008/2009

	Percentage (%)				
	All	PSG1	PSG2	PSG3	PSG4
Drug dealing	20	25	15	27	16
Vehicle crime	18	20	20	14	16
Criminal damage	17	14	18	20	19
House burglary	14	15	9	15	21
Shop lifting	12	9	15	8	13
Violent crime	9	3	13	8	10
Theft from person	5	6	5	4	5
Shed/ garage burglary	5	8	6	4	0

1st priority
 2nd priority
 3rd priority

2.6 Attendees were then asked to explain why they thought the Crime priorities they had chose where indeed a priority. Across the whole of Middlesbrough the top two choices were 'I have seen crime taking place' (32%) 'I have been a victim' (20%). Although decisions were really spread across the options, with 25% oof young people at PSG3 session saying that crime in their area is not a problem. Table 2.6 below shows the full results of this question.

Table 2.6 Attendees choice as to why they think Crime a problem

	Percentage (%)				
	All	PSG1	PSG2	PSG3	PSG4
I have seen crime taking place	32	43	36	7	39
I have been a victim	20	27	26	14	7
Agencies ineffective	11	12	5	21	7
Word on the street/ gossip	11	3	12	18	11
Crime not a problem here	9	3	2	25	11
Media	9	12	12	11	0
Someone I know has been a victim	8	0	7	4	25

1st choice
 2nd choice
 3rd choice

2.7 The questions then moved on to a focus on young people as victims of crime and anti social behaviour and the attendees were first asked if the had been a victim within the last 3 years either in school, at home or at another place.

2.8 Across the whole Middlesbrough 50% of the young people interviewed had been a victim of crime outside school or home (in the street, while shopping etc). 44% had been a victim whilst in school, and the safest place for young people was at home, with overall 37% being as victim of crime. Table 2.8 below shows the full results of this question:

Table 2.8 Young people who have been victims of crime in the last three years

	Percentage (%)				
	All	PSG1	PSG2	PSG3	PSG4
Outside school and home	50	37	57	67	35
At school	44	48	46	42	37
At home	37	24	53	41	25

1st choice
 2nd choice
 3rd choice

2.9 The next victim related question was ' have you ever told any of the following people about a crime that has happened to you?' The options were:

- I have never been a victim of crime
- Parent/ guardian
- Other members of family
- Friend
- Teacher or other adult at school
- Police Officer or PCSO
- Other

2.10 Overall across Middlesbrough young people had never been a victim of crime (24%) or if they had they told a friend (24%). These were the most common answers from three out of the four PSG areas. Young people also commonly told Parents/Guardians, Police Officer or PCSO's and other people (not specified). Table 2.11 below shows the full results of this question:

Table 2.11 Who young people informed if they had been a victim of crime

	Percentage (%)				
	All	PSG1	PSG2	PSG3	PSG4
I have never been a victim of crime	24	32	32	20	21
Friend	24	22	38	15	20
Parent/ guardian	16	18	15	10	17
Police Officer or PCSO	15	20	5	21	12
Other	9	2	5	22	9
Teacher or other adult at school	6	4	0	5	12
Other members of family	6	2	5	7	9

1st choice
 2nd choice
 3rd choice

2.11 The final victim related question was aimed at those who had been a victim but hadn't reported it to anyone. The question was 'if you have been a victim of crime but you did not tell anyone, why didn't you tell anyone'. The options were

- I have never been a victim of crime
- I did tell someone
- The crime wasn't important enough
- No one could have done anything
- You wouldn't have been taken seriously
- It might have got you into trouble
- You were frightened of the people who did it
- Other

2.12 Young people in the majority either had never been a victim of crime (36%) or had told some one (26%). For those who hadn't told anyone that they had been a victim the most common answer was 'Other' (13% overall), other answers included 'it might have got me into trouble' (19% in PSG4 area) and 'You wouldn't have been taken seriously' (9% in PSG1 area). Table 2.13 below shows the full results of this question:

Table 2.13 Why young people didn't report if they had been a victim of crime

	Percentage (%)				
	All	PSG1	PSG2	PSG3	PSG4
I have never been a victim of crime	36	45	33	15	48
I did tell someone	26	28	34	22	15
Other	13	6	15	26	7
You wouldn't have been taken seriously	8	9	5	7	11
It might have got you into trouble	8	3	3	11	19
No one could have done anything	5	3	5	11	0
You were frightened of the people who did it	2	6	0	4	0
The crime wasn't important enough	2	0	5	4	0

1st choice
 2nd choice
 3rd choice

2.14 The final set of questions were asked and the young responded by text message via the IML system. This was to allow each attendee to convey any opinions that the previous questions had not allow them to express.

2.15 The first text message questions was 'where are the unsafe areas'. Answers received include: Central Avenue, Warren Street, Grove Hill and Pallister Park. A full list of answers can be found in appendix 2.18. The list does not include inappropriate answers or answers with swear words in them.

2.16 The second text question was 'are there any other priorities that we may not have considered that you wish to tell us about'. Answers received include: Devils bridge, drugs, violent dogs, bullying and getting 'battered' at school. A full list of answers can be found in appendix 2.18. The list does not include inappropriate answers or answers with swear words in them.

2.17 The final text message question asked 'Please tell us the single biggest crime or anti social behaviour issue facing your area'. The question was asked to determine the main priority out of all the issue discussed. Answers received in duplicate include: Drugs, twocs and grannies! A full list of answers can be found in appendix 2.18.

3 CONCLUSION

- 3.1 The meetings were well attended. This is probably due to the 'pull' of the Criminal Damage Roadshow that took place after the interactive sessions at each event.
- 3.2 The three ASB priorities for Middlesbrough, as decided by young people are: teenagers hanging around the streets (20%) drug use (19%) and vandalism/damage and fires (16%). These decisions were based on attendees being a victim of ASB (26%) or seeing ASB taking place (20%).
- 3.2 The three crime priorities for Middlesbrough, as decided by young people are: drug dealing (20%), vehicle crime (18%) and criminal damage (17%). These decisions were based on seeing crime taking place (32%) and attendees being a victim of crime (20%). Agencies being ineffective, and word on the street/local gossip (both 11%) were also factors in people's decision making.
- 3.3 50% of the young people interviewed had been a victim of crime somewhere outside of the home and school, this lowered to 44% at school and 37% at home, which appears to be the safest place for young people. This result show that at least 1 in 3 young people have been a victim of crime in the last three years, and outside the school and home this moves up to 1 in 2.
- 3.4 Most of those who had been a victim of crime did tell someone, with Friends (24%), parents/guardians (16%), and Police/PCSO's (15%) being the favoured people to inform. Of those who didn't tell anyone (38%) the reasons given were 'Other' (non specified) (13%), 'you wouldn't have been taken seriously' (8%) and 'it might have got you into trouble' (8%).
- 3.5 Unsafe areas raised by the young people were mainly estates or streets in Middlesbrough including Central Avenue, Warren Street and Grove Hill.
- 3.6 Other issues brought up by young people for consideration by the Partnership included bullying and getting 'battered'. This question was hampered by the fact that many of young people wrote rude and inappropriate words, so they could see them flashing on the screen!
- 3.7 The single biggest issue facing the young people of Middlesbrough, according to attendees is drugs (although young people were not specific in whether drug dealing or using was the issue). This question was hampered by the fact that many of young people wrote rude and inappropriate words, so they could see them flashing on the screen!

Appendix 2.10

Unsafe areas in Middlesbrough

Grove hill

Grove hill

Grove hill

Bins

Grove hill

ghill

Grove hill

Grove hill

Grove hill

Grove hill

Arch way and shops

Grove hill

Bells the shop

Grove hill

Grove hill

Grove hill

Grove hill

Grove hill

Grove hill

Grove hill

Grove hill

Grove hilly

Grove hill

Grove hill

Pally park

Grove hill

Thorntree

Shop

Pally park

Park end

Grangetown

Pally park

Park end

Shops

Pally

Groville

Rothbury rd

Whinney banks

Grove hill and Grangetown and park end

Pally park

Park end grove hill

Union street

Cheriton green

Thorntree shops

Shops

Grange town

Pally park
Borotown
Doggy
Delarden road
Thorntree park
Park end
Grangetown
Pally park
Grove hill
Central avenue
Grangetown
Warren street
centrelAv
central avenue
Central
Union street central avenue
Town
Warren st
Price avenue
Central ave
Grove hill
Warren street
central
central avenue
centralAvenue and bruce avenue
central
central avenue
centralave
corder rode
central
central auenue
central
Central
Central
Grove hill
central av
central avenue
Grove hill
Grove hill
Grove hill
Grovil
Grove hill
Grovil
Grovill
Town grove hill grange town
Hemo
Grove hill
Grove hill
Growrill
Hemo
Grove hill

Grove hill p end bfarm gtown town Redcar
The Garth
Grovehil
There was unsafe area in Middlesbrough

Other issues not mentioned

No
No
Getting batted
Get batter
No
Sex
No
No
Bullying
Bulling
No
Nothing to do
Getting bulled
Getting battered
Bullying
Prostitutes
No
No
Nout
Devils bridge
Sex
Dogs r violent

Single Biggest Issue

drugs
grannys
drug usage
Drugs
Drug dealing
durgs
grannys
drugz
Drugs
Antisocialbeh
Sex

Nwt
Twoc
Drinking in parks
Twoc
Theft
Crime
Drugs
Motorbikes
Egg on the windows

Crime and to many sex

Motorbikes

Drugs

Gangs

Drugs