



D2.1 GRAFFITI VANDALISM IN PUBLIC AREAS AND TRANSPORT REPORT AND CATEGORISATION MODEL

PROJECT

Acronym: **Graffolution**

Title: ***Awareness and Prevention Solutions against Graffiti Vandalism in Public Areas and Transport***

Coordinator: **SYNYO GmbH**

Reference: **608152**

Type: Collaborative project

Programme: FP7-SEC

Theme: SEC-2013.7.2.1 – Open Topics for Small & Medium Enterprises for frequent petty crimes that are of high impact to local communities and citizens

Start: March, 2014

Duration: 24 months

Website: <http://project.graffolution.eu>

E-Mail: office@graffolution.eu

Consortium: **SYNYO GmbH**, Research & Development Department, Austria, (SYNYO)
University of Barcelona, Department of Sociology, Spain, (UB)
University of Arts London, Design Against Crime Research Centre, UK, (UAL)
Sine-Institut gGmbH, Dialogue of Science and Practice, Germany, (SINE)
Ferrocarrils de la Generalitat de Catalunya, Spain, (FGC)
London Borough of Islington, Council of Islington, UK, (LBI)
Union Internationale des Chemins de Fer, Security Division, France, (UIC)
Eticas Research & Consulting, Spain (ETICAS)

DELIVERABLE

Number:	D2.1
Title:	Graffiti vandalism in public areas and transport report and categorisation model
Lead beneficiary:	UAL
Work package:	WP2: Graffiti vandalism research, stakeholder analysis and solution elaboration
Dissemination level:	Public (PU)
Nature:	Report (R)
Due date:	July 31, 2014
Submission date:	July 31, 2014 / June 05, 2015 (re-submission)
Authors:	Marcus Willcocks, UAL Matthew Malpass, UAL Gamze Toyman, UAL Georgina Trestler, UAL Bernhard Jäger, SYNIO Gemma Galdon Clavell, ETICAS Liliana Arroyo Moliner, ETICAS Isabel Nadal Mengual, ETICAS Marina Calaf Vicente, ETICAS Sebastian Kleele, SINE Patricia Pfeil, SINE Marion Müller, SINE
Contributors:	Lorraine Gamman, UAL Paul Ekblom, UAL Peter Leitner, SYNIO Leon Meredith, LBI Joan Cantero de Matos, FGC
Reviewers:	Bernhard Jäger, SYNIO

Acknowledgement: This project has received funding from the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme for research, technological development and demonstration under grant agreement no 608152.

Disclaimer: The content of this publication is the sole responsibility of the authors, and in no way represents the view of the European Commission or its services.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	Introduction.....	5
2	Methodology	6
3	Background.....	8
4	State of the art.....	12
4.1	Graffiti vandalism categorisation models.....	12
4.1.1	Categorisation according to forms and styles	12
4.1.2	Categorisation according to Motivation.....	17
4.1.3	Categorisation within Graffiti Culture	18
4.1.4	Categorisation based on offence	19
4.1.5	Categorisations related to those who produce graffiti	24
4.1.6	Categorisation based on Public or Community perceptions of graffiti vandalism	26
4.1.7	Pro-social Models.....	27
4.2	Extent of graffiti vandalism in Europe.....	28
4.2.1	Introduction.....	29
4.2.2	Extent of Graffiti Vandalism in Public Areas.....	29
4.2.3	Extent of Graffiti Vandalism in Public Transport.....	47
4.3	Deduction of a categorisation model for the Graffolution Platform	62
5	Implications	74
6	Conclusion	78
7	Bibliography.....	79
8	Appendices	103
8.1	Keywords	103
8.2	Annotated Bibliography Example.....	106
8.3	Summary Example.....	107
8.4	Working Glossary for Graffolution	109
8.5	Graffolution Actor Typology	114

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Actor overview - Public Areas	32
Table 2: Actor overview - Public Transport.....	49
Table 3: Euros spent on cleaning Public Transport.....	54
Table 4: Type by legal framework.....	62
Table 5: Type by style or form.....	63
Table 6: Type by status	67
Table 7: Type by substrate/physical context (Location)	69
Table 8: Type by ideology.....	70
Table 9: Tools of graffiti or anti-graffiti management	71
Table 10: Type by mode of encounter	73
Table 11: Type by procedure.....	73

1 INTRODUCTION

This report builds the starting point and fundament of the Graffolution research activities. It delivers information from an extensive literature review focusing on the extent of graffiti vandalism in Europe with specific concentration on public areas and transport. Early insights showed that the available data on the extent of graffiti vandalism is very fractured which makes a consistent European wide analysis challenging. The main problem is that there are very different forms of categorising graffiti vandalism based on very different views on the topic. The report provides critical insights about these existing categorisation models that are used to compare and understand graffiti vandalism. With an international perspective it reviews existing graffiti vandalism categorisations and from the literature a consistent categorisation model is developed thereby allowing the coherent restructuring of data and subsequent integration into the Graffolution platform. In contrast to the degenerative accounts of graffiti, the review also provides pertinent accounts of the prosocial regenerative effect and use of graffiti and street art.

The following chapter describes the methodical approach that was chosen to gather and analyse the available data in a consistent way. The next section delivers essential insights of the reviewed sources and provides important background information on the gathered literature. The following state of the art chapter is divided into three subsections. Firstly, various existing categorisation models on graffiti vandalism are presented. Secondly concrete data (e.g. statistical data) is compiled for public areas as well as for public transport. Thirdly the gathered information was used to deduct a structured categorisation model. The implications chapter discusses main insights of the literature review and the conclusion section will finally give an outlook on the upcoming deliverables of Graffolution and how they will apply the insights gathered in this report.

2 METHODOLOGY

A review was conducted collaboratively with all project partners to understand the extent of graffiti vandalism and the state of the art in prevailing literature, management documentation, practice and discourse surrounding graffiti vandalism.

A body of material¹ was sourced from (a) prior research and (b) through requests made to individual and organisational contacts, predominantly from within the four partner countries - Austria, Germany, Spain and the UK – but also the project Demonstration partners, and existing and new European contacts (including the EU Crime Prevention Network) and international contacts, who were each asked to recommend relevant sources, or additional leads who could point us to key materials that may be relevant to the state of the art on graffiti vandalism (and its management) within Europe. Predominantly the resulting sources were in English language (76%), even though many of the sources were referred to us from non-natively English speaking countries, while the main other languages represented included German (16%), Spanish and Catalan (5%), French (1%), Swedish (1%) and Bulgarian (1%). The sources gathered were distributed across the project partners. The material was initially sorted into categories pertaining to:

- Graffiti writers² / Graffitiists / Street Artists - perspectives and projects
- State / Local Authorities
- Transport
- Police / Enforcement / Crime Prevention / Crime Science
- Criminology / Politics / Economics / Environment
- Cultural / Social - perspectives & projects
- Design / Urbanism / Urban Policy

Rather than allocating a particular category to each partner, each partner was allocated a sample of sources (documents) relevant across multiple categories, with the condition agreed that some adjustment was made according to language capacity in each team, where by the partners in Germany and Austria reviewed the sources published in German, the sources published in Spanish or Catalan were mostly reviewed by the partners in Spain, and the UK partners reviewed predominantly English sources, with a small number in (or translated from) Swedish, Spanish and Bulgarian.

The aim was to ensure each partner acquired a broader awareness of what is being written across the terrain, related to graffiti. As the review progressed and more sources emerged they were added to the list of documents to be reviewed.

¹ Referenced via the Graffolution Zotero library, located at https://www.zotero.org/groups/graffolution_-_sources/items

² Early on in this project some materials used the term 'sprayers', although we phased out our reliance on that term following the literature review and interviews.

An annotated bibliography was developed from more than 300 of the sources. Each partner generated a 120-150 word review for each source (see Example in the Appendix). Each annotation included five keywords from a predetermined list (see Appendix) that the reviewer considered most relevant for that source. In many cases they were different to those used by the original author; as the documents were tagged in specific relevance to the Graffolution project. If any additional keywords were required and deemed relevant, they were added to the list with a statement of justification.

Each source was given a prioritization rating with the project aims in mind: 1 high; 2 medium; 3 low. If a source was prioritised as “3 low relevance”, the reasons why it does not contribute to the Graffolution aims were noted.

The descriptive summaries considered:

- Where does the work fit within the context of the Graffolution aims?
- What kind of source the material was: scholarly article, book chapter, website, video, documentary, podcast, etc.
- What is the scope of the text e.g. does it focus on a single topic, or research area?
- Is there a central hypothesis in the text?
- If so, how is that tested?
- What conclusions, if any, does the author draw?
- Does the text offer new insights into debates on the subject?
- Does the text primarily summarise existing works?
- Has it had an impact on other practice or writing in the field – e.g. is the work referenced elsewhere in your reading?

After each partner had reviewed their allocated sources, a short (1-2 page) summary was developed to highlight salient points and findings (see example in Appendix). These documents were then reviewed by a different project partner to maintain quality, rigor and to reduce the risk of partial readings. All material is structured and synthesized as documented in this report.

This detailed review process allowed to identify and screen the most relevant materials and also ensured that all research partners achieved a well-founded understanding of the topic and the various perspectives on graffiti. This is a crucial element for all upcoming tasks within the project.

3 BACKGROUND

The identified literature is drawn from a broad range of sources and focuses on the European context but also includes a number of materials from further afield including accounts of graffiti vandalism, management and graffiti culture from the USA, Canada, New Zealand and Australia. The report includes accounts of the historical and theoretical context of graffiti in addition to documentation relating to the management and categorisation of graffiti, street art and graffiti vandalism. The literature evidences definitions of graffiti, categorisation and causes and holds a wide range of perspectives and positions including crime prevention, policing, policymaking, city councils as well as cultural and academic perspectives. In addition, it reveals how these positions are related to the duties and responsibilities of the relevant actors.

A notable project that represents the plurality of accounts included within the discourse- and this report - is the Graffiti Dialogues Network (2010). This series of workshops and research activities - which brought together members of city council departments, public transport organisations, police units, anti-graffiti associations and cleaning companies, as well as graffiti writers, academics and cultural and social engagement specialists - reflects that the different perspectives on graffiti and vandalism are based on various duties, responsibilities and interests of the relevant actors.

Within the materials related to Public Areas and those related to Transport contexts, the sources revealed both (i) evidence and methods for tackling graffiti as vandalism or 'anti-social' activity to be reduced or prevented, but also (ii) rationale and approaches to graffiti through a socially constructive lens, linked to promotion of 'pro-social' responses.

Accordingly, this report reflects sections on the extent of measures to tackle anti-social aspects of graffiti and on the extent of measures to promote pro-social aspects, within both 4.2.2 on Public Areas, and 4.2.3 on Transport contexts. We therefore introduce two categories; two broad views of the management of graffiti vandalism deduced from the prevailing literature:

- **Tackling anti-social aspects of graffiti:** Degenerative accounts of graffiti (as vandalism), and the prevention/reduction techniques used to tackle them.
- **Promoting pro-social aspects of graffiti and street art:** Constructive (generative, regenerative and restorative) effects and uses as well as related responses to graffiti and street art.

The sources reviewed demonstrate that in crime statistics graffiti is mainly categorised as forms of anti-social behaviour, malicious damage or unauthorised devaluation of property. Here we especially observe close associations between graffiti and minor ASBO (anti-social behaviour order) or illegal patterns. The activity is very often grouped together and not distinguished from activities such as littering, people being drunk or disorderly conduct in public spaces and is surveyed together with other forms of vandalism and damage to property (Office for National Statistics UK, 2011). However

other authors (e.g. San Diego Police Department, 2000) argue the need to distinguish incidents of graffiti from all other vandalism reports in order to develop strategies to tackle the graffiti problem effectively.

The screened materials also hold information on the cost of Graffiti Removal and Security Perception (Association of London Government Transport and Environment Committee, 2005). Here the authors primarily view graffiti as “a costly and annoying expression of anti-social behaviour that can undermine our sense of well-being, making us feel uncomfortable in our own neighbourhoods” (p.3).

The gathered literature includes work identifying primary sites for graffiti vandalism, for example Geason and Wilson (1990) categorise the primary sites for Graffiti Vandalism Spaces that are strongly connected to graffiti are public housing, public transport, schools, public telephones and public areas.

The British Transport Police Dedicated Graffiti Unit describe their understanding of graffiti offenders (as they characterise them):

The typical offender? ... between 15 and 23, white, and also involved in low level drug use of some kind. but that doesn't describe everyone - some vandals continue into middle age, as demonstrated by a 37-year-old currently in the Unit's sights. The graffiti culture is all about kudos... A writer's status is based on how prolific they are, how well-executed their graffiti is and where they do it, amongst other things. The more prolific the vandal is and the more high profile their target - i.e. a train carriage - the more kudos they acquire. (BTP, 2011: 9)

However, while public bodies and officials focus on graffiti as an antisocial act, some authors and commentators identify prosocial effects and opportunities linked to graffiti. This reveals that categorisations as ‘anti-social’ and ‘criminal’ are not always productive or cost-efficient ways of managing graffiti. Ferrell (1995) describes graffiti as a form of resistance which can be interpreted as social construction rather than destruction, and which may or may not constitute vandalism, dependent on multiple factors in parallel with legal status. On the other hand, it raises the fact that graffiti has been commodified as a consumer product, and has multiple times been reported as a market good (see, for example, Koon-Hwee, 2001; Theis, 2003; BBC, 2008; NuART, 2009; Cullinane, 2011; Vaughan, 2011; Molnar, 2011; Albro, 2014). We have seen graffiti and street art deployed as ‘guerrilla’ and ‘viral’ mediums for advertising and marketing campaigns (Lucas and Dorrian, 2006; Himpe, 2006; Goldman and Papson, 2000) as well as for city promotion and tourism (BBC, 2014 & 2008; Vowles, 2012; Australia Network News, 2013; Cowper, 2008). Similarly, Halsey and Young (2002) outline graffiti in terms of its diverse manifestations, its cultural forms and its causes. Attention is thereby directed towards illegal graffiti in public areas, that is, on trains (although trains are a part of the public transportation, they also exist within the public areas) and street walls. However, they also argue that the line between legitimate and illegitimate images is far less defined than expected. This is further considered in Hayward’s (2006) report of AskBristol that documents that there is a difference between graffiti as vandalism and street art and that public perceptions of

graffiti do not always align with the categorisation of graffiti as vandalism. Johnson (2011) explains the relation between disorder and crime in a community and shows that the different perceptions that society has about graffiti depend on what kind of graffiti people see and in what contexts. Illegitimate graffiti is not clearly a problem of crime or community safety in every instance.

In a more extreme thesis D'Amico and Block (2004), argue that graffiti should not be illegal, rather that it is not vandalism but an attack upon 'illegitimate government' of space and cities. Wilson (1987) writes that graffiti and vandalism cannot be seen as a static phenomenon, but rather shows dynamic variety in type and intensity that differentiate between countries and even between the cities of one country. These arguments can be associated with Cohen's (1972) seven categories of vandalism which details that vandalism is neither meaningless nor does it come in one simple form and that graffiti vandalism is not simple to categorise (see Petterson & Stafford, 2004; Wilson & Healy, 1986).

In contrast to 'illegal activity', the literature includes accounts of the use of graffiti by 'legitimate bodies' in advertising and public service campaigns. For example graffiti has been used as an advertising method for the police in New Zealand in their Christchurch ambient recruitment campaign (Doak, 2011). This is significant in that increasing numbers of law enforcement services (separately for example, Cheshire and Northumbria Police, UK) are using graffiti techniques for their own purposes and campaigns. This highlights the importance of questions related to what is being prevented and how notions of BWT/disorder and pro-social are defined in practice.

Reviewed materials also hold sources that give a background overview towards the categorisation of graffiti as vandalism and the cultural origins of the practice. Young (2014) examines the histories and taxonomies of street art, the motivations of street artists, the experiences of making street art and spectating street art in public space. Ferrell (1995) inquires about the ethical and cultural origins of graffiti as a product of political issues, authority and control. Lachman (1995) explains the development of graffiti in the different urban spaces. Klausner (n.d.) argues that rather than modern artists or academics, it was graffiti that was able to provide an honest representation of the conditions in the American society in the post-war era and argues that the graffiti artists grew up in modern urban living conditions. Klausner (n.d) and Fox Gotham, et al. (2001) detail Manual Castell's argument that space is "not a reflection of society, it is its expression. In other words: space is not a photocopy of society, it is society". In similar terms Borja and Muxí (2003) describe how culture and publics are defined through the activities and discourses played out in all kinds of shared urban contexts, be they public, privately managed 'public' areas, or transport. The authors insist that these spaces should guarantee equality through forms of appropriation on behalf of different social or cultural collectives, leaving the challenge as between affording wider definitions of "citizenship" or else "barbarism". The following expands on these themes specifically focusing on the problem and

management of graffiti vandalism in the European context, and in parallel, the opportunities that regenerative approaches to graffiti management and categorisation might offer.

4 STATE OF THE ART

4.1 Graffiti vandalism categorisation models

The review identifies a number of approaches used to categorise graffiti and graffiti vandalism. These include categorisation according to the type, form and the style of graffiti; categorisation according to the motivations of the graffiti writer; categorisation according to legal conditions and graffiti as an offence. Additionally the review identified categorisation, hierarchies and quality management and informal rules from within the practice and culture of graffiti writing. The categorisation models are relevant to and useful for both Public Areas and Public Transport. If a certain aspect refers more specifically to one of these two contexts, then this is noted. For example, in 4.4.1 the discussions on graffiti as typical youth crime are specified in terms of the context they refer to. However, 4.2 on the extent of graffiti vandalism clearly differentiates Public Areas and Public Transport, and delves into the details of factors, impacts, and stakeholders in these two specific contexts.

Related to graffiti categorisation models as well as subsequent stages of the wider Graffolution project, the D2.1 Appendix includes a Working Glossary for Graffolution (8.4) as well as a Graffolution Actor Typology (8.5). The Working Glossary is treated as a live document, which has already been updated a number of times since the original submission of D2.1, so the current latest version is now included in this updated submission. The Actor Typology provides a more detailed break-down for the categories and groupings of actors, the types of disciplines, communities, organisations and individuals represented, through the Actor types used within Graffolution.

4.1.1 Categorisation according to forms and styles

The review reveals categories for graffiti styles, case studies, statistical data, attitudes towards graffiti, factors influencing reporting of graffiti and graffiti tackling strategies. The authors categorise graffiti into a number of types. There is however a grey area in which the definition of certain categories are related to both the forms and styles but also to the motivations behind the graffiti. These two dimensions are often intertwined. For instance advertising and gang graffiti. Accordingly, where possible some of these are discussed towards the latter part of this forms and styles section (4.1.1), in the lead up to the section on motivations (4.2.2). The graffiti types categorised in the Campbell, Keep Britain Tidy (2008) report include: tags, stencils, contentious graffiti, scratches, gang graffiti, conventional graffiti, ideological graffiti, juvenile and ghost. The Campbell report takes a slightly more neutral approach than some by categorising graffiti based on forms and styles (e.g. tags, stencil, scratches), but also includes partial terms like 'contentious'. Weisel (2004 & 2009) presents four different types/categories of graffiti are presented: gang graffiti, tagger graffiti, conventional graffiti, and ideological graffiti. For each category featured styles and underlying motives are presented and may be useful to consider in the development of any categorisation model.

The following listing is developed principally from the work of Callin (2002), Weisel (2004), Keep Britain Tidy (Encams) (2007), and others. Categories discussed include but are not limited to:

Tags: Common tags and artistic tags

Campbell (Encams / Keep Britain Tidy) (2007) describes tags as: “Stylised personal graphic identifiers depicting names or nicknames, which are often large and in bold colours. Tags can be pictorial, drawn free hand or using stencils, and are usually painted with spray cans or drawn with marker pens” (6). Tagger graffiti is divided into two sections: common tags and artistic tags. Artistic tagger graffiti involves creative expression, providing a source of pride in the creation of complex works of art. Most taggers seek notoriety and recognition of their graffiti (Brassaï, 1993). In the context of the artistic tagger, recognition and prestige link us to categorisation within graffiti sub-cultures and artistic hierarchy. Accordingly, prolonged visibility due to the sheer volume, scale and complexity of the graffiti, and placement of the graffiti in hard-to-reach places or in transit systems, enhances satisfaction (Weisel, 2004; Keats, 2008). A tagger expresses the same motif over and over again, which becomes the tagger's unique signature that can be recognised.

Many graffiti writers are also members of groups known as ‘crews’ that regularly meet in person or online to discuss where to write their graffiti. Crews are formed by members of varying age groups, who have a ‘crew tag’ as well as their own individual ones and may follow codes of conduct such as not placing their tags on places of worship, trees or over another person’s tag (Uncategorised, 2006; Keats, 2008). While tags generally have simple designs, the more elaborate and complex forms of graffiti are also part of the tagging culture. These types of graffiti are more difficult and time-consuming to produce than simple tags and are understood to be underpinned in greater part by artistic motives.

An important point here is that unlike gang graffiti, tag graffiti represents personal expressions of the taggers, and they are an end in themselves, not a threat of something else (U.S. Department of Justice, 1999). Another difference is that crews’ primary focus is the graffiti, while gangs use graffiti as a form of communication to define their territories and promote their criminal activities (Alonso, 1998; Keats, 2008).

Hip hop graffiti

This is defined a form of graffiti that involves a person using spray paint, or wide felt tip pens, to write or draw an identifying word, similar to a nickname, on a space that is generally exposed to the public, most infamously on trains and the walls of buildings. Its origin is generally identified to be New York City of the 1970’s. Chang (2005) also defines how graffiti was not a phenomenon in itself but part of the hip-hop culture, which was embedded in the lives of the urban citizens in New York. It is closely aligned with hip hop music culture, in that people who practice graffiti are also interested in hip hop music and associated activities such as break dancing. It is therefore referred to commonly as

‘hip hop graffiti’. Over the years, hip-hop graffiti has developed its own culture, including history, rules, language and legend.

Scratches

Marks caused by the deliberate use of a sharp instrument to cut into painted surfaces, wood, plastic, brick etc. However, if these scratches form words, then they should be classified as ‘juvenile’ or ‘tags’ as appropriate” (Keep Britain Tidy (Encams), 2007)

Political/social

Involves words expressing a political or social viewpoint displayed in a prominent public place. Political/social graffiti can be random or organised. Many will be familiar with the Billboard Utilising Graffitiist Against Unhealthy Promotions (‘BUGA UP’) movement in the 1980’s. BUGA Up was responsible for attacking the advertising billboards of cigarette companies all over Sydney and in other parts of NSW and Australia by spray-painting slogans and the BUGA UP name.

Stencil

Any graffiti which has been sprayed through a stencil, unless it is deemed that it forms a ‘tag’ (Keep Britain Tidy (Encams), 2007)

Humorous

Opportunistic writing of a humorous nature often appears on advertising billboards, bathroom doors and walls.

Racist

Racist graffiti vilifying certain groups in different communities occurs on city walls, bathrooms, and public transport.

Offensive graffiti

Brighton Council (2013) and Pascoe (2011) detail offensive graffiti as any words or images, which may be: ageist; anti-faith; homophobic; personal; political; racist; sexist; and/or swear words.

Contentious

Closely related to offensive graffiti. “Any graffiti, which could be offensive to particular members of the general public. This would include any obscene, racist, political or religious graffiti” (Keep Britain Tidy (Encams), 2007).

Malicious

Pointless, malicious graffiti includes scratches, names, obscenities and other words written or marked into a variety of surfaces including seats on public transport, school yards, public toilets etc. As noted above, it appears that the practice of ‘tagging’ is becoming more and more distinguished

from hip hop graffiti culture and can more accurately be located within this category of malicious graffiti. Some other forms of vandalism, such as slashing seats on trains, are closely related to this form of graffiti.

Juvenile

“Generally takes the form of “x loves y” type messages or lists of first names. They are usually written with felt-tip or marker pens” (Keep Britain Tidy (Encams), 2007)

Ghost

“Graffiti which has been partially removed or has faded to such an extent that it has lost its initial visual impact” (Keep Britain Tidy (Encams), 2007).

Ideological graffiti

Ideological graffiti expresses hostility or a grievance – often quite explicitly. In its content such graffiti usually reflects a political, religious, ethnic, or other bias. For example, racist graffiti goes into this category (Heward & Hook 2013). Offenders may strategically target certain locations to further the message (Weisel, 2004; Keats, 2008).

Gang Graffiti

Some gangs use Graffiti as a method of marking out territory and intimidating rival gang members. In contrast to conventional and ideological graffiti, the primary motive for gang graffiti is tactical; the graffiti serves as a public form of communication – to mark turf, convey threats or boast of achievements (Weisel, 2004, 2009; Keats, 2008). Alonso (1998) explains that gang graffiti serves a) as an important text to understand the groups that practice graffiti writing, as the graffiti delineates space, and re-emphasises existing territory, b) as a tool of communication, as it constantly challenges the hegemonic discourses of the dominant, and c) as an aid to understand the social and cultural positioning of these marginalized groups. Gang graffiti are intended to represent the presence of a gang, and possibly convey a threat of gang violence in the neighbourhood (U.S. Department of Justice, 1999).

While this form of graffiti is widespread in many American cities, sources reviewed suggest it is far less common in Europe and Australia (Weisel, 2004; Griffin Security Consultants, 2008). This is primarily because there are not as many gangs operating in European or Australian cities and those that do, such as biker gangs, do not generally use graffiti. “Often used by gangs to mark turf or convey threats of violence, and sometimes copycat graffiti, which mimics gang graffiti” (Keats, 2008; Heward & Hook, 2013; Weisel, 2004). Among the empirical and statistically evidenced examples, one paper (Barbaro, et al. 2013) reports that gang territory formation (in public areas) does not depend on gang-to-gang interactions if gang graffiti is occurring. Barbaro asserts that this can have negative

and positive implications, in increases of gang-associated risks but also possible reductions of physical violence associated with gang-to-gang interactions.

Graffiti advertising

This category focuses on advertising in public spaces and the relation between graffiti and advertising. The literature here acknowledges graffiti as part of the spaces people inhabit. This leads to the idea that the major factors that drive attitudes towards graffiti and “graffiti prevention” are authorship (who is responsible) and aesthetics (what appears) of the signs that occupy the space (Halsey & Young, 2002; Hayward, 2006; McNichols, 2006; Lederman, 2012; Graffiti.org, 2014). This takes us to the existence of other signs and practices such as advertising in public spaces. Respectively, Halsey and Young argue:

...the line separating so-called “archetypal” instances of graffiti (pieces, tags, slogans) from other forms and techniques of marking the world, is a line far less defined than any straightforward opposition between legitimate and illegitimate images. For, in a sense, are not companies like Nike, Coca-Cola and McDonalds prime examples of what might be termed “corporate taggers”, “corporate muralists” and “corporate sloganeers”? (2002: 180)

This understanding leads to a link between advertising and graffiti, where both practices share messages in public spaces. Another point here is branding through graffiti, where for example, corporate companies use graffiti style in their commercials or packaging (Koon-Hwee, 2001). This is taken to the next level by police units or anti-graffiti organisations using graffiti styles to promote graffiti prevention or other public announcement campaigns (Doak, 2011).

Closely related to the discussions above, we also observe the emergence of graffiti as a reaction to advertising, and the motivation behind graffiti writing as a way to reclaim public spaces from excessive commercialisation (McNichols, 2006 & 2014; Molnár, 2011). This is very much link to the following model “Categorisation according to motivation”. The key question here is about the availability of public space and to whom it is available to:

Why, they [graffiti art community] wonder, can Coke, Wells Fargo, the IRS or the Army inject themselves so easily into our public space, while artists and activists with a variety of critiques must stand on the sidelines or be accused of creating “visual pollution”? (McNichols, 2006)

Accordingly, it is argued here that graffiti, specifically critical works, have the ability to question the dominance of the consumer culture, and advertising as an essential part of this culture, which take place in the public spaces (Mouffe, 2007).

Evolution and development of practice

This is not a categorisation in itself but helps to understand that many graffiti writers switch or progress from one style to another over time, and that writers frequently operate across more than one category in parallel. Separate insights from multiple contributors to the Graffiti Dialogues

Network workshops (2008-2014), suggest that the majority of graffiti writers or graffiti vandals experience, intentionally or unintentionally, a journey, or evolving 'career' (Farington, 1992) through their practice and activities. The most likely possible stages, steps or experiences are described in conversation colloquially but usefully as: "Get up"; "Get bored"; "Grow up"; "Get nicked"; "Get a USP" (Gamman, 2011; Meredith, 2013). These have no fixed order, though they helpfully remind us of some of the key differences in perspective and evolution among practitioners of graffiti. Some start less destructive and end up more destructive, while others start more destructive and end up less destructive and more constructive. The sources reviewed make clear that Graffiti writers and their activities are certainly not all the same and most change forms (categories) of intervention (including destructive and constructive interventions) and approaches over time (Bannister, 2013; Cullinane, 2011; Haworth et al., 2013; Iveson, 2008; Lewisohn, 2009; McAuliffe, 2013; Neelon, 2003; Stik, 2010). This problematises policies and modes of categorisation which group graffiti or graffiti vandalism activities and other crimes into mixed classifications - for example Keizer et al. (2008) on broken windows theory, or HM Government, UK (1971) on criminal damage. Graffiti practitioners also experiment with making different legal and illegal works simultaneously and develop their practice according to situation, context, opportunity, political and cultural trends and spend time finding and evolving their own 'styles' or 'approaches' (Meredith, 2013; Cullinane, 2011; Gamman & Willcocks, 2009; Woodward, 2009; Clarke, 1973).

4.1.2 Categorisation according to Motivation

A number of sources reviewed categorise graffiti vandalism according to motivations. The literature that focuses on the categorisation based on motivations argue that in order to develop a better understanding of graffiti and vandalism, and develop sustainable solutions to tackle with the problem, there is a need to identify different types of graffiti and distinguish the various motivations behind the act (see, for example, Wilson & Healy, 1986; Lachman, 1995; Young, 2014). In this context, Lachman (1995) argues that the motivation is the main reason for a possible graffiti writer to create a painting on a wall. Here a crucial point is to come up with a framework that helps clarify the motivations behind graffiti vandalism or other graffiti acts, and determines the appropriateness of various responses to it. These responses tend to vary and depend on the perceptions of individuals or organisations (Cohen, 1973; Wilson & Healy, 1986).

Within the literature we can identify a number of different types of graffiti: conventional graffiti, ideological graffiti, gang graffiti, tagger graffiti (common tags and artistic tags) and finally graffiti motivated to reclaim public spaces (Keats, 2008; Weisel, 2004 & 2009; U.S. Department of Justice, 1999; Kennedy, Braga & Piehl, 1997; Heward & Hook, 2013; McNichols, 2006). The discussions here points to the paradoxical nature of graffiti writing, a) as vandalism, but also b) freedom of expression and c) art; and therefore does not categorise the act of graffiti writing as an anti-social behaviour or vandalism as a whole. Yet, it establishes vandalism as part of it.

British Transport Police (2012) identify ‘Serious vandals versus opportunistic scrawler’ as two key graffiti vandal groups, however they do not define what they mean by them. The lack of definition limits the application of these categories.

The Graffolution deliverable D2.2 explores the motivations further, particularly in terms of ‘influence factors’, drawing on learning from the literature review and from interviewed graffiti writers.

Conventional Graffiti

While not exclusively a motivation, style or form ‘conventional graffiti’ is a term used by a number of authors to discuss commonly held perceptions of what ‘graffiti’ may refer to and motivations variously associated to familiar forms. ‘Conventional graffiti’ often refers mostly to tagging. While it can be seen as a non-malicious act, it can also reflect hostility towards society. Traditionally conventional graffiti is represented as a youthful “rite of passage” (Weisel, 2004, 2009; Koon-Hwee, 2001). This type of graffiti tends to be spontaneous and not malicious in nature. They tend to be isolated acts and give basic messages such as ‘Paul was here’. They are simple in design and do not have any artistic motivations – unlike the larger and more elaborate forms of graffiti (see categorisation based on form and style) (Keats, 2008). They tend to appear in “fair targets” such as abandoned buildings or schools. On the other hand, some conventional graffiti may arise from deeper negative emotions such as despair, resentment, failure, and/or frustration, in which case it may be vindictive or malicious (Weisel, 2004). In these cases vandalism becomes almost a cathartic act.

4.1.3 Categorisation within Graffiti Culture

The literature illustrates the systems of quality management existing within the community of practice. Accounts of self-policing are cited. Spicer (2005, 2007) analyses hierarchies within graffiti subcultures and related categorisation is based on skill level. Among practitioners there are certain taboos when writing. For example, it is argued that memorials, private properties and places of worship are typically respected by graffiti writers and are usually not targeted (You Suck Until Further Notice, 2006; Colt 45, 2010). The literature reveals some of the key don'ts: writing on houses of worship, people's houses, other writer's names, tombstones, memorial walls and cars as well as involving civilians in one's practice. The excerpt reflects, as opposed to what some may suggest, graffiti writing is not without rules and should not be considered as an uncontrollable phenomenon. It is significant in the way that it provides information on how some graffiti writers approach their practice. Here, we observe graffiti artists as a sub-type within graffiti writer.

4.1.4 Categorisation based on offence

The literature evidenced a number of organisations where the act of writing is always considered anti-social and criminal. It is categorised as anti-social behaviour such as littering, people being drunk or rowdy in public spaces or drug dealing and often surveyed together with other forms of vandalism and damage to property (Office for National Statistics (UK), 2011). UK Criminologists Begum, Johnson and Ekblom (2009) categorise graffiti as a form of anti-social behaviour. Stafford (2003) writes how graffiti means a careless and indifferent society arguing that it follows Wilson and Kelling's (1982) broken windows theory.

Kelling and Wilson's (1982) broken windows theory is a criminological theory of the norm setting and signalling effect of urban disorder and vandalism on additional crime and anti-social behaviour. Keizer, Lindenberg and Steg (2008) imply that all graffiti generates the same negative effect and builds towards disorder, however their study does not measure other factors in the environment where graffiti has been carried out. It is therefore difficult to know if graffiti is the absolute and only contributing factor to building urban disorder and leads to further anti social behaviour (ASB), vandalism and criminality. Following on from this, the Tipping Point by Malcolm Gladwell (2002) asserted that Kelling and Wilson's theory fits within and is supported by the notion that ideas, behaviour, messages, and products often spread like outbreaks of infectious disease, which cause major changes in our society that often happen suddenly and unexpectedly. However, more recently in interview with Jon Ronson for the BBC, Malcolm Gladwell has expressed that he 'overstated' in regard to his blanket support for broken windows theory in writing for the Tipping Point and that if he could, he would like to review how his writing has been widely interpreted (Ronson, 2013). This is significant in relation to policy on graffiti vandalism, much of which has been influenced by the theories of broken windows and the tipping point.

Vandalism, graffiti and environmental nuisance

Vandalism is most commonly defined as (any or all of) meaningless, wanton, malicious, and ignorant. Wilful, senseless damage or devaluation of others' or public property or property which has some inherent artistic, social or historical value. Geason and Wilson (1990) gathered existent types of vandalism (e.g. acquisitive vandalism, tactical vandalism, ideological vandalism) and possible motivations (e.g. boredom, revenge, anger, exploration, aesthetic experience etc.) and connect them to graffiti vandalism.

OFFENCE CATEGORISATION EXAMPLES I

The UK Criminal Damage Act 1971 makes graffiti and other forms of vandalism a criminal offence. If the value of the damage is less than £5,000, the penalty is a maximum fine of £2,500 and/or three months imprisonment [Section 33[1] Magistrates' Court Act 1980] and the court may also make a Compensation Order.

Aiding or abetting the act of graffiti and other vandalism attracts the same penalty. It is unclear however whether this would apply to a shopkeeper who recklessly sells spray cans to a minor/youth? English common or case law would be different from how it is handled in Roman law-based countries, for example, France.

Possessing equipment with intent to cause damage is also an offence in the UK and, if intent can be proven to the court, a spray paint can would be included as such equipment.

Clarke (1997) assessed measures of crime prevention. He highlights the need to focus on the solution of the problem in the configuration of the crime itself, and not of the criminals, as it has traditionally been done: the accent is placed on detecting and punishing the criminal, but not stopping the crime. An increase of countermeasures has seemed sufficient but the article describes this as problematic in trying to control crime: instead of reducing crime, it increases the security sensitivity of the population, and leads to increased surveillance and social control. Thus, the author proposes 25 techniques to reduce the opportunity for crime, through increased security measures and the increase in the perception of risk. Significant to note are the indicated successes of the plan - reporting crime reductions of about 50% - and also failures, which can both serve as a guide or example for the Graffolution project.

Arguably Clarke does not consider the impact of isolated security measures on wider environments and perceptions of different communities.

The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 introduced Anti-Social Behaviour Orders that can be applied to anyone over the age of 10 years who causes harassment, alarm or distress to others through his or her actions.

The Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001 includes a provision that allows the police to issue a fixed penalty notice to a person aged 18 years or older found committing an act of criminal damage. The consultation paper that preceded the legislation commented that only minor examples of this offence would be suitable for a fixed penalty.

OFFENCE CATEGORISATION EXAMPLES II

In March 2001, the UK Government made available financial support for local authority schemes to tackle litter. The Government also set out a new code of conduct to reduce takeaway litter and an advisory group to review existing legislation. Many local authorities already had litter wardens and issue £25 fixed penalty notices to those responsible for litter. Magistrates have the power to fine individuals up to £2,500 for non-payment. In response to increasing public concern, the Anti Social Behaviour Unit was set up in the Home Office in January 2003. That Unit has developed an Anti Social Behaviour Action Plan and disseminated good practice for tackling such behaviour through Anti Social Behaviour Orders and Acceptable Behaviour Contracts.

The 2003 Anti Social Behaviour Bill has the objective of providing the tools for practitioners and agencies to effectively tackle anti social behaviour. It contains measures drawn up from across five Government Departments and aims to clarify, streamline and reinforce the powers available to practitioners (Department of Transport, 2003).

The Department for Environment and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) categorises 'Graffiti and Fly-Posting' as a single anti-social offence, which can attract fixed penalty notices (FPN) of between £50-80 GBP, with the default set at £75 GBP, under section s.43 of the ASB Act 2003. The legislation s.96 CNEA in fact groups penalties for "graffiti and fly-posting" within "Litter; Litter Clearing Notices; Street Litter Control; Notices; Unauthorised distribution of literature; Graffiti and fly-posting; Dog Control Orders" (DEFRA, 2006).

StatCentral, Ireland's official statistics portal, classifies Graffiti within its categorisation for vandalism together with other kinds of damage: Vandalism: Graffiti; Broken windows or doors; Damaged fences etc.; Other property damage; Vehicle damage to windows or doors; Other vehicle damage; Other (StatCentral.ie, 2014).

Vandalism and graffiti do not come in one simple form. Moreover vandalism is not a precise label for a legal offence but a colloquial term with a strong emotive connotation. Its popular usage is imprecise and the meaning attached to it tends to differ according to the definer's point of view. This often results in a stereotyped use of 'vandalism' as a label, which obscures both the reasons for the behaviour, and the appropriateness of the social control measures, which are encouraged or justified by the term's emotive connotations.

Cohen's (1973) seven categories of vandalism, encompassing but not limited to graffiti, provides not only a clarification of the motivation for vandalism but also a framework for determining appropriateness of various responses to it.

- 1 Acquisitive vandalism. Damage done in order to acquire money or property, e.g. damaging telephone boxes
- 2 Tactical vandalism. Damage done as conscious tactic to achieve another end.
- 3 Ideological vandalism. Damage done to further a cause or communicate a message, e.g. slogans on buildings
- 4 Vindictive vandalism. Damage done to gain revenge, e.g. breaking school windows because of perceived unfairness by teachers
- 5 Play vandalism. Damage inflicted incidentally or deliberately as part of a game or competition, e.g. who can break the most window
- 6 Malicious vandalism. Damage as an expression of rage or frustration, e.g. scratching the paintwork on expensive cars
- 7 Innocuous vandalism. Damage done to property defined by youth as unimportant or of no value, e.g. slashing railway seats.

Within the data analysed (surveys and complaint statistics from the UK, Germany and Austria) innocuous vandalism damage to property comes across as a main heading (Bundesministerium des Innern 2010; BM.I Bundesministerium für Inneres 2010 Kemme et al., 2011; Polizeipräsident Berlin 2007 and 2013; Islington Council, 2014). Here, however the data cover graffiti along with other factors that causes property damage, which makes it hard to comprehend how much of the damage was directly caused by graffiti vandalism.

Further aspects of offender motivation are covered at a generic level in criminology rather than specific to graffiti. The Conjunction of Criminal Opportunity (Eckblom, 2010) draws together several approaches in Situational Crime Prevention and identifies a range of immediate causes of criminal events and behaviour, and in particular distinguishes between an actual or potential offenders:

- Predisposition to offend (which could include attitudes to public/private property, aggression, and a range of more or less permanent goals relating to Cohen's classification eg the need to play, the need for revenge etc (Ekblom 2007).
- Resources to avoid offending (eg empathy with potential victims, self-control, wherewithall for finding legitimate entertainment)
- Readiness to offend (shorter-term state of motivation/emotion covering eg boredom, stress, need for esteem or excitement here and now)
- Decision to offend in the immediate crime situation (based on perception of risk of arrest or other harm, effort and reward including the rewards that relate to Cohen's goals)

Wortley (2008) describes a two-stage crime precipitation process in which motivation/emotion are awakened by influences in the crime situation (or close before it in space and time) and that motivation then leads the offender to exploit or otherwise respond to the crime opportunity in that situation. Precipitators comprise Prompts (alerting them to a suitable target, occasion or place for graffiti – e.g. presence of prior graffiti), Provocations (e.g a poster seen as authoritarian), Permissions and Pressures (e.g. from any peers present).

Graffiti is also listed within the potential factors that can separately lead to fear of crime in public spaces such as being drunk in public, making noise, and littering as well as robbery, car theft and burglary (Gary et al. 2008; Breetzke and Pearson, 2014). This recognises graffiti as a visible “signal of risk” (Innes 2004). This also leads to graffiti or other anti-social behaviours’ potential to encourage further anti-social activities. This leads to a significant point: concern of crime, feeling of insecurity and fear are the products of social construction of the crime (Innes 2004). Accordingly, the perception of security and insecurity depend on a) the view of individuals, b) where the graffiti is observed, and c) what kind of graffiti is observed (Johnson, 2011; Arudo 2003; Breetzke and Pearson, 2014; Kirchner 2014). For example, in terms of understanding the relationship between disorder and fear of crime we need to take into account other factors in a given space such as bad livelihood conditions and poverty (social conditions) and vulnerability (individual factors) (Breetzke and Pearson, 2014). Here another factor is media’s role in encouraging social panics (Innes 2004). These discussions are useful in relation to understanding the perception of crime in public spaces as an “system” or an “engine” and graffiti in specific instances becoming a part of these dynamically interacting factors. The discussions here also can be interpreted as the criminalization of graffiti can lead to fear of graffiti and has influence over its perception.

While categorised as anti social behaviour, within criminology there are a number of subcategories used to define the act in terms of severity and or situation. Begum, Johnson and Ekblom (2009) subcategorise writing as environmental Anti Social Behaviour. Moreover, in practice in order to adjust their countermeasures, within the transportation context the British Transport Police (2012) divides perpetrators in two categories: the serious vandal and the scrawler. Transport for London (TfL) defines the ‘Serious Vandal’ as someone who is often involved with other types of crime, such

as drugs and robberies, and our efforts to bring them to justice can help to reduce other instances of crime on the railways too. The ‘Scrawler’ is an opportunist.

Graffiti as typical youth crime

Jacobson & Kirby (2012) and Spicer, (2005 & 2007) describe graffiti as typical youth crime and anti-social behaviour. Additionally, Landeskriminalamt NRW (2006). categorise graffiti as a symptom of ‘youth delinquency’ as a whole. Geason, S., Wilson P. R. (1990). Theories of vandalism link graffiti vandalism to youth delinquency and The Youth Action Bulletin briefly describes negative effects of vandalism and graffiti vandalism. (US Department of Justice and Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 1998). However, in practice there are other accounts of the main perpetrators for example in the UK London transport context John Strutton, Community Safety and Crime Prevention manager for Transport for London states that based on TfL research most of the graffiti is not done by youths or juveniles but by adults (Strutton, 2011).

In the context of UK public areas, Home Office 2008/09 British Crime Survey that covers England and Wales reveals that two-thirds of people either did not perceive a problem with any of the seven types of ASB or perceived a problem with only one of them (43% and 18% respectively). When three types of ASB were perceived together, the most common combinations were teenagers hanging around, litter and vandalism or graffiti (Flatley, et al., 2009).

Again In the context of UK public areas, Cooper (2011) includes graffiti as an example youth crime that can be dealt with successfully through restorative justice measures. He writes that the “restorative justice method helps young people understand the harm caused by their actions without ruining their lives with a criminal record” (p.1).

Graffiti as gender-weighted activity

The issue of gender did not appear frequently during the literature review, although some sources and authors do confirm that this is a predominantly masculine activity (e.g. Castleman, 2011; Rahn, 2002; Macdonald, 2002; Bates et.al 1980). There is some evidence of a number of female ‘street artists’ (Young, 2013; Acton 2010; Signal Project, 2009) but less reported as graffiti writers or vandals.

4.1.5 Categorisations related to those who produce graffiti

How do we characterise those who produce graffiti? For the purposes of Graffolution research and deliverables, we have predominantly referred to the term ‘graffiti writer’, as one of the least-biased and most readily understood terms we could identify. Inevitably it is not without its problems. Some crime prevention practitioners consider this term too flattering, while some who make graffiti prefer to be referred to as artists, or indeed vandals. However, the reality is that many of the related practices have either direct or associated connection with, writing letters or words using graffiti

styles, approaches and methods. Hence our use of the term ‘graffiti writer’ does not in itself intentionally prejudice in favour, of or against, the individuals who make the graffiti interventions in public areas and/or transport contexts. Rather the term refers to the material practice itself. We could have equally used other terms, such as ‘graffitist’ (not common in English, although its translations work well in certain other languages), ‘graffiti painter’, ‘graffiti producer’ other comparable, or other near-impartial terms but we did not see fit to introduce additional lexicon in this, already jargon-dense territory.

Within the deliverables, we have also used other more loaded terms ranging from ‘offender’, to ‘perpetrator’, through to ‘tagger’, ‘street artist’, and more. In these cases, it is typically because we are referring to perspectives taken by others.

How the graffiti producer is labelled and characterised between dutyholders and stakeholders depends totally on the discourse being adopted, and if – as suggested – we need awareness and agility to switch discourses as appropriate, there can be no single ‘right answer. However, it may be possible to establish a convention to create as much terminological stability as possible. It may also be necessary to simplify things for end-users of Graffolution outputs, though over-simplification will likely incur penalties in the long run.

- From perspective of crime prevention and legal processes, it is important to distinguish the positions of crime prevention and criminal justice, and to note that the same actions (e.g. law enforcement, prosecution, trial, conviction and punishment) can serve the societal goals of both justice (i.e. retribution and/or restoration) and prevention. Prevention itself can be implemented in several institutional settings, principally judicial/enforcement and civil (i.e. the activities of the everyday world undertaken by people and organisations outside the criminal justice system). In the former setting the graffiti producer is variously a suspect, a perpetrator/offender, the accused party or defendant in court, the convicted or the cautioned. Statistical tables of arrests, criminal proceedings etc. usually give clear definitions of which of these roles are being presented although unfortunately they do not present the offence of graffiti as a distinct category. From the perspective of civil crime prevention, the graffiti producer is an offender or potential offender. The status here partly depends on the targeting strategy: universal (where everyone is equivalently a potential offender), selective (where we can identify those at elevated risk of offending, e.g. on the basis of risk factors such as having friends who do illegal graffiti) or indicated (where we have someone whom we know has done illegal graffiti, and perhaps has been convicted for it. These categories are used by Wilson and Lipsey (2007) and correspond to the less helpful ‘primary, secondary and tertiary prevention categories introduced by Brantingham and Faust (1976) and used by van Dijk and de Waard (1991). To the extent that graffiti writers encourage and assist one

another they may also be considered as ‘crime promoters’, a role identified within the Conjunction of Criminal Opportunity (Ekblom 2011) as individuals, groups or organisations that increase the risk of criminal events committed by others, whether unintentionally, recklessly or deliberately. Third parties such as shopkeepers who sell spray cans and other resources for offending to potential/actual graffiti writers also come under one of these promoter categories.

- From civil law or restorative justice perspectives, it is possible there are varying terms; certainly in civil law the parties to the conflict may be less strongly negatively labelled. For example, in English civil law there is now a ‘complainant’ (formerly plaintiff), and the other party is the ‘defendant’; whereas restorative justice cases typically refer to ‘victims’ and ‘offenders’.
- From the perspective of graffiti practices as interrogators of alternative forms of spatial justice or practice-led agonistic democracies, those who produce or generate most prolifically may well be described as champions or activists.
- From the perspective of graffiti as one or more community/ies-of-interest, whose activities and status are predominantly heeded and defined among peers (in-person or remotely), graffitiists are typically referred to in terms of frames that relate to their experience and status-achieved - ‘toys’ (inexperienced) and ‘kings’ (most experienced and respected among peers) – AND/OR in terms of their methods of practice – e.g. ‘taggers’ (who leave unauthorised graffiti signatures, ‘tags’, irrespective of quantity) ‘bombers’ (who paint as many surfaces with as much visual impact as possible within/across an area); ‘artists’ (referring favourably to many kinds of graffiti producers), ‘crew’ (graffitiists who coordinate together in making their interventions).

4.1.6 Categorisation based on Public or Community perceptions of graffiti vandalism

In the public space context, Johnson (2011) aims to explain the relation between disorder and crime in a community and, to show the different perceptions that society has about graffiti depending on what kind of graffiti people see. The tests go some way to reflecting varying responses to different kinds of graffiti but the methods used rely on photographs of graffiti taken out of context, rather than respondents being able to discuss the impact of the graffiti in context, which may skew the results. Weisel (2009) states that as with most forms of vandalism, graffiti is not routinely reported to police. Many people think that graffiti is not a police or "real crime" problem. Moreover, for many

people, graffiti's presence suggests the government's failure to protect citizens and control lawbreakers. Kurt Iveson also speaks to this scenario following multiple graffiti and community linked activities, in articulating "for some every act of graffiti is an act of vandalism ... for others it is an affirmation of life in the city... The question becomes how should we handle this disagreement" (Iveson, 2008).

Research by Austin and Sanders (2007) suggested that attempts to classify graffiti and reactions to it as a uniform phenomenon may be misguided. Different to Keizer et al. (2008) who claim to have proved graffiti as implicit in broken windows effect, Austin and Sanders stress that variables such as gender, race, age, prior victimization, social integration, and perceptions of increasing crime rates have all been shown to impact attitudes concerning safety in local neighbourhoods, and whether particular instances of graffiti are seen to act negatively, neutrally or positively. Supporting this, Urban Lexicons street workshops conducted by Vitello and Willcocks (2011b), revealed that only 2 out of 256 sets of participant responses indicated any concern at all over graffiti, when participants were asked to identify what was influencing their impressions on visiting different urban contexts. The difference here is perhaps partly that graffiti was not isolated as a problem of study; rather participants were left to identify and set agendas.

Some case studies both on public spaces and transport context illustrate the capacity of pro-social measures (e.g. community mural projects) for influencing public perceptions of graffiti in a positive way (UK Department for Transport 2005; Acton, 2010, 2013), as discussed to follow.

4.1.7 Pro-social Models

Pro-social models categorise graffiti related activities through constructive contributions to society in cultural, social, economical and political terms. This combines generative, regenerative and restorative models, which are discussed in detail under generative responses in public spaces and transportation. In many instances, sources reviewed choose to use the term 'street art' as well as, or in effort to distinguish from, (possible negative) associations with graffiti or graffiti vandalism. However, it is clear that there is much cross-over between street art, graffiti practices and practitioners, and it would be unrealistic to disassociate discussions related to street art from the Graffolution project. There are multiple examples where both street artists and graffiti practitioners now reported to make pro-social interventions, have undergone an archetypal apprenticeship learning their 'craft' illegally on the street in public areas and transport contexts (Macdonald, 2002). Although the literature does not provide an established categorisation model or schema, various texts point to elements that can be considered together under pro-social models.

A key factor that comes across is street art's capacity to enhance urban social life and living spaces, which develops through the acknowledgment of an art led regeneration in urban environment. Here the quality indicators are design, street safety and activity support (the last being a class of

intervention under Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design). For instance, examples from the UK and Australia, illustrate how with the use of street art and collaboration of various actors, dysfunctional spaces can be turned into functional and safe public spaces, where various members of the communities can enjoy spending time in or using them as part of their communal route (Iveson, 2010; Austin, 2010; Tooth, 2011; BBC News, 2014).

As various examples within the literature demonstrate using street art can also be both regenerative and restorative. For example, the “Signal” project that took place in Stanwell (neighbourhood public spaces), UK a) brought the community together and helped redevelop a community identity, b) helped solve a housing problem in the area (a kind of therapy for the trauma that some residents went through due to losing their houses) and c) brought economic income (Acton 2011, 2013). Similarly the “7 Bridges” project helped create a community identity, brought various parts of the community together and was utilised to solve several problems within the community (Gilani, 2011; Acton, 2013).

Using street art or graffiti in public spaces also can allow creation of a platform, a democratic space where different groups within communities can express their thoughts – which can be observed in the King’s Cross, and Southbank areas in the UK (Borja & Muji, 2003; Stephenson, 2011; Alderton, 2014). Another value indicator here derives from the works’ aesthetic and artistic values as well as street art as part of the urban creativity process (Bartolomeo, 2001; McNichols, 2006; Austin, 2010; Cullinane, 2011; McAuliffe, 2013). Respectively, various legal graffiti activities that aim to engage with various parts of communities, especially the young people and raise awareness about problems experienced also fall into this category – see sections 4.2.2.4, 4.2.3.4 for more information – (Kennedy et al., 1996; Stafford and Pettersson, 2003; Bundeskriminalamt, 2003; Werner, 2005; Hayward, 2006; Keats, 2008; Stanton, 2010; Meredith, 2013).

Street art (legal and illegal, in some instances) can also be recognised as an economic asset to local communities – e.g. bringing tourists to the areas, increasing business for traders and forging an art led gentrification (Leach & Baker, 2010; Watts & Feeney, 2013; Young, 2014; BBC NEWS, 2014).

4.2 Extent of graffiti vandalism in Europe

This section focuses on the extent of graffiti vandalism in Europe. It draws out the various vandalism types that are observed in the context of Europe. The data presented here provides both local and countrywide insights. The analysis provides discussions on how the provided data can be interpreted. The key emerging themes here are the contrasting views on graffiti vandalism (e.g. anti-social and pro-social), and the problematic nature of the data comparison as sources use different ways to measure graffiti vandalism. The insights are divided into two contexts, Public Areas and Public

Transport, in order to identify the details of factors, impacts, and stakeholders in these two specific contexts.

4.2.1 Introduction

The information provided for this section is based on the literature and data available that considers terminology underlying kinds of vandalism, definitions of vandalism and questions how available data is and can be interpreted. ‘Graffiti’ and ‘graffiti vandalism’ are often used as synonyms in the reviewed literature (e.g. Office for National Statistics, 2011). Interestingly, those actors with a duty of paid responsibility towards graffiti prevention or removal appears to be those who use the term ‘graffiti vandalism’ the most. Especially law enforcement and associations/organisations acting against graffiti vandalism tend to strongly point out the negative effects that are said to be connected to graffiti such as gang-problems, raising feelings of insecurity and leading to further criminal activities (U.S. Department of Justice, 1999; McGovern, 2013; Stafford et al., 2003; Gray et al., 2008; Keizer et al., 2008), though some of the claims are ambiguously substantiated, or not at all. Graffiti is also seen as defacing of public or private property without the owner’s permission and considered as criminal damage (Islington Council, 2014). On the other hand, graffiti writers argue that what they recognise as “culture” or “creativity” is recognised as crime such as damage to private property (Colt 45, 2010). Respectively, Iveson (2009) suggests that the conflict of graffiti lies in the definition of the problem itself, which can only be overcome by developing a common interest definition. Jacobsson and Wahlin (2010), writing in a report on European Best Practices in the Criminal Record Procedure, cite graffiti as representing 16% of restorative justice mediation acts in Sweden. Although such figures are not known for direct comparison with Austria, Germany, Spain or the UK, this figure does tally with prevailing views of graffiti vandalism as a petty or minor crime, which can be dealt with outside of criminal justice procedures.

4.2.2 Extent of Graffiti Vandalism in Public Areas

Public areas, for the purposes of this report, are taken to refer to all areas that are publicly accessible and also those immediately impacting upon these contexts. This includes:

- Publicly owned or managed spaces and street environments, but also
- Privately or semi-privately owned or managed land which is open to public access (open or semi-restricted access by time, entry fee, etc.), as well as
- The aspects of private land or buildings, which face on to public areas, even though the properties they, may not be publicly accessible.
- Shared spaces that are regularly used between diverse and disconnected publics as well as connected actors.

This section charts the actors in relation to graffiti vandalism in public areas and presents the available data related to activities of those actors. It draws out the prevention and reduction measures taken in order to tackle graffiti vandalism in public areas, as well as the pro-social and regenerative measures that have been observed. Most of the data identified regarding public areas in the European region is primarily from the UK and secondarily from Germany, followed by other countries such as Austria.

The main issues observed draw upon sources discussing the nature and to some extent the incidence of graffiti, and also the harmful and beneficial consequences. In terms of the extent graffiti vandalism in public areas topics discussed principally include: damage to, or devaluation of property, rights and permissions of property owners, raising or lowering feelings of insecurity, gang-problems, interpretations of anti-social behaviour and activities which may link to further criminal activity, following associations with broken windows theory (U.S. Department of Justice, 1999; McGovern, 2013; Stafford et al., 2003; Gray et al., 2008; Keizer et al., 2008).

In terms the extent of (re)generative, restorative or pro-social responses related to graffiti vandalism in public areas, these included: diversionary and educational activities and initiatives; youth art projects; greening in place of cleaning; improved or smart lighting; linked to agendas seeking behaviour change and/or skills and opportunity development (Keats, 2008; Nicola, 2013, Willcocks & Gamman, 2011; Werner, 2005; Clarke, 1978); enterprise initiatives (Cullinane, 2011); 'Safe Growth' social plans or social partnerships, and separately, collaborative efforts to enable diverse graffiti and non-graffiti actors to work together (Werner, 2005; Arbeitsstelle Kinder- und Jugendprävention, 2007; Stephenson, 2011; Bannister, 2013); defining certain forms of graffiti as art (Bristol City Council, 2008) and deploying local environment quality indicators (Campbell, 2008).

4.2.2.1 Actor overview - Public Areas

The sources reveal the following actor groups related to graffiti vandalism and graffiti in Public Areas:

The following table is useful for the Graffolution project to understand the wide range of actors both affecting and affected by actions and concepts of graffiti vandalism in Public Areas in Europe. While a number of the actor groups include non-European sources, all the groups identified are understood to be potentially relevant to the EU context, hence their inclusion here.

To understand the different actors' relationships to graffiti with more granularity, the table also provides indications of whether the actors are typically Stakeholders or Dutyholders, or a combination of both.

Interestingly, in most cases through this diversity of actor groups, the actor definitions identified appear to be influenced far more by the agenda of the source, than whether the actor's activity is inherently legal, illegal, anti-social or pro-social. For example, the term 'graffiti artists' is most

frequently referred to by those making or supporting the graffiti interventions. Conversely, also in this vein, the sources using the term ‘graffiti vandals’ are predominantly dutyholders with a paid responsibility to reduce or prevent graffiti, and by implication, a vested interest to ensure the terms ‘graffiti’ and ‘vandalism’ are more consistently associated together.

Table 1: Actor overview - Public Areas

ACTORS (individuals or organisations)	STAKEHOLDER (communities of personal interest, involvement or specialism), or DUTYHOLDER (with duties of responsibility toward graffiti)	SOURCES INCLUDE
Graffiti Writers	Stakeholder	Adz, 2008; Bundespolizeiinspektion München., 2014; Chang, 2005; Colt45, 2010; Gatsman et al., 2006; Gottlieb, 2008; Huberman, 2007; McAuliffe, 2013; Neelon, 2003; NuArt, 2009; Pietrosanti, 2010; Woodward, 2009
Graffiti Artists	Stakeholder	Bunting, 2012; Castleman, 1984; Gastman et al., 2006; Goldstein, 2009; Huberman, 2007; NuArt, 2009; Rahn, 2002; Shaftoe, 2011, Signal Project, 2010; Valle & Weiss, 2010
Street Artists	Stakeholder	Adz, 2008; Austin, 2010; Bofkin, 2013; C100, 2010; Ch Hundertmark, 2005; Goldstein, 2009; Hayward, 2006; Hughes, 2009; Kazig et al., 2007; Lewisohn, 2008; Mailer, 2009; Molnar, 2011; Theis, 2013; Wacławek, 2011; Young, 2014
Graffiti Taggers	Stakeholder	Essex, 2011; Encams, 2007; Huberman, 2007; Pascoe, 2011; Sacramento Police Force, 2003; Weisel, 2004; www.graffiti.org, 2014; Young, 2014
Graffiti Offenders	Stakeholder	Brent Council, 2011; G.R.I.P., 2012; Lamm Weisel, 2002; Ministry of Justice, 2011; Polizeiliche Kriminalprävention der Länder und des Bundes, 2012; Sacramento Police Force, 2003; Strutton, 2013
Young Offenders	Stakeholder	Arbeitsstelle Kinder- und Jugendprävention, 2007;
Graffiti Vandals	Stakeholder	Clarke, 1978; Brent Council; Pascoe, 2009; Petterson and Stafford, 2004; Stanton, 2010; NMSC, 2009; Valerie, 2007; Crime Prevention Division, NSW, 2009; Crime Prevention Unit of the Ministry of Justice, NZ, EMT, n.d.; Feles et al, 2003; Geason & Wilson, 1990; Gomez, 1993; NSW Department of Justice Attorney General , Crime Prevention Division, 2009; Thompson, 2012; U.S. Department of Justice, 1998; Wilson, 1987; Wilson & Healy, 1986.
Graffiti Victims	Stakeholder	Austin and Sanders, 2007; Bundespolizeiinspektion München, 2014; Polizeiliche Kriminalprävention der Länder und des Bundes, 2012; Uitermark, 2009
Graffiti / Street Art	Stakeholder	Bofkin, 2013; Bannister, 2013

Curators		
Residential Communities	Stakeholder	Acton, 2013; Haworth et al., 2013; Woodward, 2009
Citizens	Stakeholder	Polizeiliche Kriminalprävention der Länder und des Bundes, 2012
Community Interest Groups / Publics	Stakeholder	Iveson, 2008; Gamman & Thorpe, 2010; Willcocks, 2010
Visitors / Tourists	Stakeholder	EMT, n.d.; Flo, 2014; Haworth, 2013
Internet Users	Stakeholder	Barbaro et al., 2013; Haworth et al., 2013; Valle and Weiss, 2010
Social Networks (as social capital)	Stakeholder	Barbaro et al., 2013; Latour, 2005; McAuliffe, 2013; Stanton, 2010; Young, 2014
Property Tenants	Stakeholder	Barbaro et al., 2013
Property Owners / Landlords	Dutyholder / Stakeholder	Bunting, 2012; Bundespolizeiinspektion München, 2014; Campbell, 2008; English Heritage, 1999; Haworth, 2013; Huberman, 2007; Irons, 2012; Valle and WA Police, 2010; Weiss, 2010
Housing Associations / Tennants and Residents' Associations	Dutyholder / Stakeholder	Bundespolizeiinspektion München., 2014; Campbell, 2008;
Property Developers / Constructors	Dutyholder	Alderton, 2013; Hoogwaerts, 2013
Local Businesses Owners / Managers	Dutyholder / Stakeholder	Beevers, 2006; Campbell, 2008; Crime Prevention Unit of the Ministry of Justice, 2010; Haworth et al., 2013; Valle and Weiss, 2010; WA Police, 2010
Local Employees / Staff	Dutyholder / Stakeholder	Feltes et al., 2003; Petterson and Stafford, 2004; Stafford et al., 1998; Woodward, 2009
Educational	Dutyholder / Stakeholder	Bundespolizeiinspektion München, 2014; Crime Prevention Unit of the Ministry of Justice, 2010; Haworth, et al.,

Organisations / Schools (as social capital)		2013; Huberman, 2007; Irons, 2012; McAuliffe, 2013; Rahn, 2002; Stocker, 2013; Valle and Weiss, 2010
Parents	Dutyholder / Stakeholder	Arbeitsstelle Kinder- und Jugendprävention, 2007; Bundespolizeiinspektion München., 2014
Culture Industry Providers	Dutyholder / Stakeholder	Albro, 2005; Alonso, 2008; Andron and Willcocks, 2013; Haworth et al., 2013; Hiller, 2002; Hughes, 2009; Kellner, 2000; Neelon, 2003; Schierz, 2009; Valle and Weiss, 2010
Local / Regional Municipalities or Authorities	Dutyholder	Butts, et al, 2008; CABE Space, 2009; Campbell, 2008; Chalfant and Silver, 1983; Crime Prevention Unit of the Ministry of Justice, 2010; Gastman, et al, 2006; Halsey and Young, 2002; Haworth et al., 2013; Irons, 2012; London Assembly Graffiti Investigative Committee, 2002; Thompson, 2012; Uitermark, 2009; Wilson and Healy, 1986
National / State / Federal Municipalities or Authorities	Dutyholder	Barbaro et al., 2013; Bunting, 2012; Haworth et al., 2013; Glasgow, 2007; The Government of Western Australia, 2014; Hughes, 2009; Klee, 2010; McAuliffe, 2013; Sinclair, 2010; Thompson, 2012; Wilson and Healy, 1986
Police - Local	Dutyholder	Polizeiliche Kriminalprävention der Länder und des Bundes, 2012;
Police - Regional	Dutyholder	Polizeiliche Kriminalprävention der Länder und des Bundes, 2012;
Private Security or other Law Enforcement Agents	Dutyholder	Woodward, 2009
Site Managers	Dutyholder	Campbell, 2008
Business Improvement District (BID) representatives	Dutyholder	Stephenson, 2010
Cleaning & Restorations Service Providers	Dutyholder	English Heritage, 1999; McGoovern, 2010 & 2014

Anti-graffiti materials Suppliers	Dutyholder	English Heritage, 1999; McGoovern, 2010 & 2014
Industry Associations / Groups	Dutyholder	English Heritage, 1999; McGoovern, 2010 & 2014
Non-Transport Infrastructure Providers (Electricity, Telecoms, Gas, etc.)	Dutyholder	Eastel, 2011; Vaughn, 2010
NON-HUMAN ACTORS		
Home	-	Clarke, 1978
School	-	Clarke, 1978
Work	-	
Media: internet	-	Young, 2014
Media: printed	-	Clarke, 1978
Media: broadcast	-	Clarke, 1978

4.2.2.2 Available data - Public Areas

This section presents statistical data that helps develop a picture of graffiti vandalism related to Public Areas in Europe. It is our understanding that there is lack of consistency in what and how any related data is measured between European countries and even regions, cities or districts. There appears to be no common approach in this context.

A number of sources reviewed report and calculate the cost of graffiti and the effect on local environmental quality issues. This data reveals the extent and expense of graffiti vandalism and the cost of the prevention and management measures. Graffiti is seen by the citizens of Bonn (based on a survey) as minor problem (Rüther, Werner, 2005).

Keats (2008) provides statistical data from the UK. For instance out of 135 local authorities surveyed in the UK, 89 per cent reported that they had a major (20 per cent) or minor (69 per cent) problem with graffiti in their area. This is an indicator of the problem across Europe and beyond. Significant public funds are spent internationally for cleaning up graffiti via “zero tolerance” approaches. London alone spends €8.44 million (£6.7 million) per year (Campbell, 2008). Barcelona and Madrid spend at least €8.81 million (£7 million) per year cleaning city walls (Willcocks, 2011). Munich spends £2.5 million/year (Bundespolizeiinspektion München, 2014). At a more concentrated level within London Islington Borough council spends approx £500,000/year. Within the UK Keep Britain Tidy (Gamman, 2010) calculates graffiti cleaning across the 433 local authorities in England at a cost of £32.5m/year. Munich estimated €200 million euros/year damage, of which €60 million is covered by homeowners and retailers and average cost to repair at €1,000 (Bundespolizeiinspektion München., 2014). Early into the twenty first century, the UK Home Office estimated cost to fight criminal damage, which includes graffiti at €5.2bn.(£4.1bn.)/yr (Hansard, 2002). Sadly comparable data does not appear to have been updated since 2002. Outside of the European context, the USA is reported to have spent €10.64bn(\$12bn.)/ yr. (Dickinson, 2008). While these are significant costs, it is very hard to accurately deduce the current ‘graffiti problem’ based on the reported costs, which come from varying periods and represent widely varied metrics for recording. To this end, for example, it is difficult to know how many criminal damage associated offences are attributable to graffiti. Similarly, we can assume the cost of imprisoning prolific graffiti offenders (convicted graffiti writers) is comparable to the costs for other prisoners in the – which in the UK for example, cost an average of €47,401 (£37,648 per person per year (Ministry of Justice, 2013).

Interestingly, in reported statistics the term graffiti is mainly categorised as environmental damage, criminal damage, anti-social or incivic behaviour (grouped inseparably from other activities such as littering, being drunk or rowdy in public spaces or drug dealing), together with other forms of vandalism and damage to property. Therefore specific figures of how much of a problem graffiti based on prosecutions, or how many graffiti writers are imprisoned are not readily available but are

included for example, amongst the 4,048 UK criminals sentenced for criminal damage and arson (in 2012). While this is the case, the Office for National Statistics UK (2011) crime statistics in England and Wales shows that vandalism as a whole is dropping. Interestingly, in these statistics the term graffiti is only mentioned once, in combination with vandalism and other deliberate damage to property.

The Munich federal police and collaborating authorities on graffiti (Bundespolizeiinspektion München, 2014) report that there are currently about 2,000 active graffiti writers in the Munich area, where 94% are male. They support the notion that graffiti writers ('sprayers') do not come from any particular demographic, population or educational system, rather represent highly diverse backgrounds. The ages of suspects of graffiti vandalism around Munich range between 12 to 25 years with 55% being between 14-18 with the "hard core" of the active writers being between 16-19 years of age. By comparison the Graffiti Dialogues Network research conducted for the Southbank Centre and British Transport Police (Willcocks and Gamman, 2010), London revealed graffiti writers and street artists ranging from 11 to 50 years of age.

The reports on "Crime England and Wales" (Office for National Statistics (UK), 2011 and 2012) hold data on anti-social behaviour. The data is based on a questionnaire that asks about perceptions of problems with different types of anti-social behaviour (ASB). While several ASB categories didn't significantly change over the last ten years (e.g. Rubbish and littering about 30 per cent, People being drunk or rowdy in public places about 24 per cent) the category "vandalism, graffiti and other deliberate damage to property" dropped from 35 to 22 per cent since 2002. This means that fewer people indicated these issues as problematic in their local area. In addition respondents (16 years and older) were asked if they had personally experienced or witnessed the mentioned types of anti-social behaviour. For 2011/2012 only five percent indicated that they experienced vandalism, criminal damage or graffiti.

A case study from Brent London UK (NMSC, 2011) also shows that on average the number of sites failing the BV1993 graffiti standards (a national indicator to evaluate local environmental quality) fell by 25 per cent between 2006/07 and 2009/10. Enforcement activities were more successful and 40 individuals were apprehended. The key role of the Brent Graffiti Partnership Board as a showcase for collaboration was also measured by the Brent Residents' Survey 2009 that asked "Which of these things, if any, would you say are the good things about living in Brent?" Finally 21 per cent answered "Clean Streets". This was up from 13 per cent in 2005 before the work of the Brent Graffiti Partnership Board started.

³ See <http://www.lbbd.gov.uk/Housing/EstateInformation/Documents/pictorial-quality-standard.pdf> Accessed 22 June 2014

The Office for National Statistics UK (2011) bulletin presents crime statistics in England and Wales broken down by several offence types. It shows that vandalism as a whole is dropping. It is stated that interviews revealed graffiti (and vandalism) are mentioned as big problems in the area by around 20% of the interviewees (residents).

In Germany and Austria only crime statistics based on complaints are available. An advantage of the complaint-based statistics is that often graffiti is mentioned as a separate category (mostly a subsection of damage to property).

The Austrian crime statistic (Bundesministerium für Inneres, 2010) holds comprehensive statistical data to all kind of offences in Austria. Damage to property is broken down into several sub sections also mentioning graffiti. In 2010 4.739 complaints on graffiti were reported. 25,45% of the cases were solved.

The Polizeiliche Kriminalstatistik (police crime statistics service) (Polizeipräsident Berlin, 2013) holds comprehensive statistics on crime related events in Berlin. The report identified 9.659 complaints in 2013. This is a drop of 16,6% according graffiti vandalism reported 2012. However, it is also mentioned that the numbers are very depending on the willingness of people to report such complaints.

4.2.2.3 Extent of measures to tackle (reduce or prevent) the anti-social aspects of graffiti - Public Areas

From the literature we can identify a number of prevention/reduction measures used to tackle graffiti vandalism in public areas, including but not limited to:

- Rapid removal/ Anti-graffiti coatings / Chemical strippers / Surface preparation equipment / abrasive materials / Graffiti removal with laser (experimental)
- Stop and search activities / CCTV surveillance / House searches / Targeted enforcement / Informers
- Banning the sale of graffiti materials to minors
- Public education on graffiti vandalism and collaboration with citizens.
- In-house teams and high-level trained staff who can tackle graffiti related problems
- Partnerships - sharing intelligence and best practice amongst boroughs, transport operators, the police and other key bodies.
- Gathering intelligence: surveying the community, counting the number of sites defaced, analysing patterns of vandalism and types of graffiti that emerge, and Internet surveillance.

Rapid removal, anti-graffiti coatings, chemical strippers, surface preparation equipment and abrasive materials are measures that aim to mitigate harm and discourage offenders. Rapid removal of graffiti comes across as one of the most common techniques to reduce graffiti vandalism at the present time

and prevent it from happening in the future (UK Home Office, 2005; Strutton, 2013; Parkes, 2010; Meredith, 2013; Campbell 2008, Weisel, 2009; Begum, Johnson and Ekblom, 2009; Meredith, 2013; London Borough of Islington, 2014; Bristol City Council, 2008). Callinan (2002) deals with the NSW Government's Graffiti Solutions Program (launched in 1997) and its manifold strategies – unfortunately there is no mention of any evaluation results, which consequently leads to a lack of usefulness for practice. It is similar with the evaluation of eight graffiti reduction demonstration projects by the NSW Government (2009). Here the objective was to prove the effectiveness of prevention strategies like crime prevention through environmental design, rapid removal and volunteer programs. But as the methodological basis of the project was not accurate the results have to be looked at carefully: however, the report points to CPTED as relatively the most effective among the three strategies that are discussed. Spiegel Online (2014) points out a prevention method that is recently (2014) tested by the Chinese government to preserve the Great Wall. Tourists are allowed to scratch or spray their messages in a designated graffiti zone of the Great Wall. Based on know-how at other sightseeing places this can massively reduce damage to monuments. Other sources suggest there is still not enough research and evaluation of alternative anti-graffiti interventions, other than painting out walls (Iveson, 2009; Gamman & Willcocks, 2011; Young, 2010). This appears notable also in terms of being able to compare holistic impacts of responses to reduce anti-social activity and others aimed at promoting pro-social activity.

Closely linked to discussions of the potential of disorder to lead to further criminal activities (broken windows theory), raising feelings of fear and insecurity, early disorder diagnosis and interventions, rapid removal is an effective way to discourage graffiti vandals over time (Keizer et al., 2008). The approach is often combined with the usage of anti-graffiti coatings (Weisel, 2009; Werner, 2005; London Borough of Islington, 2014). Similar approaches are observed in the United States where along with anti-graffiti coatings products such as chemical strippers, surface preparation equipment and abrasive materials are used to remove graffiti (N.N, 2007). We also observe graffiti removal by laser, an initiative that was developed in the US (Matthews, 1996). However, the extent of this method's usage is unknown.

Other common approaches to tackle graffiti are law enforcement, legislation and prevention programmes (Stafford and Pettersson, 2003; Keats, 2008; Bristol City Council, 2008), CCTV surveillance (Clarke, 1978; Stafford and Pettersson, 2003; Keats, 2008; Meredith, 2013; London Borough of Islington, 2014), stop and search activities (UK Home Office 2005; Metropolitan Police Authority, 2008), house searches (Meredith, 2013) and informers (Meredith, 2013) all aim to deter, detect and detain offenders. For example, among the prevention programmes the 'HALT' project in the Netherlands focuses on dealing with those aged between 12 and 18 years who come in contact with the police for the first or second time. It is intended primarily for offences such as vandalism, graffiti, shoplifting and illegal use of fireworks. The programme arranges punishments that can

include repair of the damage or removal of the graffiti. However, the literature found says little about the effectiveness of these measures. On the other hand, banning of the sale of graffiti materials to minors (UK Home Office, 2005; London Assembly Graffiti Investigative Committee, 2002) aims to deny resources to offenders.

While the above measures are interventions, the rest of the measures are largely process/capacity measures (Ekblom, 2008). Gathering intelligence, which falls under “Intelligence” in the 5Is framework (Ekblom, 2008) covers measures such as surveying the community, counting the number of sites defaced, analysing patterns of vandalism and types of graffiti that emerge (Stafford and Pettersson, 2003).

Other measures also include educating the public about how to respond to vandalism and mobilising citizens to be preventers rather than promoters, as well as collaboration between state authorities and inclusion of the citizens to identify illegal graffiti and prosecute illegal graffiti (London Borough of Islington, 2014; Polizeiliche Kriminalprävention der Länder und des Bundes, 2012) – which falls under “Involvement” category under the 5Is model (Ekblom, 2008). Collaboration also points to sharing intelligence and best practice amongst boroughs, transport operators, the police and other key bodies (Meredith, 2013). Islington Council (Borough of London) also indicates the significance of having in-house teams within each body formed by highly trained staff that can tackle graffiti problems in their areas (Meredith, 2013). This is also linked to gathering intelligence (surveying the community, counting the number of sites defaced, analysing patterns of vandalism and types of graffiti that emerge) in order to identify problems and find solutions to deal with them (Stafford and Pettersson, 2003; Bristol City Council, 2008). This strategy is acknowledged as key in dealing with graffiti vandalism in researches around the world (San Diego Police Department, 2000; Wilson & Healy, 1986; Lachman, 1995; Young, 2014).

Collaborative approaches are proposed by multiple sources as a productive category for graffiti management or engagement/involvement models. Forms of collaboration can vary hugely but in best practice situations this has shown to enable actors to learn from and contribute to each other as well as meeting multiple requirements.

Multiple authors (Bannister & Perkins, 2013; Strutton, 2013; McGovern, 2013; Meredith, 2013) state that partnerships of relevant actors are an important basis to achieve sustainable changes. Often these partnerships consist of city councils, law enforcement agencies, transport organisations, youth organisations, anti-graffiti associations and cleaning companies, though only a few appear to include the publics whose interests or agendas are not determined by their paid responsibilities related to graffiti prevention. The Anti Graffiti Association (McGovern, 2013), for example report that the Sheffield Graffiti Charter (Beevers, 2006) was created and a partnership between council, police and

commercial signatories was set up. The charter was certainly considered successful among dutyholders though in this case it unclear what communities were accounted for.

Saville (2009) reports the success of a social plan (for Safe Growth) in the reduction of the rate of crime and insecurity of a neighbourhood of Toronto, Canada. The successes of this plan is interesting for the challenges and objectives of the Graffolution project, because it becomes an example of social partnership, which works, although in the article graffiti is not specifically treated. Sampson and Scott (1999) also report positive results where the police, the cities and the communities worked closely together collaboratively.

4.2.2.4 Extent of measures to promote pro-social (generative or regenerative) aspects or responses to graffiti - Public Areas

This section explores the generative responses towards graffiti vandalism. The measures listed here have a multi-sided approach. They aim to reduce vandalism whilst making use of graffiti in controlled environments rather than trying to dissolve it completely. Some of these approaches also support graffiti and point to its positive implications for enhancing urban life in various ways (e.g. develop community identity, encourage collaboration, make spaces more functional, help develop a sense of security, etc.). The measures listed fall into two categories: intervention methods and implementation related measures. While the first five fall into intervention, the last four fall into implementation.

- Education a) street art in art classes, b) social responsibility and vandalism in the curriculum
- Education at school, at home and in the media
- Diversionary activities: sports, youth programmes, street art workshops
- Legal spaces and Mural projects
- Crime prevention through environmental design (this in some projects includes murals and legal spaces for graffiti/street art)
- Using a combination of approaches
- Approaching problems at a local level rather than using “one size fits all” policies
- Collaboration between various actors
- Tackling with graffiti as part of a web of problems in a space rather than focusing on a single aspect

In this section a need to explain the distinction between the terms ‘crime prevention’ and ‘criminality prevention’ emerges. Crime prevention refers to reducing the risk of criminal and antisocial events (their frequency and severity) by intervening in their causes and frustrating offenders' goals (Ekblom, 2008). On the other hand, criminality prevention is a subset of crime prevention, where the causes in question are 'offender-oriented'. For example, in CCO (the conjunction of criminal opportunity) terms, it is about reducing the predisposition to offend, increasing the resources to avoid offending

and influencing offenders' current life circumstances, which may be motivating readiness to offend (Ekblom, 2010).

Within pro-social measures the theme criminality prevention is key. This includes diversionary activities (such as sports, youth programmes, street art workshops), education, as well as legal walls projects and community murals. These measures aim to work with citizens from all age groups (especially with a focus on children and young people) to develop more responsible and safe behaviour as well as peaceful spaces (Stafford and Pettersson, 2003; Keats, 2008). The strategies listed here are what some consider welfare approaches (Iveson, 2009; Acton, 2010). They mainly aim to reduce criminalisation of graffiti writers and develop a dialogue and understanding between various parts of a community (Iveson, 2009; Acton, 2010, 2013).

Diversionary activities charted in the literature are youth art projects, public artworks, workshops in street art, authorised graffiti events and sports sessions (Kennedy et al., 1996; Bundeskriminalamt, 2003; Werner, 2005; Hayward 2006; Keats, 2008; Stanton, 2010; Meredith, 2013).

The literature also argues for the role of education in reducing negative impacts of graffiti vandalism, and improving understanding, as well as appreciation and practice of art. This includes diversionary activities as well organised street art in art classes, art courses in colleges which include components on graffiti and street art, as well as adding education on vandalism in the curriculum for developing social responsibility (Koon-Hwee, 2001; Keats, 2008; Acton, 2010, 213). The importance of education is also explored by Bollier (2008) who speaks of a 'community of shared interest' in order to create value and accessibility through the sharing of knowledge in a collaborative way. Hughes (2009) states that she believes there is a relevance of graffiti and street art study within an educational frame and particularly within the context of a secondary arts curriculum. Clarke (1978) points to the increasing number of youth programs and education in proposals against tackling graffiti. Clarke (1978) takes this one step further as he underlines the place of education not only at school but also at home and in the media. For example, South London's 'Get the Message' initiative aims to positively channel young people's creativity to art projects (Pettersson et al. 2004). The programme also encourages public and private property owners in the area to make space available where young people can paint and use graffiti in the creation of murals.

While in certain projects legal walls and community murals fall in the criminality prevention schemes, at times these approaches are taken primarily to protect graffiti artists and their works. Supplying designated spaces for graffiti or authorised graffiti projects on the one hand aims to reduce vandalism, and on the other hand is used to enhance public areas culturally as well as aesthetically (Meredith, 2013; Heward & Hook 2013; Hayward 2006; Bundeskriminalamt 2003; Essex 2011; Leach & Baker 2010; Bannister & Perkins, 2013). The literature provides various examples that reflect the multi sided approaches. In Spain the "Open Gallery" project aimed to provide a safe place for graffiti

artists (Ballaz & Diamante 2010). In Brighton street art was used as part of a solution rather than a problem where artists were included in the design of public spaces (Bannister & Perkins, 2013). In the city of Brighton and Hove a public park (which was covered with graffiti) was revitalised with the use of graffiti art and murals (Leach & Baker 2010). Again in Brighton and Hove artists also reserved spots to showcase their works. They were also allowed to do graffiti on utility boxes. There were also murals placed in front of houses. The council points out that it was a win win situation as they had less of a graffiti problem (less money to spent on cleaning) and the project was attracting tourists to the area. Similarly, mural projects can have various aims and outcomes: a) bringing a community together, b) developing a dialogue between the residents from various age and social groups, c) helping to develop the identity of the place, d) helping to redesign/revitalise a space, and e) reducing vandalism (Acton, 2010, 2013).

This takes us to the discussion on design. Here we observe two distinct points. Firstly, as discussed above, graffiti and/or street art being utilised in urban planning. For example projects in London and Brighton aimed for / or led to using art as part of the solution, brought different actors together to create a space that everyone can use, revitalised spaces, developed a sense of community and identity, and reduced graffiti vandalism (Stephenson, 2011; Bannister & Perkins, 2013; Gilani, 2011). A second design element is Crime Prevention through Environmental Design, which argues for greening instead of cleaning as well as improved lighting and designing environments that can be used by a wide range of people (Gamman and Willcocks, 2009, 2011; Nicola 2013). Halsey and Pederick (2010), looking at converting a vandalised space into an art space, arguing that what is missing in many graffiti vandalism responses is a response to graffiti that does not only seek to engage through sanctions, but one that recognizes ‘a new ecology of urban becoming’.

Many of the examples above also highlight the importance of forming a dialogue between various actors and the collaboration of various actors in developing spaces and policies (Iveson, 2009; Bundeskriminalamt, 2003; Gilani, 2011; Bannister & Perkins, 2013; Acton, 2010). By way of examples we observe this approach in Germany, the project ESCAPE which brought together young offenders, police, parents and schools (Arbeitsstelle Kinder- und Jugendprävention, 2007) and in the UK in Brighton (Bannister & Perkins, 2013) and Stanwell (Acton, 2010) where people from all ages of the community as well as various organisations, graffiti artists and government authorities worked together.

The discussions on the welfarist projects and examples from Europe as well as around the world (mainly the US, Canada, New Zealand and Australia) point to softening strategies for anti-crime interventions, especially on graffiti (Gamman & Willcocks, 2009) and preventing criminalisation of young people (Halsey & Young, 2002). For example, the STOP strategy aims to avoid bringing children and youth unnecessarily into the formal criminal justice system, and instead considering restorative justice alternatives (The Ministry of Justice in New Zealand 2011).

For some, regenerative responses recognise the desire of expression through graffiti (Halsey & Young, 2002). The arguments also recognise the frictions between tastes and ideas fundamental to democracy, which help us see the opposition in opinion in a positive light and handled with constructive approaches (Walkeart, 2014; Iveson, 2009). They argue that through collaboration these constructive approaches can lead to developing welfarist projects and policies (Iveson, 2009; Acton, 2010). Such welfarist approaches have their foundations in a pragmatic acknowledgement that graffiti is not likely to go away (Iveson, 2009). Therefore, these measures find useful ways to utilise graffiti in order to reduce vandalism and or make public places more functional or welcoming through the use of art. As some cases reflected (e.g. Bristol and Brighton) this also attracts tourists (Watts & Feeney 2013; Leach & Baker, 2010) as well as becoming communal hotspots for all the residents (Iveson, 2010). In that sense here graffiti or street art become valuable players in gentrification in urban spaces (Young, 2014) as well as in reduction of insecurity and fear of crime in public spaces (Gamman et al., 2009). For example, Banksy Cans of 2008 led to increased positive and legitimate uses of the area around Leake Street, and increased business footfall for traders on the adjacent Lower Marsh near Waterloo in London (BBC NEWS, 2014).

The literature suggests that it is possible to reduce vandalism and money spent on 'fighting' graffiti vandalism by developing policies based on planning rather than policing (Iveson, 2009). The arguments and the case studies point to the significance of advocating new policies that can establish a political process, which is able to bring different opinions on graffiti into some kind of democratic contact. Accordingly, this is possible by inclusion of various members of the society (graffiti writers, other groups and residents), policy makers and urban planners (Iveson, 2009, Koon-Hwee, 2001; Hoogwarts, 2014). Developing policies and municipal strategies, will a) help develop a rounded understanding of the problem(s) at hand, and b) bring long-lasting, constructive and cost effective solutions (Iveson, 2009; Acton, 2010 and 2013). It is also underlined that these alternative policies should be informed by evidence and supported by qualitative and quantitative research.

The studies also reflect that a problem in a community does not exist in a vacuum but is a part of the ecology of that space and part of a mesh of problems. Thus, in tackling the 'graffiti problem' it is important to consider the overall environment – the people who occupy it, its history, its function and the various problems in it. The studies demonstrate that when a problem related to graffiti is tackled as part a wider set of problems within a community it is more likely to provide solutions (Acton, 2010, 2013; Hoogwarts, 2014). They signify that community projects where graffiti and graffiti artists are not the sole intent and focus group, but a part of a whole web of objectives and people bring long-lasting solutions. This also points to graffiti's capacity as a creative practice, and pro-social activity, which can help develop solutions to social problems and help develop better urban spaces (Acton, 2010; Halsey & Young, 2002; Iveson, 2009, 2010). This practice then leads to collaborative culture production via community projects. The studies also argue that legal

graffiti/community projects are cost-efficient exercises that help reduce vandalism, stops marginalisation within societies and enhance the urban spaces (Halsey & Young, 2002; Iveson, 2010; Delgado, 1991; Bofkin, 2014; Ostrom, 2014).

A number of the examples and cases among the literature uphold that rapid removal of graffiti as part of the management of urban or transportation imagery does not automatically solve the problem of graffiti vandalism; rather it “changes the location, form and diversity of graffiti encouraging ‘quick and dirty’ forms over more complex design works”, as diverse forms of displacement (Haworth et al., 2013; Young, 2010). Also that removing/preventing all graffiti inadvertently further confuses and downgrades “street art” with “vandalism” (Ballaz, 2010). Such discussions point the question of whose image/vision does removal or prevention of graffiti assert? This relates to the friction between tastes, right of property and of commerce to express, compared to right of other communities of interest (though the literature does not discuss safety). The sources focusing on regenerative aspects of graffiti (discussed above) suggest that graffiti can also be a part of the development of urban imagery and imaginary. The literature that focuses on collaboration in urban planning – contends that urban image planning, design and policy need to be realised more collectively between diverse agents: communities, corporations, civil organisations, governing bodies and individuals (see Bouton, et al., 2013; Fox Gotham et al., 2001; Borja & Muxi 2003; Burns et al., 2006; Bressi 1997; Haworth et al., 2013). The application here is that management and strategies related to graffiti in public and transport contexts could also emerge through more inclusive systems.

However, it is important to underline that there are mixed views on the value of the regenerative aspects graffiti walls and mural projects (Stafford & Pettersson, 2003). The studies that evaluate the effectiveness of various approaches have different outcomes. For example, Stafford and Pettersson (2003) argue that legal walls and mural projects have their negative sides as graffiti might leak to other areas. On the other hand, some studies argue that lack of spaces for practising graffiti safely alienates young people and limits their mobility (McAuliffe, 2013). Comparing various methods to tackle graffiti vandalism the NSW Government (2009) study reflects that among the three strategies – a) Crime Prevention through Environmental Design; b) Rapid Removal in terms of prevention and graffiti management and c) Volunteer Programmes – Crime Prevention through Environmental Design is said to be the most effective. McAuliffe (2013) suggests that reconfiguration of public spaces through either the expanding practices of surveillance, or privatization of public spaces (pseudo-public spaces such as shopping malls) marginalize young people.

This leads us to the discussions on combining various measures. Various case studies reflect the usefulness of integrating prevention and generative measures. For example, Thanet Community Safety Partnership (2011) indicate that the district was unable to eradicate graffiti by just concentrating on law enforcement and removal of tags. Therefore additional prevention and diversion methods were added to the overall strategy. A study on Vancouver shows the massive

reduction of graffiti in the city which was based on five core strategies: education, enforcement, partnerships, intelligent management and restorative justice (Spicer, 2005, 2007). Brighton and Hove City Council (2012) also supports a strategy that combines various measures that both aim to reduce vandalism as well as support graffiti writers.

4.2.3 Extent of Graffiti Vandalism in Public Transport

For the purposes of this report Public Transport is taken to refer to:

- Public, private or semi-private vehicles, infrastructure and land pertaining to transport systems and services, for which tickets can be bought for travel by all members of public.

This section charts the actors in relation to graffiti vandalism in Public Transport Contexts and presents the available data indicating the extent of graffiti vandalism in terms of some of the actors identified. This section also reveals the identified range of prevention and reduction measures taken in order to tackle graffiti vandalism in transport contexts, as well as some of the span of pro-social and regenerative measures that have been observed among transport contexts. Most of the data particularly regarding public transport in the European region is identified primarily from the UK, Spain and Germany, followed by other EU countries.

Public transport contexts where graffiti vandalism has been reported include the exteriors and interiors of trains, buses, metros, trams, but also train and bus stations, bus stops, rail sidings, track environments, and other property owned or managed by transport companies.

Keats (2008) explains that “Graffiti will be seen on the trains and track sides by the traveling passengers thus fulfilling [the graffiti writers/offenders’] need to be known and their ‘work’ recognised” (26).

John Strutton, Community Safety & Crime Prevention officer for Transport for London explains that “Graffiti is defined as a problem for TfL based on three reasons: Customers don’t like it; it is expensive; it incurs traffic interruptions” (Strutton, 2011).

Campbell (2008), Strutton (2011) and Bundespolizeiinspektion München (2014), highlight that the most serious issues related to graffiti in Transport environments include the issue of personal safety, irrespective of challenges of permission, aesthetic, social or cultural value.

Campbell (2008) notes, “Many writers operate in areas of danger (e.g. bridges, rooftops, railway properties, tube tunnels) to acquire greater respect for their writing amongst their peers” (9). This is reflective of the meritocratic characteristic of graffiti on trains, where danger perhaps plays a more important part for both graffiti writers and rail authorities, than on most walls in public areas of cities.

Commissioned ‘customer surveys’ (of passengers) suggest that customers do not like graffiti, although the surveys or questions asked have not been made accessible to this research and may or may not be partial. This is in contrast to some empirical research (e.g. Austin, 2001; Iveson, 2010; Gastman et al., 2006; GDN, 2011) indicating that a certain proportion of passengers and residents do consider some instances of graffiti to help revitalise or add interest within transport environments.

Delays and interruptions to the service provision of bus or train companies. Trains and train routes typically have to be halted if there is a trespasser located on the line. This can affect transport schedules and many passengers. A train travelling at 100 km/h can take up to 1,000 metres to stop, and a more rapid deceleration can pose an injury threat to passengers (Strutton, 2013, 2011).

European rail networks witness fatalities each year, linked to trespassing. Because of the extreme dangers of trespass on railway installations these areas are prohibited to unauthorized persons, and each case is a criminal offence. Electric train environments can host infrastructure of anything from 220 volts to 15,000 volts, which is enough for current to jump 1.5-2 metres, even if a trespasser is not in contact with an electrical element (Bundespolizeiinspektion München, 2014).

On this account Keats (2008) argues that one might assume that tragedies such as the deaths in London in 2008 would deter other offenders from producing graffiti; however, this is not always the case and can instead encourage them to paint tribute 'tags' in honour of their peers. Keats (2008) also adds:

The dangers associated with the railways are also an attraction because of the sense of excitement offenders gain when writing in this environment and the enhanced status they receive amongst their crew members and peers. This is not just the case with graffiti. It is worth noting that the dangers associated with crime are often a part of its excitement. (26)

Wilson and Healy (1987) go to great lengths attempting first to understand the causes of why graffiti appears on public transport, and subsequently to develop specific policies for preventing this phenomenon, as referenced earlier in this document.

Writing on the German context, regarding the Deutsche Bahn rail service, Schumacher (2013) presents the extent and consequences of graffiti-vandalism for the Deutsche Bahn, environment and general public. Furthermore there is an examination and a concrete definition of the phenomenon graffiti-vandalism in relation to transport contexts. The article refers to statistics from 2011/2012 which give an impression of the financial damage for the Deutsche Bahn caused by graffiti and vandalism in general. The article illustrates the various ways and methods taken by the Deutsche Bahn in order to prevent and counteract graffiti vandalism. The main intention of the author is to strengthen public awareness, by giving a detailed explanation of the consequences. As such the article aims to discourage young people getting in contact with illegal graffiti spraying.

Transport for London report that their experiences of communicating the extent of graffiti related prosecutions and convictions via the media had a counterintuitive effect, in that when it was made public that TfL declared war on graffiti it led to even more vandalism and was very expensive (Strutton, 2013). For this reason perhaps, some transport organisations in the EU are hesitant to record or share the extent of graffiti vandalism, or of the impact of measures taken in response.

4.2.3.1 Actor overview - Public Transport

The sources reviewed, in regard to graffiti vandalism and graffiti in Transport contexts, reveal the following actors:

Table 2: Actor overview - Public Transport

ACTORS (individuals or organisations)	STAKEHOLDER (communities of personal involvement, interest or specialism), DUTYHOLDER (with duty of responsibility)	SOURCES INCLUDE
Graffiti Writers	Stakeholder	Adz, 2008; Bundespolizeiinspektion München, 2014; Chang, 2005; Colt45, 2010; Gastman et al., 2006; Gottlieb, 2008; Huberman, 2007; McAuliffe, 2013; Neelon, 2003; NuArt, 2009; Pietrosanti, 2010; Woodward, 2009
Graffiti Artists	Stakeholder	Bunting, 2012; Castleman, 1984; Gastman et al., 2006; Goldstein, 2009; Huberman, 2007; NuArt, 2009; Rahn, 2002; Shaftoe, 2011, Signal Project, 2010; Valle & Weiss, 2010
Street Artists	Stakeholder	Adz, 2008; Austtin, 2010; Bofkin, 2013; C100, 2010; Ch Hundertmark, 2005; Goldstein, 2009; Hayward, 2006; Hughes, 2009; Kazig et al., 2007; Lewisohn, 2008; Mailer, 2009; Molnar, 2011; Theis, 2013; Wacławek, 2011; Young, 2014
Graffiti Taggers	Stakeholder	Essex, 2011; Encams, 2007; Huberman, 2007; Pascoe, 2011; Sacramento Police Force, 2003; Weisel, 2004; www.graffiti.org, 2014; Young, 2014
Graffiti Offenders	Stakeholder	Brent Council, 2011; G.R.I.P., 2012; Lamm Weisel, 2002; Ministry of Justice, 2011; Polizeiliche Kriminalprävention der Länder und des Bundes, 2012; Sacramento Police Force, 2003; Strutton, 2013
Young Offenders	Stakeholder	Arbeitsstelle Kinder- und Jugendprävention, 2007;
Graffiti Vandals	Stakeholder	Clarke, 1978; Brent Council; Crime Prevention Division, NSW, 2009; Crime Prevention Unit of the Ministry of Justice, NZ, EMT, n.d.; Feles et al, 2003; Geason & Wilson, 1990; Gomez, 1993; NSW Department of Justice Attorney General , Crime Prevention Division, 2009; Pascoe, 2009; Petterson and Stafford, 2004; Stanton, 2010; Thompson, 2012; U.S. Department of Justice, 1998; Valerie, 2007; Wilson, 2987; Wilson & Healy, 1986; Yieke; NMSC, 2009.

Tresspasser	Stakeholder	Pascoe, 2011; Strutton, 2013
Graffiti Victims	Stakeholder	Austin and Sanders, 2007; Bundespolizeiinspektion München, 2014; Polizeiliche Kriminalprävention der Länder und des Bundes, 2012; Uitermark, 2009
Passengers	Stakeholder	BTP, 2011; Pascoe, 2011; Strutton, 2013
Commuters	Stakeholder	Pascoe, 2011; Strutton, 2013
Visitors / Tourists	Stakeholder	EMT, n.d.; Flo, 2014; Haworth, 2013
Citizens	Stakeholder	Polizeiliche Kriminalprävention der Länder und des
Community Leaders / Advocates	Stakeholder / Dutyholder	Tooth, 2011
Community Interest Groups / Publics	Stakeholder	Iveson, 2008; Gamman & Thorpe, 2010; Willcocks, 2010
Internet Users	Stakeholder	Barbaro et al., 2013; Haworth et al., 2013; Valle and Weiss, 2010
Social Networks	Stakeholder	Barbaro et al., 2013; Latour, 2005; McAuliffe, 2013; Stanton, 2010; Young, 2014
Property Tenants	Stakeholder	Barbaro et al., 2013
Property Owners / Landlords	Dutyholder / Stakeholder	Bunting, 2012; Bundespolizeiinspektion München, 2014; Campbell, 2008; English Heritage, 1999; Haworth, 2013; Huberman, 2007; Irons, 2012; Valle and WA Police, 2010; Weiss, 2010
Property Developers / Constructors	Dutyholder	Alderton, 2013; Hoogwaerts, 2013
Local Businesses Owners / Managers	Dutyholder / Stakeholder	Beevers, 2006; Campbell, 2008; Crime Prevention Unit of the Ministry of Justice, 2010; Haworth et al., 2013; Valle and Weiss, 2010; WA Police, 2010
Employees / Staff	Dutyholder / Stakeholder	Feltes et al., 2003; Petterson and Stafford, 2004; Stafford et al., 1998; Woodward, 2009
Educational Organisations / Schools	Dutyholder / Stakeholder	Bundespolizeiinspektion München, 2014; Crime Prevention Unit of the Ministry of Justice, 2010; Haworth, et al., 2013; Huberman, 2007; Irons, 2012; McAuliffe, 2013; Rahn, 2002; Stocker, 2013;

		Valle and Weiss, 2010
Parents	Dutyholder / Stakeholder	Arbeitsstelle Kinder- und Jugendprävention, 2007; Bundespolizeiinspektion München, 2014
Culture Industry Providers	Dutyholder / Stakeholder	Albro, 2005; Alonso, 2008; Andron and Willcocks, 2013; Haworth et al., 2013; Hiller, 2002; Hughes, 2009; Kellner, 2000; Neelon, 2003; Schierz, 2009; Valle and Weiss, 2010
Transport / Rail / Bus Authority	Dutyholder	Austin, 2001; BTP, 2011; Campbell, 2008; Innes, 2004; Pascoe, 2011; Thompson, 2012; Strutton, 2013;
State Rail / Transport Authority		Wilson, 1987
Transport Security	Dutyholder	BTP, 2011; Pascoe, 2011; Strutton, 2013,
Private, Regional or PPP Transport / Rail Authority		Tooth, 2011
Transport Planners / Service Providers	Dutyholder	Pascoe, 2011; Strutton, 2013, Tooth, 2011
Urban / Land Planners	Dutyholder	Tooth, 2011
Local / Regional Municipalities or Authorities	Dutyholder	Butts, et al, 2008; CABE Space, 2009; Campbell, 2008; Chalfant and Silver, 1983; Crime Prevention Unit of the Ministry of Justice, 2010; Gastman, et al, 2006; Halsey and Young, 2002; Haworth et al., 2013; Irons, 2012; London Assembly Graffiti Investigative Committee, 2002; Thompson, 2012; Uitermark, 2009; Wilson and Healy, 1986
National / State / Federal Municipalities or Authorities	Dutyholder	Barbaro et al., 2013; Bunting, 2012; Haworth et al., 2013; Glasgow, 2007; The Government of Western Australia, 2014; Hughes, 2009; Klee, 2010; McAuliffe, 2013; Sinclair, 2010; Thompson, 2012; Wilson and Healy, 1986
Police - Transport	Dutyholder	Pascoe, 2011; Polizeiliche Kriminalprävention der Länder und des Bundes, 2012; Strutton, 2013
Police - Regional	Dutyholder	Polizeiliche Kriminalprävention der Länder und des Bundes, 2012;
Private Security or other Law Enforcement Agents	Dutyholder	Woodward, 2009

Site Managers	Dutyholder	BTP, 2011, Campbell, 2008
Business Improvement District (BID) representatives	Dutyholder	Stephenson, 2010
Cleaning & Restorations Service Providers	Dutyholder	English Heritage, 1999; McGoovern, 2010 & 2014
Anti-graffiti materials Suppliers	Dutyholder	English Heritage, 1999; McGoovern, 2010 & 2014
Industry Associations / Groups	Dutyholder	English Heritage, 1999; McGoovern, 2010 & 2014
NON-HUMAN ACTORS		
Home	-	Clarke, 1978
School	-	Clarke, 1978
Workplaces / Business hubs	-	Alderton, 2013
Media: internet	-	Young, 2014
Media: printed	-	Clarke, 1978
Media: broadcast	-	Clarke, 1978
Courts	-	BTP, 2011
Prisons	-	BTP, 2011
Drones	-	Spiegel Online, 2013

This table is useful for the Graffolution project to understand the wide range of actors both affecting and affected by actions and concepts of graffiti vandalism in Transport contexts in Europe. These cross over in many instances with Actors related to Public Areas but with a number of changes, significantly including transport passengers, transport and urban planners, community leaders, and of course, transport authorities and service providers. While a number of the actor groups include non-European sources, all the groups identified are understood to be potentially relevant to the EU context, hence their inclusion here.

To understand the different actor's relationships to graffiti with more granularity, the table also provides indications of whether the actors are typically Stakeholders or Dutyholders, or a combination of both.

In some cases for Transport contexts (but not so many as for Public Areas), the actor definitions identified appear to be influenced more by the agenda of the source, than whether the actor's activity is inherently legal, illegal, anti-social or pro-social. For example, those making or supporting the graffiti interventions most frequently refer to the term 'graffiti artists'. Conversely also in this vein, the sources using the term 'graffiti vandals' are predominantly dutyholders with a paid responsibility to reduce or prevent graffiti, and by implication, a vested interest to ensure the terms 'graffiti' and 'vandalism' is more consistently associated together.

4.2.3.2 Available data - Public Transport

This section presents statistical data from materials that have been located or made available, towards helping to help build an up to date picture of graffiti vandalism related to public transport contexts in Europe.

As discussed in regard of attempting to understand a quantified picture of graffiti for Public Areas in Europe, the overwhelming finding is that consistent or comparable statistical data specifically related to graffiti is either not recorded or not made readily available. It is our understanding that this also reflects an overriding lack of consistency in what and how any related data is measured between European countries and even regions, cities or districts.

Additionally, data that has been recorded or made available is predominantly out of date. Very few figures indeed are available to reflect the extent of graffiti or related activities over the past year, or even three years, in European countries. The newest figures we have access to which pertain to Public Transport contexts are from FGC, yet many other transport related organisations have not released or recorded their recent data regarding graffiti or graffiti vandalism.

The following table gives a snapshot of available spends and cost related data as reported by transport authorities or authorities that include transport in the reported figures.

Table 3: Euros spent on cleaning Public Transport

Context	Euros € on Cleaning Public Transport
Deutsche Bahn AG, Germany	Estimated €50 million euro loss due to vandalism (all types, not just graffiti), across 46,000 instances (Bundespolizeiinspektion München, 2014)
FGC, Spain	Acts of graffiti represent a cost to FGC of €175,000 euros/year. This excludes the cost of the immobilization of a train unit for a day, to remove the graffiti. (FGC, 2014)
RENFE, Spain	Spending €200 million EUR/year in 2005. (Graffiti Dialogues Network, 2010)
RENFE, Spain	In 2005 a graffiti'd area of 16m ² on a train cost €3000 EUR to clean (Graffiti Dialogues Network, 2010)
Network Rail, UK	Estimate > €6.25 million EUR (£5m GBP) per year in the UK to clean up graffiti, not including delays or loss of revenue to the service. (BTP, 2014)
Transport for London (TfL), UK	Reported in 2006 to spend €7.68 million EUR (£6.1 million GBP) per year (Graffiti Dialogues Network, 2010)
Transport for London (TfL), UK	€3.125 million EUR (£2.5m GBP) estimated spend per year clearing up graffiti from trains except glass (Campbell, 2008).
	By contrast BTP report London Underground (run by TfL) incur €12.5 million EUR (£10m GBP) per year cleaning graffiti, excluding etching. (BTP, 2014)
Transport for London (TfL), UK	€25 million EUR (£20m GBP) per year and 70,000 hours per year removing graffiti from the rail network (Guardian, 2007)
	Cleaning graffiti from city walls, including some transport infrastructure
Local authorities, UK	€40.1 million EUR (£32.5m GBP) per year, spend on graffiti cleaning across the 433 local authorities in England, including some transport infrastructure. (Campbell, 2008)
Local authorities, UK	€5.16 billion EUR (£4.1bn GBP) per year, estimated cost to fight criminal damage, which includes graffiti (Hansard, 2002)
London Borough Councils	London Graffiti costs £6.7 million for all 33 London boroughs per year, including some transport infrastructure. (Campbell, 2008)
	Imprisoned graffiti writers: Average prison place, in the UK by way of example, costs €47,390 EUR (£37,648 GBP) per person per year (Ministry of Justice, 2013), yet figures have not been made available on how many imprisonments are linked to graffiti.

Campbell (2008) and Keats (2008) indicate that graffiti is the most widespread form of vandalism on the railway network, where it can be found on trains, buses, bus stops shelters, rail stations, rail sidings and etched into glass and polycarbonate surfaces of public transport vehicles. Keats (2008) suggested that 86 per cent of Passenger Train Executives/ Transport for London and 60 per cent of bus service operators considered graffiti is a serious and persistent problem. FGC Spain (FGC, 2014) and Transport for London (Strutton, 2013) report some reduction of graffiti vandalism in 2012-14 periods, linked to programmes of multiple measures combined with considerable investment to realise necessary measures. It is understood that this investment is typically borne by the fare-paying traveller on the respective public transport services.

Focusing on the cost to transport and infrastructure RENFE spends €200/m where a graffiti'd area of 16m² on a train costs €3000. Transport For London puts public transport cleaning costs at an additional £6.1 million/ year (2006). Deutsche Bahn AG estimate €50 million euro loss due to vandalism (all types), across 46,000 instances (Bundespolizeiinspektion München, 2014).

The London Assembly Graffiti Investigative Committee (2002) suggests that Transport for London (London Underground) was in 2002 spending €10-12.6 million EUR (£8-10 million GBP) per year replacing glass that had been etched or scratched. It is understood that this figure has since reduced owing to improved protective films that have been developed and implemented on trains and buses (McGovern, 2011; Strutton, 2011). Further costs are also incurred through the security measures installed by different dutyholders, in order to prevent acts of graffiti (Keats, 2008).

Griffin Security Consultants (2008: 2-3) presented the following analysis, following research commissioned by Transport for London and conducted in Holland, Spain, the UK and USA:

Graffiti offenders [related to transport contexts] are usually teenagers, although some continue offending into their twenties and thirties. As with other forms of antisocial behaviour, motivation for graffiti writers varies widely. However, they can be broadly categorised into five groups:

- Gangs: main motivation is to identify their own territory/neighbourhood
- Street 'artists': people who feel they have the right to express themselves (e.g. egoistic - tend to use free form, stencils stickers, etc.; anti-establishment - tend to be risk-averse)
- Taggers: specialise in tags and have their own culture. Status markers within that culture include: high visibility (number of people who see their tags); physical challenge of tag location; getting away with the crime
- Messages: offenders want to advertise an often political message/slogan
- Petty: often committed by young people who do not see graffiti as a crime. It gives them an opportunity to show-off to their peers. The graffiti is of low quality but can be prolific, causing a negative impact.

Griffin Security Consultants describe that because this work focuses on graffiti vandalism, their report provides categories on graffiti offenders, motivations and main prevention approaches (2008). However, no description is given as to why offender profiles, motivations and prevention approaches should be the only factors necessary to respond to graffiti vandalism. Other sources which qualitatively communicate differing extents of dutyholder concerns over graffiti vandalism in transport contexts include, for example: Local Environmental Quality, A Local Authority Perspective (Keep Britain Tidy (Encams), 2004); Using the Legal System to Reduce Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour on Public Transport (Department for Transport, 2005), and Key Findings from the Survey of Operators (Department for Transport, 2005). Comparing the Griffin/TfL (2008) analysis and groups above to other sources reporting on the EU, it appears the Griffin report is possibly over influenced by USA-centric perspective. For example other sources do not so readily link gang graffiti to transport environments in European contexts. Additionally the synthesis behind the groupings presented above is described or justified in any detail.

The British Transport Police report that 'route crime' - which includes graffiti and other crimes including trespassing, creating obstructions on tracks, and more - costs upwards of €187 million EUR (£150m GBP) per year to the police and rail industry. The Office of Rail Regulation reports a decrease in route crime from 309 to 213 incidents in the UK during 2010-11. Yet 213 represents 42 percent of all train incidents. (BTP, 2011). In 2012/13 the total number of graffiti-related offences reported to BTP dropped 7% compared to the previous year (BTP, 2014).

Publicdata.eu hosts data on graffiti incidents recorded by British Transport Police (British Transport Police, 2011). This offers some emerging patterns, trends and ups and downs in graffiti vandalism activities in London's tube and railway system. Over two years the count of graffiti at London's transport system was recorded by the BTP every month and in every borough. The data reveals for example, that incidents of reported graffiti vandalism across the tube and rail network for 33 London boroughs shifted from an average of 117 per month in the second quarter of 2009, to an average of 72 per month in the first quarter of 2011. The five boroughs with the highest incidents of reported graffiti vandalism on public transport were: Hammersmith and Fulham, Redbridge, Harringey, Ealing and Brent. All of these boroughs experienced a drop in reported graffiti incidents between 2009 and 2011. The caveats for interpreting this data are explained as:

Incidents are recorded as occurring in the borough where the incident was reported. Often incidents occur in transit and victims can sometimes be unsure as to the exact location that the incident took place. This naturally affects the accuracy of the data. It should also be considered that some boroughs host more passenger journeys (and stations) than others. This will mean that the level of incidence seen in BTP data will be skewed toward those boroughs. (BTP, 2011)

In 2007 the BTP established a dedicated graffiti unit, covering 500 stations and over 3,500km of routes. They communicate that graffiti writers vary but typically use the transport system to build social capital as 'kudos'.

The Unit report that in 2010 they prosecuted nine graffiti related cases for €438,000 EUR (£350,000 GBP) of damage.

The FGC rail company in Catalonia, Spain, record data on 14 groups of 'incivilities' including graffiti on trains, which showed between 2010-2013 to represent the first or second highest grouping of incivilities with instances of illegal line crossing being the other alternately ranking first or second, among the fourteen categories (FGC, 2014). FGC also report that for the year 2013 the incidents of graffiti had dropped on trains, to 78 from 109 in 2012 and at stations to 469 from 641. However the 2012 figures are higher than previous years' data since 2010, possibly linked to the introduction of a mobile app, allowing graffiti and other incivilities to be reported more easily. The 2013 prosecutions index for FGC related to instances of graffiti stood at 6.4% on trains (5 convictions of 78 reported incidents) and 0.4 % in the case of graffiti in stations (2 convictions of 469 reported incidents) (FCG, 2014). However, in most European transport contexts figures are not readily available on how many convictions have been made related to graffiti, nor how much has been spent tackling graffiti vandalism. Many figures are bound into data on wider categories, for example of criminal or malicious damage and arson, thus obfuscating the data that would be useful understand a truer picture of graffiti in public areas or in transport contexts.

Regarding convictions, we know that an average prison place, in the UK by way of example, costs €47,390 EUR (£37,648 GBP) per person per year (Ministry of Justice, 2013). This excludes all costs for under 18's. These estimates indicate that reoffending also cost the UK economy between €11.96 billion EUR (£9.5bn GBP) and €16.4 billion EUR (£13 billion GBP) in 2007-8. Marsh (2007) indicates that graffiti re-offending is extremely high at a figure of above 75%, which she attributes to its addictive nature. However current and consistent figures from across European countries are not readily available regarding the number of prosecutions or imprisonments specifically related to graffiti, so it is difficult to know the real extent or cost of graffiti on the criminal justice system.

4.2.3.3 Extent of measures to tackle (reduce or prevent) the anti-social aspects of graffiti - Public Transport

Examples of the measures taken in public areas can also be observed in transport. The prevention/reduction measures include:

- Law enforcement
- Rapid removal
- Situational Crime Prevention: security, CCTV surveillance

- Anti-graffiti coatings
- Information posters
- Criminality Prevention: youth programmes and education
- Collaboration: sharing intelligence
- Comprehensive frameworks

Law enforcement covers the measures through the criminal justice system that enforce the law against the perpetrators of graffiti, vandalism and environmental damage (UK Department for Transport, 2003; Griffin Security Consultants, 2008). Law enforcement (court sentences) aims to send a message to the graffiti writers who may be tempted to write graffiti in public transportation (British Transport Police, 2013). However, high level of arrests reflect that law enforcement do not provide an effective solution as it does not deter graffiti writers from committing crime (Williams 2011). As an alternative to criminal justice system, a programme called “HALT” was designed in the Netherlands with a belief that while police warning was too “soft”, criminal justice system was limited. Through this programme the person does not acquire a criminal report. However, the programme arranges punishments that can include repair of the damage or removal of the graffiti (UK Department for Transport, 2003).

Kevin Williams (2011) from Keep Britain Tidy provides statistical data on proportions of graffiti (types) over previous years and where graffiti geographically takes place.

Williams (2011) argues that “Everyone who has travelled on the underground has at some point come into contact with graffiti. In the 1980’s there was an uneducated response to graffiti and a huge amount of money was spent unsuccessfully”. In more recent years a new approach focused on customer concern has been brought in. Customers tell TFL they do not like graffiti and this drives the response. Since 2003 TFL have been addressing graffiti in a more holistic way. However there is still a huge arrest rate that Williams views as a failure as there has not been a prevention in the first place. A failing measure is posters that placed on public transport stating ‘do not write here’, which have actually increased graffiti placement on the posters and surrounding areas (Williams 2011). More successful measures for prevention and reducing graffiti in transportation are charted as rapid cleaning and situational crime prevention (Griffin Security Consultants 2008; Williams 2011; Strutton, 2013; NSV 2014). However, Internet displays may also mean that perpetrators of graffiti are less concerned by rapid removal of their work (UK Department for Transport, 2003). Situational crime prevention includes measures that are designed to reduce the opportunities for incidents. This is done through restricting access, increased surveillance or changes to the design of the rolling stock or infrastructure to make it more robust and less vulnerable to criminal damage (UK Department for Transport, 2003; NSV, 2014). Here we observe the usage of protective coatings on trains as well as protective coatings and protective boards within train stations (Schumacher 2013; NSV 2014). However, focusing on Germany’s Deutsche Bahn it is also highlighted that graffiti writers constantly

experiment with their paints against anti-graffiti coatings (Schumacher, 2013). This reflects a vicious cycle where transportation companies try to develop special chemicals to protect surfaces while graffiti writers develop their materials to make their graffiti last longer.

UK Department for Transport (2003) describes criminality prevention as “Measures designed to prevent or reduce the risk of potential perpetrators from becoming involved in illegal activities” (5). By “predators” the organisation refers to children and young people. These measures include working with children and young people to deter them from trespass on the tracks, or diversionary activities to channel their interest and energy into more productive and positive outcomes, which were utilised for example by Network Rail Midlands zone in the UK (UK Department for Transport, 2003). Education at schools as well as community programmes that promote responsibility are also mentioned under this category (Geason and Wilson, 1990; Stafford et al., 1998; Griffin Security Consultants, 2008). Griffin Security Consultants’ (2008) research also suggests ways to use various media to illustrate the difference between illegal and legal forms of graffiti (street art). Similar to measures taken in public areas we also observe diversionary activities such as sports and leisure and entertainment (Geason and Wilson, 1990).

In order to tackle with graffiti the studies also point to the use of in-house graffiti unit that focus solely on graffiti. These units, such as the London Underground Graffiti Unit and the London South Area Graffiti Unit gather intelligence (UK Department for Transport, 2003; British Transport Police, 2011). This data is analysed to identify persistent offenders and hotspots. Locations and perpetrators are targeted on this basis (UK Department for Transport, 2003).

Various studies also point to the importance of partnerships between transportation planners, community leaders and advocates. These partnerships a) to do with sharing intelligence on graffiti vandalism and collaborating to find ways to reduce it using existing databases and internet monitoring tools (UK Department for Transport, 2003; Griffin Security Consultants 2008), and b) it is to do with urban planning, designing functional spaces that will lead to designing out crime and increase quality of life (Tooth, 2011; Geason and Wilson, 1990). Maintenance and repairs is also a part of the strategies used (Geason and Wilson, 1990). Some studies develop frameworks that combine various methods (Geason and Wilson, 1990; UK Department for Transport, 2003).

In general sources reviewed indicate a strong homogeneity in terms of the themes discussed and the perspectives in the transport context. This might be because most of the literature reviewed is either published or commissioned by a public transport service or appertaining organisation. Accordingly, a strong focus lies on the damage caused by graffiti and possible preventive - and countermeasures to tackle and reduce graffiti vandalism on and around public transport facilities. In light of this, we need to bear in mind that the literature might be partial, in respect of the particular agendas of those actors. The literature reviewed includes reports, predominantly covering UK and German cases, a

number of multi-country experiences and one from Australia (which has proved to be one of the referential countries on graffiti studies).

4.2.3.4 Extent of measures to promote pro-social (generative or regenerative) aspects or responses to graffiti - Public Transport

Public transport tends to be run by private service providers. The analysis suggests that service providers are not likely to prioritise pro-social measures. Therefore the literature offers few examples of generative/regenerative practices.

In this section public art projects and design against crime take the lead (Stafford, et al., 1998; Gilani, 2011; Nicola, 2013). London's "7 Bridges Project" that has been set up by the Loughborough Junction Action Group to give the area a stronger identity. This is a community project that gathered various members of the community (different age groups and social groups). It also aims to use artists to help define Loughborough Junction as a place, and give it a sense of community and identity (Gilani, 2011). Nicola (2013) within the transport strategy of Camden Council (London) talks about a newly designed a ramp for cyclists as part of a new cycle link. This area had graffiti problems before reconstruction. Nicola points to graffiti as a sign of neglect and the significance of redevelopment. To reduce graffiti vandalism a dual approach was deployed. The wall that was covered in graffiti was cleaned and painted with anti-graffiti coating. Also the area was redesigned to be more functional and better lighting was installed. Nicola explains that this brought a solution to the vandalism problem. However, there are different outlooks on public art in transport services. On the one hand, on behalf of London's TfL Strutton (2013) argues that even street art can encourage vandalism, while Pascoe (2011) argues that by supporting street art and making it mainstream graffiti incidents can be reduced. On the other hand, there is also a growing consideration within transportation service providers to consider street art as a separate entity than other graffiti practices and tend to use it to regenerate areas related to transport (UK Department for Transport, 2003).

The use of public art on Centro's bus, rail and metro systems help us understand the latter approach. The project has two aims a) to create a pleasant travelling environment and b) to deter acts of vandalism (UK Department for Transport, 2003). Private sector companies support this project. Some of these works reflect community members and the history of the community. Local communities are also active participants in designing the works. For example, for the Winson Green metro station, artists spent a year at the local primary schools developing designs with pupils. For the refurbishment of Lea Hall railway station public art also played an important role. The local community was consulted over the theme and design of the art work. The planners also used the suggestions of the residents for the design of the space – improved lighting, the siting of CCTV cameras, and improved fencing. Local people were involved in laying a mosaic floor, to foster a sense of ownership. The additional cost of the public art features, over and above the standard costs for

the refurbishment, is estimated at less than 5% of the total. It is acknowledged, though, that the percentage may be higher for small schemes. Since re-opening in 1998 there has been very little vandalism at Lea Hall. The majority of respondents in a survey in early 2001 said that the artwork improved their feelings of safety at the station. Others examples include redesigning an area near a school in Camden where there was a major graffiti problem together with school kids (Nicola, 2013) and Involving young people to develop artworks for a train station in South London as part of the 'Get the Message' initiative (Pettersen et al., 2004).

4.3 Deduction of a categorisation model for the Graffolution Platform

The following table set is a comprehensive attempt at representing the categorisations identified during the present research and is useful for informing the next stages towards the Graffolution Platform.

Table 4: Type by legal framework

1. TYPE BY LEGAL FRAMEWORK				
Actors	Type	Form/ medium	Typical Location	Example Authors
Multi Actor	Graffiti as criminal damage (UK, Germany, Austria)	Graffiti and other forms of vandalism are a criminal offence. Possessing equipment with intent to cause damage is also an offence. Graffiti tools such as spray paint can be included as such equipment. Criminal damage also includes associated damage to property, trespass, narcotics, vandalism, graffiti, environmental nuisance and insult or assault to police during arrested.	Urban areas, Transport, Buses, Trains, Railway, Shopping Centres,	Office for National Statistics, 2011; Ekblom, 2009
Multi Actor	Graffiti as Crime and Disorder UK	Anti-Social Behaviour Orders (ASBOS) can be applied to anyone over the age of 10 years who causes harassment, alarm or distress to others through his or her actions. Through the Crime and Disorder Act 1998.	Urban areas, Transport, Buses, Trains, Railway, Shopping Centres,	Office for National Statistics, 2011
Multi Actor	Graffiti as Anti Social Behaviour UK	(ASBOS) can be applied to anyone over the age of 10 years who causes harassment, alarm or distress to others through his or her actions. 2003 Anti-Social Behaviour Bill has the objective of providing the tools for practitioners and agencies to effectively tackle anti-social behaviour. It contains measures drawn up from across five Government Departments and aims to clarify, streamline and reinforce the powers available to practitioners. In crime statistics graffiti is categorised as anti-social behaviour such as littering, people being drunk or rowdy in public spaces or drug dealing and often surveyed together with other forms of vandalism and damage to property (Office for National Statistics (UK) 2011).	Urban areas, Transport, Buses, Trains, Railway, Shopping Centres,	Office for National Statistics, 2011; NSMC 2010; Stanton, 2010.
Multi Actor	Graffiti in conflict with the Civil Code (Spain)	Spain has city specific civil codes that aim to promote positive activities, when graffiti is seen in conflict to these civic codes writers will be fined and possibly prosecuted.	Urban areas, Transport, Buses, Trains, Railway, Shopping Centres,	Graffiti dialogues, 2011; Ajuntament de Barcelona, 2006

Table 5: Type by style or form

2. TYPE BY STYLE OR FORM				
Actors	Type	Form/ medium	Typical Location	Example Authors
Graffiti Writers / Vandals / Serious Writers/ Juveniles	Tags/ Tagging	Names or nicknames or individuals or groups or writers. Tagging can be done through any medium, usually spray paint or markers but in some cases writers use 'shoe dye kits according to www.graffiti.org '. 'Roll Call' is when a whole crew tag their names in lists on a piece.	Transport (Bus stop, railways)	Encams, 2007; Weisel, 2004; Chalfant, 1984; Bristol Council, 2011; Young, 2014; Gamman, 2014.
Graffiti Writers / Serious Writers/ Street Artists	Street Art	Typically involves pre-prepared formats Mediums include but not limited too; Stencil/ Posters/ Spray and brush Paint/ Stickers etc.	Public Areas, Buildings.	Young, 2014; Hughes, 2009; Barnes, 2009; Acton, 2013; Bofkin, 2014; Abarca, 2011; Ballaz and Diamante, 2010; Bressi, 1997; Vaughan, 2011; Mc Nichols, 2006; Molnar, 2011; Austin, 2010; Gilani, 2011.
Graffiti Writers / Serious Writers/ Street Artists	Street Sculpture	Typically involves pre-prepared formats	Public Areas, Buildings.	Young, 2014.
Graffiti Writers / Serious Writers/ Street Artists	Miniatures	Stickers, painted, plastic sculpture, assemblage.	Public Areas, high up, low down.	Young, 2014
Graffiti Writers / Vandals / Juveniles	Scratching	Scratched into glass, metal or concrete. A 'scriber' or sharp instrument could be used to do this usually made out of a diamond drill bit or sometimes sandpaper is also used.	Transport (Bus stop, railways). Urban environment (steel, glass)	Chalfant, 1984; Griffin, 2008; G.R.I.P, 2012
Graffiti Writers / Vandals / Serious Writers/	Wild Style	Spray paint; A complicated construction of interlocking letters. A developed style that consists of lots of arrows and connections. Wild style is considered one of the hardest styles to master and pieces	Transport, Public Areas, Buildings	Chalfant, 1984; Dossensport.com, 2014.

		done in wild style are often completely undecipherable to non-writers. A '3D's effect can also be applied to this style for added complexity. 'Props' is an American graffiti term meaning 'proper respect' writers who can do 'wild style' would gain 'props' from their peers.		
Graffiti Writers / Serious Writers/ Street Artists	Piece	A large, complex, and labor-intensive graffiti painting. Pieces often incorporate 3-D effects, arrows, and many colors and color-transitions, as well as various other effects.	Public walls, urban environment, transport.	graffitiseite-muenchen.de, 2014; Hoogwarts, 2014; Grant, 2012; Thesis, 2014.
Graffiti Writers / Serious Writers/ Street Artists	Blockbuster Style	Square and as flat as possible, spraying off the surface.	Public walls, urban environment, transport.	graffitiseite-muenchen.de, 2014
Graffiti Writers / Serious Writers/ Vandals.	Throw Up	Traditionally a spray painted or painted piece. A 'Scrub' is a certain type of throw up (two colours) filled very quickly with spray paint.	Initially was just a term used in relation to transport. Railway, buses, bus shelters, public areas, walls, buildings.	Chalfant 1984
Graffiti Writers / Serious Writers/ Street Artists	Bubble Style	Round balloon like design of letters.	Public walls, urban environment, transport.	Chalfant, 1984
Graffiti Writers / Serious Writers/ Street Artists	Character	Figurative representation.	Public walls, urban environment, transport.	graffitiseite-muenchen.de, 2014
Graffiti Writers / Serious Writers/ Street Artists	Stencil	Sprayed through a stencil, commonly used in street art.	Public Areas, Buildings.	Encams,2007, Young, 2014
Graffiti Writers / Serious Writers/ Street Artists	Mosaic	Ceramic tiles laid in a pixilated style inspired by the 1970s PacMan style.	Urban Environment, Public Areas.	Young, 2014

Graffiti Writers / Serious Writers/ Street Artists/ Eco-activists	Reverse Graffiti/ Grime Writing.	Is a method of creating temporary or semi-permanent images on walls or other surfaces by removing dirt from a surface. It is often done by removing dirt/dust with the fingertip(s) from windows or other dirty surfaces. Artists use a cloth or a high power washer to remove dirt on a larger scale.	Public walls, urban environment, transport.	Graffiti Dialogues, 2010
Graffiti Writers / Serious Writers/ Street Artists	Mural	Could take any form, including; Felt tip/ marker pens/ Spray/ Paint/ Stickers/ Stencil, Normally spray paint or paint.	Public Areas, Buildings.	Wignall, 2008; Heward & Hook, 2013, Young, 2014
Graffiti Writers / Serious Writers/ Street Artists	Stickers	Paper stickers, can be 'thrown up' onto a wall/ surface quickly.	Public Areas, Buildings, transport.	Chalfant, 1984
Graffiti Writers / Serious Writers/ Street Artists	Spray Paint	1. Wet Look (a type of old spray paint). 2.Sucker Tips (stock tip that comes with spray can). 3. Red Devil (old school).4. Rustoleum (expensive) 5. Krylon 6. Homemade (shoe dye and rags/ old socks in deodorant cans).	Public Areas, Buildings, transport.	Chalfant, 1984
Graffiti Writers / Serious Writers/ Street Artists	Brush Paint	1. Ultra- Flat (Type of paint that sticks better than glossy paint so this is preferred).2. Mean Streak (Opaque, waterproof with a solvent of ethyl glycol so hard to clean. Comes in white, blue, red and yellow made by Sanford corp. To 'rack in' an American graffiti term meaning to 'steal' art supplies.	Public Areas, Buildings, transport.	Chalfant, 1984
Graffiti Writers / Serious Writers/ Street Artists	Roller Paint	Paint applied to a flat surface via a roller.	Public Areas, Buildings, transport.	Chalfant, 1984
Graffiti Writers / Serious Writers/ Street Artists	Green Graffiti	Green wall, Moss, Mud, Leaves, green wall, Guerilla Gardening,	Walls, Urban environment, fences.	Moose, 2011
Graffiti Writers / Vandals / Juveniles	Scawling	Felt tip/ marker pens	Transport	Griffin, 2008
Graffiti Writers / Vandals / Juveniles	Carving	Chisel or sharp instrument to make marks typically into wood.	Trees, walls, urban environment.	Graffiti Dialogues, 2010

Graffiti Writers / Vandals / Juveniles	Paste Ups	Wheatpaste used to stick posters onto flat surfaces.	Trees, walls, urban environment, bus stops, traffic light polls.	Young, 2014
Graffiti Writers / Vandals / Juveniles	Marker Pen	1. Sharpie, 2. Pilot, SG -7, 3. Magnum, 4. Ultra- Wide. 5. Marks-a -Lot. 6. Griffin (A type of shoe dye used in homemade markers). 7. China Marker. To 'rack in' an American graffiti term meaning to 'steal' art supplies (normally paint or markers).	Public Toilets, Transport, Public Areas, Schools	Chalfant, 1984
Graffiti Writers / Serious Writers/ Street Artists	Chalk	Chalk drawn graffiti that should easily be able to be removed	Pavement.	Graffiti Dialogues, 2010
BTP, Police, Councils	Ghost	Partially removed, faded/ cleaned. Messaged changed.	Transport, Public Areas, Buildings	Encams, 2007
Graffiti Writers / Serious Writers/ Street Artist.	Bomb (hit/ Burn)	Early hip hop terms from 70s/80s/90s America meaning to fill an urban area.	Public space, Urban space.	Chalfant, 1994, Gomez, 1993
Graffiti Writers / Serious Writers/ Street Artists	Knitted Graffiti/ Yarn Bombing/ Craftivism	Knitter graffiti	Public Areas, Buildings.	Young, 2014
Graffiti Writers / Serious Writers/ Street Artists	Digital Graffiti	Photographs of graffiti	Internet/ TV/ Handheld devices.	Young, 2014
Graffiti Writers / Serious Writers/ Street Artists	Public Notices	Information provision, often through spray, marker pen or posters.	Urban walls.	Graffiti Dialogues, 2010
Graffiti Writers / Serious Writers/ Street Artists	Historic graffiti	Graffiti attacks on historic buildings and monuments are best countered with passive design and active management measures.	Historical l/Public space, Urban space.	English Heritage, 1999
Graffiti Writers / Vandals / Juveniles	Latrinalia	Usually done in pen or stickers.	Toilet doors/ walls	Chalfant, 1984; Koon-Hwee, 2001;

Table 6: Type by status

3. TYPE BY STATUS				
Actors	Type	Form/ medium	Typical Location	Example Authors
Graffiti Writers / Vandals / Serious Writers	Contentious	Could take any form, including; Felt tip/ marker pens/ Spray/ Paint/ Stickers/ Stencil	Transport, Public Areas, Buildings	Encams, 2007
Graffiti Writers / Vandals / Juveniles	Juvenile	Felt tip/ marker pens/ Spray/ Paint. NB. Badly done inexperienced graffiti can be described as 'wack'. 'Bite' is the hip-hop term used when one writer copies another's style.	Transport, Public Areas, Schools	Encams, 2007; US Department of Justice and Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 1998; San Diego Police Department, 2000; Polizeiliche Kriminalprävention der Länder und des Bundes, 2012; Kennedy, D. et al.1996.
Serious Graffiti Writers.	King	The best with the most. Some people refer to different writers as kings of different areas. King of throwups, king of style, king of a certain line, etc.	Urban areas, Transport, Buses, Trains, Railway.	Chalfant, 1984
Graffiti Writers / Vandals / Juveniles	Toy	An inexperienced writer just starting writing. Could take any form, including; Felt tip/ marker pens/ Spray/ Paint/ Stickers/ Stencil. NB. Badly done inexperienced graffiti can be described as 'wack'.	Transport, Public Areas.	Chalfant, 1984; Gomez, 1993.
Graffiti Writers / Serious Writers/ Vandals.	Serious Vandalism (associated to prolific, organised graffiti as well as other serious	Could take any form, including Scratching/ Felt tip/ marker pens/ Spray/ Paint/ Stickers/ Stencil	Railway, buses, bus shelters, public areas, walls, buildings.	BTP 2014, Griffin, 2008, Colt 24, 2010; Austin, 2012; Indio Police Department, 2008; De Diego,1997;

	crimes)			
Graffiti Writers / Serious Writers/ Vandals.	Gang	Could take any form, including; Scratching/ Felt tip/ marker pens/ Spray/ Paint/ Stickers/ Stencil	Railway, buses, bus shelters, public areas, walls, buildings.	Weisel, 2004; Barbaro, A.B.T., Chayes, L. and D'Orsogna, M.R., 2013; Tobin, 1995; Chang 2005; Kennedy, D. M., Braga A.A., Piehl A. M., 1997; US Department of Justice, 1999; Keats, 2008;
Graffiti Writers / Vandals / Serious Writers	Conventional	Could take any form, including; Felt tip/ marker pens/ Spray/ Paint/ Stickers/ Stencil	Transport, Public Areas, Buildings	Weisel, 2004, Pascoe, 2011, Young 2010,
Graffiti Writers / Serious Writers/ Street Artists	Situational/ Activist/ Guerilla Art	Not form specific but focuses on location of pre-planned 'artwork.' Mediums include but not limited too; Stencil/ Felt tip/ marker pens/ Spray/ Paint/ Stickers.	Public Areas, Buildings.	Young, 2014; Chang, 2005; Mc Nichols, 2006;
Multi Actor	Community Art/ Collaborative Group Art	The term "community art" refers also to field of community, neighbourhood and public art practice with roots in social justice and popular and informal education methods.	Public Areas, Buildings.	Young, 2014; Delgado, 1991; Bofkin, 2014; Hoogwarts, 2014; Alderton, 2014; Stocker, T.L., Dutcher, L.W., Hargrove, S. M. and Cook, E.A. (1972),
Multi Actor	Graffiti as a tourist Attraction	In areas such as Shoreditch in London, Brighton and Bristol in the UK paid guides give tours of graffiti areas.	Public Areas, Buildings.	Young, 2014, Rebobinart, 2014
Multi Actor	Commercial Graffiti	Aspirational, advertising	Public Areas, Buildings.	Young, 2014, woostercollective.org, 2014
Multi Actor	Graffiti as regeneration	Gentrification of urban areas for example Shoreditch in London and areas of Berlin.	Public Areas, Buildings.	Young, 2014

Table 7: Type by substrate/physical context (Location)

4. TYPE BY SUBSTRATE/ PHYSICAL CONTEXT (LOCATION)				
Actors	Type	Form/ medium	Typical Location	Example Authors
Graffiti Writers / Serious Writers/ Vandals.	Whole Train	Traditionally spray paint would be used. 'White trains' from 70s New York were preferred as these were like a 'blank canvas' for writers. Something completely covered can also be described as 'Top to bottom' or 'T2B'.	Train (transport) Extremely dangerous to write on trains with a real potential for death.	Chalfant, 1984
Graffiti Writers / Serious Writers/ Vandals.	Whole Car	Could take any form but traditionally spray paint would be used.	Car (transport)	Chalfant, 1984
Graffiti Writers / Serious Writers/ Vandals.	Vehicles	Covered in paint/ roller or spray.	Vehicles	Chalfant, 1984
Graffiti Writers / Serious Writers/ Vandals.	Historical Buildings	Not that common to write on historical buildings but it does happen, more likely to be juvenile over a serious writer.	Historical Buildings	Albro, 2005; English Heritage, 1999; Neelon, 2003
Graffiti Writers / Serious Writers/ Vandals.	Private Houses	Not that common to write on private homes but it does happen, more likely to be juvenile over a serious writer	Private Houses	Crime Prevention Unit of the Ministry of Justice, 2010; Huberman, 2007; Iveson, 2006; WA Police, 2010
Graffiti Writers / Serious Writers/ Vandals.	Public Walls	A visible public surface or canvas for writers, any form of graffiti could take place here.	Public Walls	Alonso, 1998; Callinan, 2002; Griffin Security Consultants, 2008; Minton, 2008; Rahn, 2002; Young 2014;
Graffiti Writers / Serious Writers/ Vandals.	Educational Buildings/ Civic Buildings	Graffiti can take place anywhere for many varied reasons and motivations.	Educational Buildings/ Civic Buildings	Crime Prevention Unit of the Ministry of Justice, 2010; Irons, 2012; Neelon, 2003; RAGE, 2014; Rahn, 2002; Koon-Hwee, 2001;

Table 8: Type by ideology

5. TYPE BY IDEOLOGY					
Actors	Type	Form/ medium	Typical Location	Example Authors	
Graffiti Writers / Serious Writers/	Religious	Could take any form, including; Scratching/ Felt tip/ marker pens/ Spray/ Paint/ Stickers/ Stencil	Railway, buses, bus shelters, public areas, walls, buildings.	Alonso, 1998; Bates, 1980;	
Graffiti Writers / Serious Writers/	Ideological	Could take any form, including; Scratching/ Felt tip/ marker pens/ Spray/ Paint/ Stickers/ Stencil	Railway, buses, bus shelters, public areas, walls, buildings.	Weisel, 2004; Bartolomeo, 2001; Alonso, 1998	
Graffiti Writers / Serious Writers/	Gendered	Could take any form, including; Scratching/ Felt tip/ marker pens/ Spray/ Paint/ Stickers/ Stencil.	Railway, buses, bus shelters, public areas, walls, buildings.	Young, 2014	

Table 9: Tools of graffiti or anti-graffiti management

6. TOOLS OF GRAFFITI OR ANTI GRAFFITI MANAGEMENT					
Actors	Type	Form/ medium	Typical Location	Example Authors	
Graffiti Writers / Serious Writers/ Street Artist.	Piece Book	A writer's sketchbook where outlines and ideas to be executed are kept and worked out. Also referred to as a "black book" or a "writer's bible". These books contain 'outlines' or sketches.	Sketch book	Chalfant, 1984	
Graffiti Writers / Serious Writers/ Street Artist.	Old School/ Hip Hop	General term used to refer to the early days of writing, more specifically, the mid 70s to '82 or '83. Also may refer to hip-hop music of this period. Old-school writers are given respect for being there when it all started, and specific writers are remembered for creating specific styles. Hip Hop: The culture in the late 70s and early 80s that spawned the graffiti culture as we know it now, breakdancing and hip-hop music, which has since turned into modern rap music	Historical I/Public space, Urban space.	Chalfant, 1984, Dosensport.com, 2014	
Graffiti Writers / Serious Writers/ Street Artist.	Ups/ Up/ All City.	Describes a writers work that is visible and has been put 'up'. Could take any form, including; Scratching/ Felt tip/ marker pens/ Spray/ Paint/ Stickers/ Stencil. If a writer was truly 'up' they would be considered 'All City.'	Public space, Urban space.	Chalfant, 1984; Grant, 2012;	
Authorities/ Independent Urban Cleaners	Chemical Cleaning	Cleaning is realised through chemical removal, mechanical removal or combined approaches involving both	Walls, Transport, Public space, Urban space.	IPL, 2014; Shaftoe, 2008; Association of London Government, Transport and Environment Committee, 2005; BTP, 2014;	
Authorities/ Local Councils/ Independent Urban Cleaners	Surface Protection (anti-graffiti coating)	Protection applications can be temporary, permanent or semi-permanent. Their restorative surface treatments include acrylics, pliolites, polyurethanes, epoxy and chlorines.	Walls, Transport, Public space, Urban space.	IPL, 2014; Shaftoe, 2008; BTP, 2014	

Authorities/ Local Councils/ Independent Urban Cleaners	Pressure Washing	Paint is used to cover over graffiti on smooth, painted surfaces. It is fairly low cost (ranging from donated paint to 6 cents per square foot), and paint is a relatively safe product compared to removing graffiti with some chemical solvents.	Walls, Transport, Public space, Urban space.	IPL, 2014; Shaftoe, 2008; BTP, 2014; graffitihurts.org, 2014
Authorities/ Local Councils/ Independent Urban Cleaners	Paint Out	Pressure washing equipment uses water or water in combination with a solvent to remove graffiti from a surface. A solvent may first be applied and then the surface is washed with pressurized water. Sometimes a blasting media, such as baking soda, is used to remove graffiti. While pressure washing is effective, it can wear down the surface being treated.	Walls, Transport, Public space, Urban space.	IPL, 2014; Shaftoe, 2008; BTP, 2014; graffitihurts.org, 2014

Table 10: Type by mode of encounter

7. TYPE BY MODE OF ENCOUNTER				
Actors	Type	Form/ medium	Typical Location	Example Authors
Multi Actor	Internet Media	Internet Media	Internet Media	Young, 2014; Neelon, 2003; Klausner, 2014, Webstercollective, 2014
Multi Actor	Broadcast Media	Broadcast Media	Broadcast Media	Young, 2014
Multi Actor	Printed Media	Printed Media	Printed Media	Young, 2014

Table 11: Type by procedure

8. TYPE BY PROCEDURE				
Actors	Type	Form/ medium	Typical Location	Example Authors
Multi Actor	Pre-Planned	Have tools but work only starts on site.	Urban areas, Transport, Buses, Trains, Railway.	graffiti dialogues, 2010
Multi Actor	Pre-Prepared	Have tools and work is initiated before arriving at site.	Urban areas, Transport, Buses, Trains, Railway.	graffiti Dialogues, 2010
Multi Actor	Opportunistic	No preparation or planning, intervention made based on situation or opportunity.	Urban areas, Transport, Buses, Trains, Railway.	graffiti Dialogues, 2010; BTP 2014.

At this stage the following headings have been considered but left out until further analysis has been carried out;

1. Suggested Motivations
2. Progression (how does practice change over time
3. Indicators of Impact
4. Response

5 IMPLICATIONS

What is clear from findings of the research presented is that a stronger collaborative approach is required to deduce a truly useful, shareable and transformative categorisation model regarding graffiti vandalism for Europe and its actual societal impact. The graffiti vandalism data accessible for different European contexts (public spaces and public transport) is not presently available in formats useful for productive comparisons to be drawn. Categorisations and methods for data collection vary significantly and the most up to date and apparently respected accounts among literature reviewed are, in a number of cases, out of date or recent but based on tertiary data from older sources.

To give one example, specific to organising categorisation models, a crowd sourced, or ‘wiki’-type categorisation and data organisation model could prove productive in this context (as has worked previously in unifying disparate standards and categorisations, such as on the Bikeoff project, 2006-2010⁴). Such a format would permit experts, specialists and practitioners with new, primary or secondary data to upload, correct, refine and update information and categorisations through a shared, live and evolving platform. Clearly if realised, such a facility would be best as part of a wider range or suite of tools and resources, aimed at better-empowering dutyholders and stakeholders to match the response to their respective contexts. This is discussed further in Graffolution deliverable D2.6 and the Demonstration work package WP4 is aimed at ensuring any such responses are suitable to the contexts and experiences of the users who are likely to engage with the Graffolution platform.

More widely speaking, the merged, or connected management models discussed below and also in WP2.6, look towards a moment when individuals and organisations can assess harm of unauthorised graffiti activities, or indeed benefit, from multiple perspectives in parallel. One opportunity for the proposed Graffolution platform here is to act as a ‘gateway’ to enable users to develop their own categorisation approaches and share with others to build mutual and diversely informed capacity in terms of graffiti related categorisations and responses.

In seeking possible and appropriate directions for categorisation models for the Graffolution platform, we must consider that almost all actors within authority or enforcement or policy-making roles covering public spaces and public transport stress that resources are scarce and therefore cheap, effective and sustainable solutions are needed. To this end, categories and approaches, which can capture and help replicate the successes of collaborative, partnership, shared-resource or merged models prove to be of particular interest. Further consideration should be given also to prevention and awareness-oriented practices. Many sources reviewed during this research activity

⁴ See

http://latlon.org/~jek/bikes/docs/bikeparking/investigation/Layout_and_Spacing_of_Parking_Furniture.html
and <http://www.bikeoff.org>

(WP2.1) principally focus on the former and far less on the latter. However, both are relevant in order to maximise resources in terms of people, time, places, materials and finance.

Zero tolerance strategies are understood to be among the most expensive to implement. In the context of public spaces, the experience of Thanet, a local government district of Kent, England demonstrated their inability to eradicate graffiti vandalism by just concentrating on law enforcement and removal of tags. In this case, additional prevention and some pro-social methods were added to the overall strategy through working between multiple dutyholders within a 'Community Safety Partnership' (Thanet Community Safety Partnership, 2011). Halsey and Young (2002) identify that regulatory strategies devised by municipal councils that they studied up to 2002 were categorised as: removal, criminalisation, welfarism and acceptance of graffiti culture. However, they conclude that responses to graffiti should eschew criminalisation as no strategy can be (cost) effective by absolutely ignoring the desire of expression through graffiti (Hasley & Young, 2002). Other sources, in the context of public transport, including Strutton (2013) add to this concerns over the high costs associated to constant removal and criminalisation of all graffiti as vandalism. Iveson (2009) presents a series of measures focused on improving the problem and facilitating open discussion in communities through both the abandonment of the zero tolerance and new opportunities for political dialogues linked to street art and graffiti. The thesis of Woodward (2009) focuses on an analysis of graffiti in Hyde Park (Leeds) as a public space, also in search of ways to avoid the criminalisation of the activity per se. Instead Woodward looks for restorative and regenerative measures to promote and improve coexistence, increase activity support and natural and artificial surveillance and security, dealing with graffiti through facilitating social, arts-led projects and legal graffiti walls since, he argues not all painted walls are vandalism.

Merged Models, such as those implemented by Brighton and Hove City Council (Barker & Leach, 2010) in the context of public spaces work to both reduce instances of graffiti vandalism and to work with graffiti writers to help regenerate some areas of the city, whereby the writers are allowed wall space on the agreement that they contribute their own time and material resources to help maintain the site. Barker and Leach describe an example responding to the situation where the Brighton municipality needed to spend less on cleaning and does not have funds to pay for murals, and in parallel wanted artists to have space for their creativity. Examples of their responses include permitted graffiti pieces on utility boxes, which worked well to reduce tags and improve image in the immediate vicinities. Some artists who are in relationship with the council have reserved spots where they can show their art. Another example is of a park that attracted previously a lot of graffiti vandalism and was revitalised through cleaning but also provision of space with graffiti art and murals. They explain that the park subsequently experienced a greater range of visitors and positive associated responses. Separately Brighton and Hove City Council established an initiative engaging graffiti writers to create street art murals on whole house fronts and on lanes on backs of

commercial buildings. Instead of the council constantly cleaning the walls the artists were allowed to spray at the whole wall. The project became very well-known and is understood to have also attracts tourists and are associated with an economic boost to local businesses. This appears to work towards a win-win scenario where different agendas of both dutyholder and stakeholder-actors can be met while sharing resources of labour, time, material and economic investment between collaborators (actors).

Graffiti as a category of vandalism is broadly understood as instances of graffiti-related activity which are seen to damage, destroy or devalue property, maliciously or unintentionally, where permission is not granted but not so where permission is granted. The implication is that permission is the sole driver, which serves to determine whether any intervention adds or detracts value to or from a property (see Shaftoe, 2011). A significant gap knowledge and practice that has been observed through this research is that very few sources describe or agree upon what really does define damage, destruction, or devaluation. The notion of graffiti vandalism needs to be better considered with regards to the respective contexts and evidence of communities affected, rather purely only looking at material form of interventions on a micro-level. This relates also to Kurt Iveson's suggestion that one person's interpretation of vandalism is another person's affirmation of life in the city. His emphasis is that we now need strategies around how to handle this disagreement (Iveson, 2008).

There are notably few sources offering cross-comparable statistical data, and less so with up to date quantitative data in both public space and public transport contexts. There is also some apparent variation in parameters measured and considerable lack of evidence, method detail or references, regarding exactly how some conclusions were arrived at. For example, in terms of public transportation "our [Transport for London] customer satisfaction survey says that people don't like graffiti" (Strutton, 2013), reveals little about the rigour of the survey, nor how it was conducted or interpreted. Keep Britain Tidy, which now embraces the Anti Graffiti Association (AGA) report that in some contexts (specifically in relation to public spaces) graffiti and demand for graffiti cleaning and graffiti resistant products have reduced, owing in part it is believed, to cost-reductions and austerity measures affecting budgets available to invest against graffiti and in part to the effectiveness of technologies already implemented (AGA Meeting, London, 27 February 2014). While some transport related sources suggest that graffiti vandalism is a serious and on-going problem (Campbell, 2008; Keats, 2008), others also indicate that graffiti vandalism has reduced in public transport contexts over the past half decade (e.g. FGC, 2014; Strutton, 2013), linked to implementation of multiple measure, achievable through on-going spend absorbed by fare-payers. None of these diverse qualitative assertions are presently supported by robust quantitative data, however it appears likely that multi-actor and collaborative initiatives across different contexts in Europe, can and do effect reductions in the extent of graffiti vandalism when significant financial resources are invested. It

would be useful to establish more robust models for documenting and sharing graffiti management and engagement practices to give a more global and comparative picture of any intervention's capacity both to promote pro-social and to restrict anti-social.

Following multiple contacts with different European city and transport authorities, and with the EU Crime Prevention Network, only a limited number came forward with data. This may be linked to data not being available for public spaces and public transportation, or to resource availability for colleagues to respond within the timeframe, or equally reflective of current agendas of the organisations contacted. Questions remain of how the extent of reported graffiti vandalism can be indicated and analysed more consistently, comparably and robustly, and how it can be impacted upon more cost-effectively. In parallel, issues have emerged where graffiti is classed as vandalism in and some (not all) instances it simultaneously acts to regenerate an environment (Young, 2014). Accordingly, graffiti and graffiti vandalism need to be approached through multi-dimensional category and response approaches (Austin and Sanders, 2007), and its impact understood within the wider context in which it is being experienced (Vitiello and Willcocks, 2011b), since different kinds of graffiti produce different security perceptions among different publics (Austin and Sanders, 2007).

Where Fox Gotham, Fox Gotham, Shefner and Brumley (2001) state that policy-makers need to understand the meanings given to a space by communities, as well as its history and significance for the people in developing policies, perhaps the Graffolution project should also look at categorisation models that can help capture such detail in more depth and more open ways. Further, Iveson (2009) questions the definition of "the graffiti problem" and aims to provide new approaches, to better understand it. He argues that the definition of the "graffiti problem" created by the dominant anti-graffiti policies is limited while the means utilised (such as rapid removal, surveillance and harsher penalties) to solve it are costly and inadequate. The debates he presents are informed by a pragmatic acknowledgement that graffiti is not likely to go away. The approach the article pursues, as opposed to policing, takes planning to centre stage. He suggests that planners, by working to involve a variety of actors in a democratic and paradigmatic compromise that takes account of genuine differences in how different communities value and appreciate urban environments, can end the costly war on graffiti. This signifies the importance of engaging with graffiti writers in developing policies, differentiating between good and bad graffiti as well as proportioning the costs of implementing laws to the harms caused. Such an approach demands new policies (implicitly including new categorisation models) that can establish a political process able to bring different opinions on graffiti into some kind of democratic contact. It also implies that these alternative policies should be better informed by evidence being supported by both qualitative and quantitative research. Respectively, one of the most valuable contributions of the Graffolution project is that it takes into account the "whole picture" rather than focusing on a single perspective or a single method.

6 CONCLUSION

This report establishes the starting point of the Graffolution research activities. Currently this is the most comprehensive collection and review of literature and other sources pertaining to graffiti vandalism influencing the 'state of the art' in Europe in the contexts of public spaces and public transport. The sources included in the bibliography and annotated in the appendix provide a comprehensive starting point working towards the aggregation of a research compendium on graffiti vandalism in Europe.

The report provides information of existing categorisation models that are used to compare and understand graffiti vandalism. Furthermore it identifies relevant project stakeholders. The literature provides an extensive account of graffiti vandalism with a broad focus within the European context, additionally it begins to identify regional cultural, ethical, privacy and legal aspects and influence factors within specific parts of Europe and will contribute to the development of regional reports. The primary contribution here is how it identifies and augments the choice of stakeholders selected to interview in D2.2 as identified in table 1 and 2. The material also begins to identify stakeholder initiatives and alliances providing a starting point for D2.3. The categorisation model has identified approaches to, and motivations for graffiti vandalism and began to detail prevention and management strategies included in Table 4-11. This will strongly contribute to the foundation of D2.6. The literature pertaining to awareness and perceptions of graffiti vandalism and prevention concepts will also be useful in D2.6. The identification of relevant stakeholders contributes to the foundation of D2.7 delivering an account of stakeholder experiences challenges and requirements. The review includes examples of management strategies and tools that will make a contribution to D2.9 and the development of future tool concepts against graffiti vandalism. Here, however the literature and statistical data demonstrates that a zero tolerance approach may not be the most effective way to manage graffiti vandalism and that an open and inclusive account exploring a plurality of stakeholder perspectives, merged models of graffiti vandalism management should be considered in order to inform the development of an appropriate and fit for purpose Graffolution platform.

7 BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [solid]. (2005). Anti-Graffiti-Kongress in Bln und Gegendemo. 30.03.2005, 1. Retrieved from <http://de.indymedia.org/2005/03/110522.shtml> [Accessed 21-May-2014]
- Abarca, J. (2011, May 27). *Dialogues with Graffiti for 21st Century Cities- presentation for the DACRC ESRC workshop 3 "Codes of practice linked to the Dark Side of Creativity."* Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CMCXheqI5MY#t=32> [Accessed 14-May-2014]
- Acton, L. (2010, December). *Dialogues with Graffiti for 21st Century Cities- presentation for the DACRC ESRC workshop 1 "Connected Environments, Communities, Materials and Technologies"*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AC-eo4E4nss> [Accessed 14-May-2014]
- Acton, L. (2013, October 30). *Graffiti Dialogues Network presentation for the Graffiti Impact 2013 Event*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tZ4hYUlvXIU> [Accessed 14-May-2014]
- Adz, K. (2008). *The Urban Cook Book: Creative Recipes for the Graffiti Generation*, London, Thames and Hudson Ltd.
- Ajuntament de Barcelona. (2006). *Measures to encourage and guarantee peaceful coexistence and respect in Barcelona* (p. p.2). Barcelona: Ajuntament de Barcelona. Retrieved from http://www.bcn.cat/prevenio/championsuefa/pdf/Ord_Civisme-en.pdf [Accessed 22-May-2014]
- Albro, R. (2005). *The Challenges of Asserting, Promoting, and Performing Cultural Heritage. Theorising Cultural Heritage Series*, 1(1). Retrieved from http://www.folklife.si.edu/resources/center/cultural_policy/pdf/RobAlbrofellow.pdf [Accessed 04-June-2014]
- Alderton, H. (2013, October 30). *Graffiti Dialogues Network presentation for the Graffiti Impact 2013 Event*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=B9GKNJTbNRE> [Accessed 14-May-2014]
- Alonso, A. (1998). *Urban Graffiti on the City Landscape*. Retrieved from <http://www.streetgangs.com/academic/alonsograffiti.pdf> [Accessed 12-May-2014]
- Anderson, C. L. (2012). anderson.pdf. *Graduate Journal of Visual and Material Culture*, (5). Retrieved from <http://shiftjournal.org/archives/articles/2012/anderson.pdf> [Accessed 16-May-2014]
- Antigraffiti Rhein Main. (2014). *Graffiti Lexikon. Antigraffiti Rhein Main*. Retrieved June 14, 2014, from <http://www.antigraffiti-rhein-main.de/informationen/graffiti-lexikon.html> [Accessed: 14-Jun-2014].
- Arbeitsstelle Kinder- und Jugendkriminalitätsprävention. (2007). *Evaluation in der Kinder- und Jugendkriminalitätsprävention* (p. 250). München: Arbeitsstelle Kinder- und Jugendkriminalitätsprävention. Retrieved from https://www.worldcat.org/title/evaluation-in-der-kinder-und-jugendkriminalitatspraevention-eine-dokumentation/oclc/254072449&referer=brief_results [Accessed 02-July-2014]
- ARIFA AKBAR. (2012). *Damien Hirst in vicious feud with teenage artist over a box of pencils*

- Millionaire gets young rival banned from galleries after taking. *Independent*, (April), 1–7. Retrieved from <http://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/art/news/damien-hirst-in-vicious-feud-with-teenage-artist-over-a-box-of-pencils-1781463.html> [Accessed 01-July-2014]
- Armitage, R., & L. Gamman et. al. (2009). SafeGrowth : Moving Forward in Neighbourhood Development. *Built Environment*, 35(3). Retrieved from http://www1.toronto.ca/city_of_toronto/social_development_finance_administration/files/pdf/STEP_SafeGrowth.pdf [Accessed 01-July-2014]
- Association of London Government Transport and Environment Committee. (2005). *Graffiti Removal: Code of Practice for exercising the powers set out in section 12 and 13 of the London Local Authorities Act 1995 (as amended)*. Retrieved from www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/London%20Councils/.../GraffitiA.pdf [Accessed 03-May-2014]
- Ausfelder, K. (1990). *Kunst oder Chaos? – Graffiti an der Berliner Mauer*. Darmstadt.
- Austin, D., & Sanders, C. (2007). Graffiti and Perceptions of Safety: A Pilot Study Using Photographs and Survey Data. *Journal of Criminal Justice and Popular Culture*, 14(4), 25.
- Austin, J. (2001). *Taking the train: how graffiti art became an urban crisis in New York City*. New York City: Columbia University Press.
- Austin, J. (2010). More to see than a canvas in a white cube: For an art in the streets. *City*, 14(1-2), 33–47. Retrieved from <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/13604810903529142> [Accessed 28 May 2014].
- Bannister, S. (2013, October 30). *Graffiti Dialogues Network presentation for the Graffiti Impact 2013 Event*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=A-9tzOP3jHw> [Accessed 14-May-2014]
- Barbaro, A. B. T., Chayes, L., & D’Orsogna, M. R. (2013). Territorial developments based on graffiti: A statistical mechanics approach. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and Its Applications*, 392(1), 252–270. doi:10.1016/j.physa.2012.08.001. <http://arxiv.org/pdf/1208.0401v1.pdf> [Accessed 16-May-2014].
- Barnes, P. (2006). *Capitalism 3.0 A Guide to Reclaiming the Commons* (First.). Berrett-Koehler Publishers. Retrieved from http://capitalism3.com/files/Capitalism_3.0_Peter_Barnes.pdf [Accessed 22-March-2014]
- Bartolomeo, B. (2001). *Cement or Canvas : Aerosol Art & The Changing Face of Graffiti in the 21st Century*. Schenectady NYC.
- Bates, John A., M., Michael. (1980). The Thematic Content of Graffiti as a Nonreactive Indicator of Male and Female Attitudes. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 16, 300–315. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/3812049?uid=3737864&uid=2&uid=4&sid=21104190369283> [Accessed 21-July-2014]
- Battaglini, M., & Palfrey, T. R. (2007). *The Dynamics of Distributive Politics 1*. Retrieved from http://www.hss.caltech.edu/~trp/BP_econtheory.pdf [Accessed 04-June-2014]
- BBC News. (2008). *Tunnel becomes Banksy art exhibit*. Retrieved from

- <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/england/london/7377622.stm> [Accessed 20-06-2014]
- Begum, B., Johnson, S. D., & Ekblom, P. (2009). Project Socio-Environmental Disorder & Urban Configuration (SEDUC) Report Anti-Social Behaviour : A Practitioners Guide UCL Jill Dando Institute of Crime Science , University College, (January), 1–58.
- Behforouzi, H. (2006). *Die deutsche Graffiti-Szene*. Tübingen: Universität Tübingen.
- berlingraffiti.de. (2014). *Graffiti Filmdatenbank*. Berlin Graffiti. Retrieved from <http://berlingraffiti.de/movies/> [Accessed 02-July-2014]
- Bernard E. Hardcourt. (2001). *Illusion of order, the false promise of Broken Windows Policing*. Harvard University Press.
- Berti, G. (2009). *Pioneros del Graffiti en España*. Valencia: Universitat Politècnica de València. Servicio de publicación. Information at <http://gabrielaberti.wordpress.com/category/pioneros-del-graffiti-en-espana/> [Accessed 20-June-2014]
- Berti, G. (2010). *Spanish graffiti. Old School*. Retrieved from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eh6gb9xJJ0> [Accessed 13 May 2014]
- Bielak, S., & Duffalo, A. (2012). Agonizing over “ Agonism ”: Exploring How Difference Can Fuel Democracy. *Walker Art Magazine (online)*. Retrieved from <http://www.walkerart.org/magazine/2012/agonism-politics-consensus-art-democracy> [Accessed 22-May-2014]
- Biller, S. (2014). *i-love-urbanart*. *i-love-urbanart*. Retrieved June 17, 2014, from <http://www.i-love-urbanart.com/wordpress/> [Accessed: 17-Jun-2014].
- Bofkin, L. (2013, October 30). *How can street art be better and more transferably incorporated into city management structures? Presentation for the Graffiti Impact 2013 Graffiti Dialogues Event*. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=d8ksH_GOWR0 [Accessed 22-May-2014]
- Bollier, D. (2008). *Viral spiral : how the commoners built a digital republic of their own*. New York City: New Press.
- Borja, J. (2000). El espacio público, ciudad y ciudadanía.
- Brantingham, P. and F. Faust (1976) ‘A Conceptual Model of Crime Prevention’. *Crime and Delinquency*, 22:130-146.
- Brassaï, G. (1993). *Brassaï Graffiti*. Paris: Flammarion.
- Breetzke, G., & Pearson, A. (2014). The fear factor: Examining the spatial variability of recorded crime on the fear of crime. *Applied Science*, 46, 45–52.
- Brent Council & NSMC. (2007). Reducing graffiti vandalism. http://www.thensmc.com/sites/default/files/Brent%20Graffiti%20FULL%20case%20study_0.pdf [Accessed 22-May-2014]
- Brent Council. (2010). *Brent Graffiti Policy Co-design Report*. London. Retrieved from http://www.brent.gov.uk/media/2024999/Environmental_Report_2005-09.pdf [Accessed

14-July-2014].

- Bressi, T. (1997). *Common Places: Anything but Simple. American Institute of Architects Regional and Urban Design Committee.* Retrieved from http://placesobserver.com/media/pdf/Common_Places_273.pdf [Accessed 22-May-2014]
- Brighton & Hove City Council. (2013). *Offensive graffiti. Brighton & Hove City Council: Graffiti.* Retrieved June 11, 2014, from <http://www.brighton-hove.gov.uk/content/environment/recycling-rubbish-and-street-cleaning/graffiti> [Accessed: 11-Jun-2014].
- Brighton and Hove City Council. (2012). *Graffiti.* <http://www.brighton-hove.gov.uk/content/environment/recycling-rubbish-and-street-cleaning/graffiti>. Retrieved June 18, 2014, from <http://www.brighton-hove.gov.uk/content/environment/recycling-rubbish-and-street-cleaning/graffiti> [Accessed: 18-Jun-2014].
- Bristol City Council. (2008). *Bristol City Council Graffiti Policy Background.* Retrieved from https://www.bristol.gov.uk/committee/2009/ob/ob001/1117_3.pdf [Accessed 14-July-2014].
- British Transport Police (2011). *Graffiti Incidents Recorded by British Transport Police.* Retrieved from http://publicdata.eu/my_MM/dataset/graffiti-incidents-recorded-by-british-transport-police84ef6 [Accessed: 14-July-2014].
- British Transport Police. (2012). *Graffiti.* Retrieved June 1, 2014, from https://www.btp.police.uk/advice_and_information/how_we_tackle_crime/graffiti.aspx [Accessed: 01-Jun-2014].
- British Transport Police (2013). http://www.btp.police.uk/pdf/The_Line_July_V8_WEB.pdf. *The Line-The Magazine of British Transport Police*, 7–8. Retrieved from http://www.btp.police.uk/pdf/The_Line_July_V8_WEB.pdf [Accessed: 14-July-2014].
- Brown, N., Griffis, R., Hamilton, K., Irish, S., & Kanouse, S. (2007). *What Makes Justice Spatial ? What Makes Spaces Just ? Three Interviews on the Concept of Spatial Justice Critical Spatial Practice Reading Group.*
- Brown, T. (2008). *Transcript for Tim Brown on creativity and play.* Retrieved from <http://www.presentationzen.com/presentationzen/2008/11/play-is-good-for-you-and-its-good-for-business.html> [Accessed 23-July-2014].
- BTP. (2011a). *Graffiti Incidents Recorded by British Transport Police.* Greater London: London Analyst Support Site (LASS), Intelligence Unit, Greater London Authority. Retrieved from http://publicdata.eu/my_MM/dataset/graffiti-incidents-recorded-by-british-transport-police84ef6 [Accessed 19-June-2014].
- BTP. (2011b). *Rooting Out Route Crime. The Line (The Magazine of British Transport Police)*, 9. Retrieved from http://www.btp.police.uk/pdf/the_line_april_web.pdf
- BTP. (2013a). *Exhibition and sock trap graffiti vandals. Line Magazine*, 7–8. Retrieved from http://www.btp.police.uk/pdf/The_Line_July_V8_WEB.pdf [Accessed 11-July-2014].
- BTP. (2013b). *Graffiti Incidents Recorded by British Transport Police.* publicdata.eu. Retrieved from

- <http://publicdata.eu/dataset/graffiti-incidents-recorded-by-british-transport-police84ef6>
[Accessed 11-July-2014].
- Bundesministerium für Inneres (AT). (2010). *.KRIMINALITÄTSBERICHT - Statistik und Analyse - 2010*.
Bundesministerium für Inneres (AT).
- Bundespolizeiinspektion München. (2014, July 5). *Graffitiseite-München. Graffitiseite-München*.
Retrieved June 12, 2014, from <http://www.graffitiseite-muenchen.de/index.html> [Accessed:
12-June-2014].
- Bunting, A. M. (2012). A Sociological Study of Graffiti in Seville, Spain. *Journal of Student Research*,
1(2), 51–54. Retrieved from <http://www.jofsr.com/index.php/path/article/view/64>
[Accessed: 02-June-2014].
- Burns, C. et al (2006). PAPER 02 Transformation Design, 44(272099). Retrieved from
[http://www.designcouncil.info/mt/RED/transformationdesign/TransformationDesignFinalDr
aft.pdf](http://www.designcouncil.info/mt/RED/transformationdesign/TransformationDesignFinalDraft.pdf) [Accessed 21-May-2014].
- Butts, C., Sumray, R., & Roberts, J. (2008). *Seen and Heard – Young People, Policing and Crime: An
MPA Report* (pp. 55 – 88). London, United Kingdom: Metropolitan Police Authority. Retrieved
from [http://policeauthority.org/metropolitan/downloads/scrutinities/youth/youth-scrutiny-
adultversion.pdf](http://policeauthority.org/metropolitan/downloads/scrutinities/youth/youth-scrutiny-adultversion.pdf) [Accessed 23-July-2014].
- C100. (2010). *The Art of Rebellion III*. publikat.
- CABE Space (2005). *What are we scared of? The value of risk in designing public space*. Retrieved
from
[http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20110118095356/http://www.cabe.org.uk/files/w
hat-are-we-scared-of.pdf](http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20110118095356/http://www.cabe.org.uk/files/what-are-we-scared-of.pdf) [Accessed: 14-July-2014].
- CABE Space (2007). *Living with risk Promoting better public space design Design better streets*.
London. Retrieved from
[http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20110118095356/http://www.cabe.org.uk/files/li
ving-with-risk-briefing.pdf](http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20110118095356/http://www.cabe.org.uk/files/living-with-risk-briefing.pdf) [Accessed: 22-June-2014].
- CABE Space. (2009). *No Title* (p. 54). Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment and the
Greater London Authority. Retrieved from
[http://www.designcouncil.org.uk/sites/default/files/asset/document/open-space-
strategies.pdf](http://www.designcouncil.org.uk/sites/default/files/asset/document/open-space-strategies.pdf) [Accessed 14-July-2014].
- Callinan, R. (2002). *Dealing with Graffiti in New South Wales*. Retrieved from
[http://www.parliament.nsw.gov.au/prod/parlment/publications.nsf/0/9C425494BD3AE384C
A256ECF0007BBDD/\\$File/08-02.pdf](http://www.parliament.nsw.gov.au/prod/parlment/publications.nsf/0/9C425494BD3AE384CA256ECF0007BBDD/$File/08-02.pdf) [Accessed 23-July-2014].
- Campaignbrief.com (2011). *NZ Police launches post-Christchurch ambient recruitment campaign via
M & C Saatchi , Auckland*. Retrieved from [http://www.campaignbrief.com/2011/08/nz-
police-launches-post-christ.html](http://www.campaignbrief.com/2011/08/nz-police-launches-post-christ.html) [Accessed 28-May-2014]
- Campbell, F. (2008). *Good Graffiti Bad Graffiti? A New Approach To an Old Problem*. Wigan:
Environmental Campaigns Limited (ENCAMS). Retrieved from
http://www2.keepbritaintidy.org/imgLibrary/Good_Graffiti,_Bad_Graffiti_602.pdf [Accessed
28-May-2014].

- Cassegard, C. (2011a). *The limits of agonistic pluralism*. Retrieved from carlcassegard.blogspot.com/2011/01/limits-of-agonistic-pluralism.html [Accessed 13-July-2014]
- Cassegard, C. (2011b). *The limits of agonistic pluralism*. Retrieved from carlcassegard.blogspot.com/2011/01/limits-of-agonistic-pluralism.html [Accessed 13-July-2014]
- Castleman, C. (1984). *Getting Up: Subway Graffiti in New York*. Cambridge (Mass.): The MIT Press. Retrieved from http://www.cwrl.utexas.edu/~burdette/projects/readings/castleman_politics_of_graffiti.pdf [Accessed 16-May-2014].
- Castleman, C. (2011). The Politics of Graffiti. In M. Forman & M. Anthony Neal (Eds.), *That's the Joint! The Hip-Hop Studies Reader* (2nd Edition., p. 764 pages). Routledge. Retrieved from http://www.cwrl.utexas.edu/~burdette/projects/readings/castleman_politics_of_graffiti.pdf [Accessed 16-May-2014].
- Ch Hundertmark. (2005). *Art of Rebellion : The World of Street Art*. Gingko Press Incorporated.
- Chalfant, H., & Cooper, M. (1984). *Subway Art*. New York City: New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Chalfant, H., & Pigoff, J. (1987). *Spraycan Art*. New York City: New York, N.Y. : Thames and Hudson.
- Chang, J. (2005). *Can't Stop Won't Stop: A History of the Hip-Hop Generation*. New York, St. Martin's Press.
- City of Stockholm. (2014). Stockholms Stads Klotterpolicy. Retrieved from https://www.google.co.uk/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=2&ved=0CCsQFjAB&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.stockholm.se%2FPageFiles%2F77860%2FStockholms%2520stads%2520klotterpolicy.pdf&ei=YDtsVceKB8mrgwTdgoOoCg&usg=AFQjCNH1S_Tmz7abvFiBuDEGZO89LfGaTA&sig2=i_dcqGK4j8yoz4EXfjkZuA&bvm=bv.94455598,d.ZGU&cad=rja [Accessed 17-June-2014]
- Clarke, R. V. (1978). *Tackling Vandalism*. Retrieved from http://www.popcenter.org/problems/graffiti/pdfs/clarke_1978.pdf [Accessed 21-July-2014].
- Clarke, R. V. (1997). Situational Crime Prevention: Successful Case Studies. *Crime and Justice*. Retrieved from http://www.popcenter.org/library/reading/pdfs/scp2_intro.pdf [Accessed 21-July-2014].
- Colt 45. (2010). Our culture is your crime. *City: Analysis of Urban Trends, Culture, Theory, Policy, Action*, 14(1-2), 156–157. Retrieved from <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/13604810903529175> [Accessed 02-May-2014].
- Cooper, K. 28 October 2011. *Restorative justice: making neighbourhood resolution panels work*. Retrieved June 22, 2014, from <http://www.theguardian.com/local-government-network/2011/oct/28/restorative-justice-neighbourhood-resolution-panels> [Accessed 22-June-2014]

- Cresswell, T. (1992). The crucial “where” of graffiti: a geographical analysis of reactions to graffiti in New York. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 10(3), 329 – 344. Retrieved from http://www.academia.edu/538479/The_crucialwhereof_graffiti_a_geographical_analysis_of_reactions_to_graffiti_in_New_York [Accessed 02-May-2014].
- Crime Prevention Division, & General, A. (2009). *Graffiti vandalism*. Retrieved from <http://www.crimeprevention.nsw.gov.au/cpd/protectcommunity/graffitivandalism.html> [Accessed 09-June-2014].
- Crime Prevention Unit of the Ministry of Justice. (2010). *How to STOP Graffiti Guide A practical resource for territorial authorities, schools, businesses and private residents*. Waitakere City. Retrieved from <http://www.justice.govt.nz/policy/crime-prevention/documents/vandalism/STOP-Graffiti-Guide-LR.pdf> [Accessed 17-July-2014].
- Cullinane, L. (2011). *Dialogues with Graffiti for 21st Century Cities- presentation for the DACRC ESRC workshop 3 “Codes of practice linked to the Dark Side of Creativity”*. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yFK21y1QG_I [Accessed 02-June-2014].
- Currie, G., Delbosc, A., & Mahmoud, S. (2010). Perceptions and Realities of Personal Safety on Public Transport for Young People in Melbourne. Retrieved from http://www.atrf.info/papers/2010/2010_Currie_Delbosc_Mahmoud.pdf [Accessed 11-July-2014].
- D’Amico, D. J., & Block, W. (2004). *A Legal and Economical Analysis of Graffiti*. Pittsburg. Retrieved from http://www.graffiti.org/faq/damico_a_legal_and_economic_analysis_of_graffiti.pdf [Accessed 12-July-2014].
- Darin Rowland, Roger Gasstman, Ian Sattler. (2006). *Freight Train Graffiti*. Thames & Hudson.
- De Bono, J. (2011). *Dialogues with Graffiti for 21st Century Cities - presentation for the DACRC ESRC workshop 1 “Connected Environments, Communities, Materials and Technologies”*. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=D_WavVuUtLs&feature=youtu.be [Accessed 22-May-2014].
- De Diego, J. (1997). LA ESTÉTICA DEL GRAFFITI EN LA SOCIODINÁMICA DEL ESPACIO URBANO. Orientaciones para un estudio de las culturas urbanas de fin de siglo. *Departamento de Historia del Arte, Uni Zaragoza*. Retrieved from <http://www.graffiti.org/faq/diego.html> [Accessed 07-July-2014].
- De la Concha Ahúja, B. E. (2012, November). *Arte Urbano. Los procesos de apropiación y significación en los graffitis de Banksy*. Universidad Autónoma de Querétaro, Santiago de Querétaro, México. Retrieved from <http://ri.uaq.mx/bitstream/123456789/821/1/RI000391.pdf> [Accessed 19-July-2014].
- Delgado, M. (1991). La Ciutat Tatuada. *Quadern Central de Barcelona metròpolis mediterrània*, 95–98. Retrieved from http://www.bcn.cat/publicacions/bmm/pdf_historic/21_BCN_Metropolis_Mediterrania/ciutat_tatuada.pdf [Accessed 18-July-2014].
- Delgado, M. (2012). El espacio público no existe. *La plazica*, 1–10.

- Dennert, N. (2014, March 20). Graffiti-Entfernung ist aufwändige Handarbeit. *Reisen in Berlin und Brandenburg*, 6, 6–7.
- Der Polizeipräsident in Berlin. (2010). *Polizeiliche Kriminalstatistik 2010*. Bundesministerium des Innern.
- Department for Transport. (2003). *Graffiti and vandalism on and around public transport - Briefing Paper* (p. 12). London, Department for Transport.
- Dickinson, M. (2008). The Making of Space, Race and Place: New York City's War on Graffiti, 1970--the Present. *Critique of Anthropology*, 28(1), 27–45.
<http://coa.sagepub.com/cgi/doi/10.1177/0308275X07086556> [Accessed 16-May-2014].
- van Dijk, J. and J. de Waard (1991) 'A Two-Dimensional Typology of Crime Prevention Projects: with a Bibliography'. *Criminal Justice Abstracts*, 23: 483-503.
- Dosensport.com. (2014). *Graffiti Filme – Übersicht aller Filme mit Trailer*. Dosensport. Retrieved from <http://www.dosensport.com/graffiti-filme> [Accessed 07-July-2014].
- Ekblom, P (2007) 'Making Offenders Richer' in G. Farrell, K. Bowers, S. Johnson and M. Townsley (Eds.), *Imagination for Crime Prevention: Essays in Honour of Ken Pease*. Crime Prevention Studies 21: Monsey, N.Y.: Criminal Justice Press.
- Ekblom, P. P. (2008). The 5Is framework: a practical tool for transfer and sharing of crime prevention and community safety knowledge. Design Against Crime Research Centre. Retrieved from http://www.designagainstcrime.com/files/crimeframeworks/04_5i_framework.pdf [Accessed 12-June-2014].
- Ekblom, P. (2010). The Conjunction of Criminal Opportunity Theory. *Sage Encyclopedia of Victimology and Crime Prevention*. Retrieved from <http://5isframework.wordpress.com/conjunction-of-criminal-opportunity/> [Accessed 02-July-2014].
- EMT. (2014). Gelenkter Vandalismus: Touristen dürfen Chinesische Mauer mit Graffiti verzieren. 04.03.2014, 1. Retrieved from <http://www.spiegel.de/reise/fernweh/chinesische-mauer-bekommt-graffiti-zone-fuer-touristenkritzeleien-a-956882.html> [Accessed 14-July-2014].
- Essex, R. (2011). *Dialogues with Graffiti for 21st Century Cities- presentation for the DACRC ESRC workshop 3 "Codes of practice linked to the Dark Side of Creativity"*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=c7MYRrne2e8> [Accessed 02-June-2014].
- Falcon, M. (2014, April 1). Mikel Falcon Interview. Retrieved from <http://www.goodfellasmagazine.com/category/interviews/> [Accessed: 23-07-2014].
- Feeney, T. and Watts, P. (2013, October 30). *Graffiti Dialogues Network presentation for the Graffiti Impact 2013 Event*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FhJe3zoN5Eo> [Accessed 13-June-2014].
- Feixas, C., Costa, C., Costa, M. del C. C. G., & Pollarás, J. (2002). *Movimientos Juveniles en la Península Ibérica: Graffitis, Grifotas, Okupas*. Ariel, Editorial S.A.
- Feltes, T., Caire, A., Di Serio, S., & Stafford, J. (2003). *Vandalism, terrorism and security in urban public transport* (pp. 1 – 30 / 99 – 116 / 135 – 150). Paris, France: European Conference of

- Ministers of Transport. Retrieved from <http://www.internationaltransportforum.org/Pub/pdf/03RT123e.pdf> [Accessed 24-05-2014].
- Ferrell, J. (1993). *Crimes of style: urban graffiti and the politics of criminality*. New York City: New York : Garland.
- Ferrell, J. (1995). Urban Graffiti: Crime, Control, and Resistance. *Youth & Society*, 27(1), 73–92. doi:10.1177/0044118X95027001005. <http://yas.sagepub.com/cgi/doi/10.1177/0044118X95027001005> [Accessed 24-May-2014].
- Figueroa, F. (2012, June 30). Revista de Letras (LaVanguardia.com). Retrieved from <http://revistadeletras.net/fernando-figueroa-la-lucha-antigrafiti-es-un-pretexto-para-aumentar-el-control-del-espacio-publico/> [Accessed 21-July-2014].
- Figueroa Saavedra, F. (2014). *Graffiti: un problema problematizado*. Retrieved May 17, 2014, from https://www.academia.edu/5739082/Graffiti_un_problema_problematizado [Accessed: 17-May-2014].
- Flatley, J., Murphy, R., Parfremment-Hopkins, J., & Hall, P. (2009). *Perceptions of crime and anti-social behaviour: Findings from the 2008/09 British Crime Survey. Supplementary Volume 1 to Crime in England and Wales 2008/09*. 2008/09 British Crime Survey. Supplementary Volume 1 to Crime in England and Wales 2008/09.
- Flo. (2014). Das Etwas Andere Klo-Graffiti. *Das Etwas Andere Klo-Graffiti*. Blog. Retrieved from <http://www.welikethat.de/2011/04/27/das-etwas-andere-klo-graffiti/> [Accessed 08-June-2014].
- Friend, C. (1999). From the Contact Zone to the City : Iris Marion Young and Composition Theory. *Jaconline Journal*, 19(328). Retrieved from <http://jaconlinejournal.com/archives/vol19.4/friend-from.pdf> [Accessed 23-July-2014]
- Fox Gotham, K., Brumley, K., & Sheffner, J. (2001). Abstract space, social space, and the redevelopment of public housing. *Critical Perspectives on Urban Redevelopment*, 6, 313–335. Retrieved from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com/journals.htm?articleid=1783963&show=abstract> [Accessed 17-June-2014].
- Griffin Research Consultants & CPTED Security Consultants. (2008). International Graffiti Conference – Sharing Best Practice. Los Angeles.
- G.R.I.P. (2012). Graffiti Reduction & Interception Program. Retrieved from <http://gripsystems.org/> [02-July-2013]
- Gach, V. (1973). Graffiti. *College English*, 35(3), 285–287. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/374981> . [02-July-2014]
- Gadsby, J. (1995). *Critical Review and Taxonomy of Graffiti Texts*. Retrieved from <http://www.graffiti.org/faq/critical.review.html> [02-July-2014]
- Gamman, L. (2011a, February 11). *Dialogues with Graffiti for 21st Century Cities- presentation for the*

- DACRC ESRC workshop 2 “Social Policy, Criminal and Restorative Justice”. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4YRcxOo5sMk> [02-June-2014]
- Gamman, L. (2011b, May 27). *An Introduction to the “Dialogues with Graffiti for the Twenty First Century City” Network and Workshop*. Bristol Museum. Retrieved from http://issuu.com/designagainstcrime/docs/01_w3_lgamman3 [22-May-2014]
- Gamman, L., & Willcocks, M. (2009). Greening not Cleaning Graffiti walls. *CPTED Perspective*, 8(2), 1, 6 and 7.
- Gastman, R., Rowland, D., & Sattler, I. (2006). *Freight Train Graffiti*. New York: Harry N. Abrams.
- Geason, S., & Wilson, P. R. (1990). *Preventing Graffiti and Vandalism*. Canberra.
- Giardino, A. (2011). *Dialogues with Graffiti for 21st Century Cities- presentation for the DACRC ESRC workshop 1 “Connected Environments, Communities, Materials and Technologies”*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=K8pqLxxP1kU> [22-May-2014]
- Gilani, N. (2011, April). Bridge art backed by Basement Jaxx. Retrieved from <http://www.slp.co.uk/news.cfm?id=14586&y=2011&searchword=jaxx> [10-June-2014]
- Goldstein, R. (2009). *Né dans la rue*. Paris: Fondation Cartier pour l’art contemporain. Retrieved from <http://fondation.cartier.com/#/en/art-contemporain/55/publications/289/publications/429/born-in-the-streets-graffiti/> [02-July-2014]
- Gomez, M. (1993). The Writing on Our Walls: Finding Solutions Through Distinguishing Graffiti Art From Graffiti Vandalism. *University of Michigan Journal of Law Reform*, 26(3), 633–708.
- Gottlieb, L. (2008). *Graffiti Art Styles: A Classification System and Theoretical Analysis*. McFarland.
- Grant, N. (2012). “Outlawed Art: Finding a Home for Graffiti in Copyright Law” by Nicole A. Grant. Retrieved from http://works.bepress.com/nicole_grant/1/ [16-May-2014]
- Gray, E., Jackson, J., & Farrall, S. (2008). ABSTRACT: Reassessing the Fear of Crime. *European Journal of Criminology*, 5(3), 363–380. doi:10.1177/1477370808090834
- Gray, I. (2013, October 30). *Graffiti Dialogues Network presentation for the Graffiti Impact 2013 Event*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bMEX1upgdIw> [02-June-2014]
- Griffin Security Consultants. (2008a). *Managing Graffiti -Keeping Ahead of the Game: Phase 2*. Keep Britain Tidy. Retrieved from <http://kb.keepbritaintidy.org/graffiti2/FactsandFigures/managinggraffiti.pdf> [02-July-2014]
- Griffin Security Consultants. (2008b). *Managing Graffiti -Keeping Ahead of the Game: Phase 2. Proposal for Transport for London*. Hitchin, United Kingdom: Griffin Security Consultants.
- Halsey, M. (2006). “Our desires are ungovernable”: Writing graffiti in urban space, 10. Retrieved from <http://tcr.sagepub.com/cgi/doi/10.1177/1362480606065908> [02-July-2014]
- Halsey, M., & Pederick, B. (2010). The game of fame: Mural, graffiti, erasure. *City*, 14(1-2), 82–98.
- Halsey, M., & Young, A. (2002). The Meanings of Graffiti and Municipal Administration. *Australian &*

New Zealand Journal of Criminology, 35(2), 165–186. doi:10.1375/acri.35.2.165

- Hartwig, M. (2013). Was hat Graffiti mit Wirtschaft zu tun? Graffiti als wirtschaftlicher Faktor. *Jenvision*, 2. Retrieved from <http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=10&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=0CGsQFjAJ&url=http%3A%2F%2Fjenvision.de%2Fwp-content%2Fuploads%2F2014%2F03%2FWas-hat-Graffiti-mit-Wirtschaft-zu-tun.pdf&ei=qyZ6U6HGDaOH4gSfwIDgCA&usg=AFQjCNFzEuYYMgkzF9Lj9ZF0NSa21p4nRw&bvm=bv.66917471,d.bGE> [Accessed 29-June-2014].
- Haworth, B., Bruce, E., & Iveson, K. (2013). Spatio-temporal analysis of graffiti occurrence in an inner-city urban environment. *Applied Geography*, 38, 53–63. doi:10.1016/j.apgeog.2012.10.002
- Hayward, Carol. (2006). *Banksy: Graffiti or Street Art? AskBristol Consultation report*. Bristol: Carol Hayward, Corporate Consultation.
- Hillier, B. (2002). A theory of the city as object: or, how spatial laws mediate the social construction of urban space. *Urban Design International*, 7(3-4), 153–179. <http://www.palgrave-journals.com/doi/10.1057/palgrave.udi.9000082> [Accessed 29-June-2014].
- Höffler, K. (2008). *Graffiti - Prävention durch Wiedergutmachung. Implementation und Evaluation eines Münchner Modellprojektes* (Dissertation). Munich, Münster. Retrieved from http://bvbr.bib-bvb.de:8991/exlibris/aleph/a21_1/apache_media/FCE11L4JC4CQHfYBVVS7DJJ78UFLV5.pdf [Accessed 09-June-2014].
- Hansard (2002, July 11). Bound Volume Hansard - House of Commons Debate. UK Parliament. Retrieved from <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200102/cmhansrd/vo020711/debtext/20711-33.htm> [Accessed 02-May-2014].
- Hoogwaerts, L. (2013, October 30). *Graffiti Dialogues Network presentation for the Graffiti Impact 2013 Event*. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nCVVk-6_D5A [Accessed 22-May-2014].
- Hristova, M. (2005). *Graffiti is Art*.
- Huberman, B. (2007). The Graffiti Paradox, 1–6.
- Hughes, M. (2009). *Street Art & Graffiti Art: Developing An Understanding*. Georgia State University.
- In Berlin, D. P. (2007). *Polizeiliche Kriminalstatistik Berlin 2007*. Berlin: Der Polizeipräsident in Berlin. Retrieved from <http://www.berlin.de/imperia/md/content/seninn/abteilungiii/kriminalitaetsstatistiken2007/pks.pdf?start&ts=1204883902&file=pks.pdf> [Accessed 29-May-2014].
- Innes, M. (2004). Signal crimes and signal disorders: notes on deviance as communicative action. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 55(3), 335–55. doi:10.1111/j.1468-4446.2004.00023.x. Retrieved from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15383091> [Accessed 08-June-2014].
- IPL, & Urbano), (Expertos en el Mantenimiento del Patrimonio. (2014). *Mantenimiento de la Imagen Urbana*. Retrieved from <http://www.ipl.es/> [Accessed 14-July-2014].

- Iveson, K. (2006). *Too public or too private ? The politics of privacy in the real-time city*. Cambridge, MA. Retrieved from http://senseable.mit.edu/engagingdata/papers/ED_SII_Too_Public_or_Too_Private.pdf [Accessed 12-July-2014].
- Iveson, K. (2009a). The City versus the Media? Mapping the Mobile Geographies of Public Address. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 33(1), 241–245. Retrieved from <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1468-2427.2009.00844.x> [Accessed 21-June-2014].
- Iveson, K. (2009b). War is over (if you want it): rethinking the graffiti problem. *Australian Planner*, 46(11), 24–35. Retrieved from <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/07293682.2009.10753419> [Accessed 16-May-2014].
- Iveson, K. (2010a). The May Lane Art Project: Making A Better City Through Better Graffiti. Full Colour Catalogue.
- Iveson, K. (2010b). The wars on graffiti and the new military urbanism. *City*, 14(1-2).
- Iveson, K. (2012). Branded cities : outdoor advertising , urban governance , and the outdoor media landscape. *Antipode: A Radical Journal of Geography*, 44(1), 151–174.
- Jacobson, J., & Kirby, A. (2012). *Public attitudes to youth crime - Report on focus group research*. Home Office.
- Jacobsson, M. and Wahlin, L. (2010). *The development of victim offender mediation in Sweden*. In, Melinda Gyokos and Krisztina Lanyi, eds., *European best practices of restorative justice in criminal Procedure*. Budapest: Ministry of Justice and Law Enforcement, Republic of Hungary.pp. 213-216.
- Johnson, S. (2011, February 11). *Dialogues with Graffiti for 21st Century Cities- presentation for the DACRC ESRC workshop 2 "Social Policy, Criminal and Restorative Justice"*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Fcn162um3FA> [Accessed 22-May-2014].
- Jörg Bässmann. (2003). *Kriminalprävention, Sammlung ausländischer Präventionsprojekte/-programme* (Bundeskriminalamt., Vol. Polizei und Forschung, Bd. 24). Luchterhand.
- Journal of Architectural Coatings. (2007, March). Directory of Anti-Graffiti Coatings and Removal Products. *Journal of Architectural Coatings*.
- Kaiser, K. (2007). *Graffiti in der gesellschaftlichen Kontroverse: Unter Berücksichtigung der 'Demokratie von unten'*. Hamburg: Diplomica Verlag. Retrieved from https://opacplus.bsb-muenchen.de/metaopac/singleHit.do?methodToCall=showHit&curPos=1&identifier=255_PRI_MO_RESULTSET_285452405 [Accessed: 14-July-2014].
- Kazig, R., Schweitzer, A. and Wiesemann, L. (2007). *Graffiti & Streetart - Standortwahl und Wahrnehmung*. 1. Geographisches Institut der Rheinischen Friedrichs-Wilhelm-Universität Bonn. Retrieved from <http://de.slideshare.net/mapmorph/graffiti-streetart-standortwahl-und-war> [Accessed: 14-July-2014].
- Keats, G. (2008). The motivations behind Graffiti. *SECURITY INSIDER*, (Feb/Mar 2008), 24–28. [Accessed: 14-July-2014].

Keep Britain Tidy (Encams). (2007). Guides for the Public.

Keizer, K., Lindenberg, S., & Steg, L. (2008). The spreading of disorder. *Science (New York, N.Y.)*, 322(5908), 1681–5. doi:10.1126/science.1161405

Kellner, D. (2000). *Habermas, the Public Sphere, and Democracy: A Critical Intervention*. Retrieved from <http://pages.gseis.ucla.edu/faculty/kellner/papers/habermas.htm> [Accessed: 23-07-2014].

Kemme, S., Hanslmaier, M., & Stoll, K. (2011). *Kriminalitätsentwicklung 1995 bis 2008 Ergebnisse einer Expertenbefragung*. Kriminologisches Forschungsinstitut Niedersachsen e.V. (KFN).

Kennedy, D. M., Braga, A. A., & Piehl, A. M. (1996). *THE (UN)KNOWN UNIVERSE : MAPPING GANGS AND GANG VIOLENCE IN*. Retrieved from http://www.popcenter.org/library/crimeprevention/volume_08/08-Kennedy.pdf [Accessed: 14-July-2014].

Kirchner, L. (2014). Breaking Down the Broken Windows Theory. *Pacific Standard Magazine*. Retrieved from <http://www.psmag.com/navigation/politics-and-law/breaking-broken-windows-theory-72310/> [Accessed: 23-July-2014].

Klausner, A. (2014). *Bombing Modernism- Graffiti and the built environment*. Retrieved from http://www.core77.com/reactor/04.07_klausner.asp [Accessed: 14-07-2014].

Klee, A. (2010). *Politische Kommunikation im städtischen Raum am Beispiel Graffiti*. Wiesbaden.

Koon-Hwee Kan. (2001). Adolescents and Graffiti. *National Art Education Association*, 54, No 1, 18–23. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/3193889?uid=3737864&uid=2&uid=4&sid=21104190369283> [Accessed: 14-07-2014].

Kramer, R. (2013). Painting with permission: Legal graffiti in New York City. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 16, 155–170. Retrieved from <http://eth.sagepub.com/content/11/2/235.short> [Accessed: 16-05-2014].

Landeshauptstadt Düsseldorf. (2002). *Empirisch gesicherte Erkenntnisse über kriminal-präventive Wirkungen* (p. 457). Düsseldorf: Landeshauptstadt Düsseldorf.

Landeskriminalamt NRW. (2006b). *Jugendkriminalität in Nordrhein-Westfalen* (p. 42). Retrieved from <http://www.ajs.nrw.de/images/pdf/lkajukrim.pdf> [Accessed: 23-07-2014].

Latour, B. (2005). *Reassembling the Social An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. Oxford. Retrieved from http://dss-edit.com/plu/Latour_Reassembling.pdf [Accessed: 23-07-2014].

Leach, S. and Baker, T. (2010, December). *Dialogues with Graffiti for 21st Century Cities- presentation for the DACRC ESRC workshop 1 "Connected Environments, Materials and Technologies"*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=g4nKRalolu0> [Accessed: 12-May-2014].

Lederman, R. (2012). *It's All Under Control*. Retrieved from <http://www.graffiti.org/faq/control.html> [Accessed: 26-06-2014].

London Assembly Graffiti Investigative Committee (2002). *Graffiti in London: Report of the London*

- Assembly Graffiti Investigative Committee*. Greater London Authority. Retrieved from <http://legacy.london.gov.uk/assembly/reports/environment/graffiti.pdf> [Accessed: 23-07-2014].
- Macdonald, Nancy. (2002). *The Graffiti Subculture, Youth, Masculinity and Identity in London and New York*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Macinnes, T., et al. (2013). *MONITORING POVERTY AND SOCIAL EXCLUSION 2013*. Joseph Rowntree Foundation. Retrieved from: <http://www.jrf.org.uk/sites/files/jrf/MPSE2013.pdf> [Accessed: 23-07-2014].
- McKinsey & Company. (2013). How to make a city great. Retrieved from http://www.mckinsey.com/insights/urbanization/how_to_make_a_city_great [Accessed 03-July-2014].
- Madlener, N. (2004). "We Can Do" - Geschlechtsspezifische Raumanerkennung am Beispiel von Graffiti von Mädchen und jungen Frauen in Berlin. Stuttgart.
- Mailer, N, N., J. (2009). *The Faith of Graffiti* (First edition published in 1974.). New York : icon It.
- Markussen, T. (2011). THE DISRUPTIVE AESTHETICS OF DESIGN ACTIVISM : ENACTING DESIGN BETWEEN ART AND POLITICS, 1–9.
- Maron, C. O. (2009). *Das 39. Strafrechtsänderungsgesetz: Die strafrechtliche Antwort auf Graffiti?* (Dissertation). Konstanz, Konstanz. Retrieved from http://bvbr.bib-bvb.de:8991/exlibris/aleph/a21_1/apache_media/M6VH5D35K9VYX422I9HFDBYPBHAC57.pdf [Accessed: 23.06.2014].
- Matthews, D. (1996). Graffiti Removal by Laser Adding Agility to Manufacturing. *Science and Technology Review*, (April), 21–22. Retrieved from https://www.llnl.gov/str/pdfs/04_96.3.pdf [Accessed: 23-07-2014].
- Maughan, G. (2011). *Dialogues with Graffiti for 21st Century Cities- presentation for the DACRC ESRC workshop 1 "Connected Environments, Communities, Materials and Technologies"*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=99x7Bd7Nl9w> [Accessed: 02-05-2014].
- Maughan, Graeme, E., Simon. (2011). *Dialogues with Graffiti for 21st Century Cities- presentation for the DACRC ESRC workshop 2 "Social Policy, Criminal and Restorative Justice"*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Br400OldLf8> [Accessed: 05-07-2014].
- McAuliffe, C. (2013). Legal Walls and Professional Paths: The Mobilities of Graffiti Writers in Sydney. *Urban Studies*, 50(3), 518–537. doi:10.1177/0042098012468894
- McGovern, D. (2011). *Dialogues with Graffiti for 21st Century Cities- presentation for the DACRC ESRC workshop 2 "Social Policy, Criminal and Restorative Justice"*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OWlpCz5z5go> [Accessed: 09-06-2014].
- McGovern, D. (2013, October 30). *Graffiti Dialogues Network presentation for the Graffiti Impact 2013 Event*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ILqiAXZTwGs> [Accessed: 09-07-2014].
- McNichols, J. (2006, July 26). *Visualizing Dissent Graffiti As Art*. Retrieved May 10, 2014, from

- <http://thinkingpictures.blogspot.co.uk/2006/07/visualizing-dissent-graffiti-as-art.html>
[Accessed: 10-May-2014].
- Meredith, L. (2011). *Dialogues with Graffiti for 21st Century Cities- presentation for the DACRC ESRC workshop 2 "Social Policy, Criminal and Restorative Justice"*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JfTyjSNbbCM> [Accessed: 28-06-2014].
- Meredith, L. (2013, October 30). *Graffiti Dialogues Network presentation for the Graffiti Impact 2013 Event*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fpSkgDupumY> [Accessed: 29-06-2014].
- Ministry of Justice. (2011). *National Offender Management Service Annual Report 2009 / 10 : Management Information Addendum Ministry of Justice Information Release* (No. March) (p. 110). Retrieved from https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/218353/noms-annual-rept-0910-addendum.pdf [Accessed: 23-07-2014].
- Ministry of Justice (2012). *Statistical Bulletin Crime in England and Wales , Year Ending June 2012* (No. October) (pp. 1–96). Ministry of Justice. Retrieved from https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/217632/criminal-justice-stats-june-2012.pdf [Accessed: 14-July-2014].
- Minton, A. (2006). *The privatisation of public space: what kind of world are we building?*. RCS.
- Minton, A. (2012). *Ground Control, Fear and Happiness in the twenty - first - century city* (2nd ed.). London: Green Penguin.
- Mogg, C. (2007). *Die strafrechtliche Erfassung von Graffiti* (Dissertation). Tübingen, Tübingen. Retrieved from http://bvbr.bib-bvb.de:8991/exlibris/aleph/a21_1/apache_media/VF8G1MB3HA19HEGTSGJXXGV5VMD633.pdf [Accessed: 23-07-2014].
- Molnár, V. (2011). *Street Art and the Contemporary Urban Underground : Social Critique or Coolness as Commodity ?* Retrieved from http://nuclireflexiu.wikispaces.com/file/view/molnar_street_art_ces_2011.pdf [Accessed: 23-07-2014].
- Moon, D. (Ed) et al. (2009). Flatley, J., Parfremment-hopkins, J., & Hall, P. Home Office Statistical Bulletin, (November).
- Moore, B. (2007). Professional Products of Kansas, (April), 36–41. Retrieved from <http://watersealant.com/index.php/products/anti-graffiti-system-2/> [Accessed: 23-07-2014].
- Moose. (2011). *Dialogues with Graffiti for 21st Century Cities- presentation for the DACRC ESRC workshop 3 "Codes of practice linked to the Dark Side of Creativity"*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=M-zizpJBdXg> [Accessed: 21-06-2014].
- Moritz, Katrin. (2013). *Die Farben der Anderen - das Magazin für junge Kunstinteressierte* (No. 1 / March 2013). Retrieved from http://www.diefaerberei.de/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/Katrin-Moritz_-Projektarbeit-WS-2012-2013_F%C3%BCr-F%C3%A4rberei-4.pdf [Accessed: 23-07-2014].

- Mutiny of Colours (trailer)*. (2014). Retrieved from <http://vimeo.com/95385359> [Accessed: 13-07-2014].
- Mouffe, C. (2007). Artistic Activism and Agonistic Spaces. *Art & Research: A Journal of Ideas, Contexts and Methods*, 1(2), 1–5. Retrieved from <http://www.artandresearch.org.uk/v1n2/mouffe.html> [Accessed 14-June-2014]
- Municipality of Sofia, Bulgaria. НАРЕДБА № 1 за обществения ред и опазването на общинските имоти на територията на Столична община. Retrieved from <http://sofiacouncil.bg/?page=ordinance&id=133> [Accessed 22-May-2014]
- Nancy Macdonald. (2001). *The Graffiti Subculture, Youth, Masculinity and Identity in London and New York*. Palgrave macmillan.
- Neelon, C. (2003a). *Critical Terms for Graffiti Study*. *Art Crimes*. Retrieved May 15, 2014, Retrieved from http://www.graffiti.org/faq/critical_terms_sonik.html [Accessed: 15-May-2014].
- Neelon, C. (2003b). *Ten Years of Art Crimes: The Effects and Educational Functions of the Internet in Graffiti*. Retrieved from http://www.graffiti.org/faq/ten_years_of_art_crimes.html [Accessed: 15-May-2014].
- Neves, P. S. (2011). *Dialogues with Graffiti for 21st Century Cities- presentation for the DACRC ESRC workshop 3 "Codes of practice linked to the Dark Side of Creativity"*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AYzXgezlK6s> [Accessed: 02-June-2014].
- Nicola, C. (2013, October 30). *Graffiti Dialogues Network presentation for the Graffiti Impact 2013 Event- Transport Strategy*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vriUoFQkUUU> [Accessed: 02-June-2014].
- NSMC (stands for National Social Marketing Centre) (2009). Show Case: Reducing Graffiti Vandalism. NSMC (stands for National Social Marketing Centre). Retrieved from http://www.thensmc.com/sites/default/files/Brent%20Graffiti%20FULL%20case%20study_0.pdf [Accessed: 14-July-2014].
- NSV. (2014, April). Graffitis gemeinsam den Kampf ansagen. *Regio Takte*, 96, 6–7. Retrieved from http://nvsthueringen.de/t3/fileadmin/images/NVS/RegioTakte/Archiv/NVS_RegioTakte_05-2014.pdf [Accessed: 14-July-2014].
- NSW Crime Prevention Division. (2009). *The Graffiti Reduction Demonstration Project 3 Review of the Intervention Strategies*.
- NSW Department of Justice and Attorney General. (2009). *Graffiti Vandalism. The motivations and modus operandi of persons who do graffiti*. Crime Prevention Division. NSW Department of Justice and Attorney General.
- NSW Department of Justice Attorney General. (2009). *Graffiti vandalism : review of graffiti reduction demonstration projects 2007-08 / Policy and Analysis Crime Prevention Division NSW Department of Justice Attorney General. [electronic resource]*. Retrieved from <http://trove.nla.gov.au/work/36944913?versionId=47982842> [Accessed: 14-July-2014].
- NSW Department of Justice Attorney General , Crime Prevention Division. (2009). *GRAFFITI VANDALISM REVIEW OF GRAFFITI REDUCTION DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS 2007-08*.

- Retrieved from [https://www.parliament.nsw.gov.au/Prod/parlment/committee.nsf/0/9335098e32945b17ca2577500020697d/\\$FILE/47%20-%20NSW%20Government%20-%20Attachment%20A.pdf](https://www.parliament.nsw.gov.au/Prod/parlment/committee.nsf/0/9335098e32945b17ca2577500020697d/$FILE/47%20-%20NSW%20Government%20-%20Attachment%20A.pdf) [Accessed: 14-July-2014].
- NuArt. (2009). *Eloquent Vandals Locked Cut*. Retrieved May 18, 2014, from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TBC5a13oZy8> [Accessed: 14-July-2014].
- Office for National Statistics (2012). Statistical Bulletin Crime in England and Wales - Quarterly First Release , March, (March), 1–91. Retrieved from http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/dcp171778_273169.pdf [Accessed: 14-July-2014].
- Ostrom, D. (2010). EXECUTIVE SUMMARY – Beautiful City BillBoard Fee (BCBF) Alliance Approved. Retrieved from <http://www.beautifulcity.ca/bcbf/BCBF-Brief-v10.pdf> [Accessed 16-June-2014].
- Oswald, T. (2012). *The culture of tube graffiti is dying*. London. Retrieved from <http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2012/jul/09/culture-tube-graffiti> [Accessed: 14-July-2014].
- Palmer, L. (2011). *Dialogues with Graffiti for 21st Century Cities- presentation for the DACRC ESRC workshop 3 "Codes of practice linked to the Dark Side of Creativity"*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oSnKN8xC7jc> [Accessed: 14-July-2014].
- Parkes, T. (2010, December). *Dialogues with Graffiti for 21st Century Cities- presentation for the DACRC ESRC workshop 1 "Connected Environments, Communities, Materials and Technologies"*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=J7GFaehYej4> [Accessed: 14-July-2014].
- Partnership, T. C. S. (2011). *Graffiti Strategy 2008 – 2011 1*. Kent.
- Pascoe, T. (2009). Graffiti Motivation & Prevention, National ALO/CPDA Conference 2009. London: Griffin Research Consultancy.
- Pascoe, T. (2011). *Dialogues with Graffiti for 21st Century Cities presentation for the DACRC ESRC workshop 2 "Social Policy, Criminal and Restorative Justice"*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=R-J57c1GB3c> [Accessed: 14-July-2014].
- PC Kevin Hook, I. H. (2013, October 30). *Graffiti Dialogues Network presentation for the Graffiti Impact 2013 Event*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=S6V1XB9VxQc> [Accessed: 14-July-2014].
- Petterson, G., & Stafford, J. (2004). Graffiti and vandalism on and around public transport. Association for European Transport. Retrieved from http://www.cete-nc.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/IMG/pdf/dft_mobility_pdf_024496_cle03816a.pdf [Accessed: 14-July-2014].
- Pietrosanti, S. (2010). *Behind the tag: A journey with the graffiti writers of European walls* (Master Thesis). University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam.
- Polizeiliche Kriminalprävention der Länder und des Bundes. (2012). Informationsblatt für Graffiti-Geschädigte. Polizeiliche Kriminalprävention der Länder und des Bundes.

- Polizeiliche Kriminalprävention der Länder und des Bundes. (2014). Sprühende Phantasie kann teuer werden. Wertvolle Informationen für Eltern, wie sie Graffiti verhindern oder richtig darauf reagieren können. Retrieved from <http://www.polizei-beratung.de/medienangebot/details/form/7/26.html> [Accessed: 14-July-2014].
- Polizeipräsident Berlin. (2013). *Polizeiliche Kriminalstatistik Berlin 2013*. Polizeipräsident Berlin.
- The Prison Service (2005). *HM Prison Service is failing A new approach is urgently needed The Prison Service*. Retrieved from http://www.taxpayersalliance.com/the_failure_of_the_prison_service_in_the_uk.pdf [Accessed: 14-June-2014].
- Project for Public Spaces, I. (2008). *Streets as Places: Using Streets to Rebuild Communities*. Retrieved from http://www.pps.org/pdf/bookstore/Using_Streets_to_Rebuild_Communities.pdf [Accessed: 14-July-2014].
- Proud, A. (2014, January 13). "Why this Shoreditchification of London Must Stop." *The Telegraph*. Retrieved from <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/men/thinking-man/10561607/Why-this-Shoreditchification-of-London-must-stop.html> [Accessed: 17-July-2014].
- Radio Sweden. (n.d.). Graffiti - konst eller skadegörelse? - Radio Sweden på svenska. From <http://sverigesradio.se/sida/artikel.aspx?programid=3993&artikel=4643248> [Accessed 01-May-2014]
- Rahn, J. (2002). *Painting without permission hip-hop graffiti subculture*. Greenwood Publishing Group. Retrieved from http://books.google.de/books?id=tw90vBmNKhEC&dq=+Painting+without+permission+hip-hop+graffiti+subculture&lr=&hl=de&source=gb_s_navlinks_s [Accessed: 14-July-2014].
- Rawlinson, C., & Guaralda, M. (2011). *Play in the city: parkour and architecture*. Brisbane. Retrieved from http://eprints.qut.edu.au/42506/1/2011009216_Rawlinson_ePrints.pdf [Accessed: 22-June-2014]
- Rebobinart. (2013). *Informe octubre 2012 - gener 2014* (Graphics) (pp. 1 – 3). Barcelona: Rebobinart Plataforma d'art. Retrieved from <http://rebobinart.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/04/dades-murslliures-novembre-2012-gener-2014.pdf> [Accessed: 14-July-2014].
- European Commission Regional & Urban Policy (2013). *Guide to social innovation* (No. February) (p. 72). European Commission. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/presenta/social_innovation/social_innovation_2013.pdf [Accessed: 14-July-2014].
- Reno, J., Fisher, R. C., & Gist, N. E. (2011). *Spaceshaper- have your say*. Retrieved from <http://www.parksleisure.com.au/documents/item/670> [Accessed: 14-July-2014].
- Rheinberg, F., & Manig, Y. (2003). Was macht Spaß am Graffiti-Sprayen? Eine induktive Anreizeanalyse. *Report Psychologie*, 4, 222–234. Retrieved from <http://www.ecem2007.psych.uni-potsdam.de/people/rheinberg/files/Graffiti3.pdf> [Accessed: 14-July-2014].
- Rodgers, S. (2008). *Media change, urban publics and urban politics*. Lond. Retrieved from

- http://www.mediapolis.org.uk/Papers/Scott_Rodgers.pdf [Accessed: 26-June-2014].
- Rüther, W. (2005). *Kommunale Kriminalitätsanalyse. Auswertung offizieller Kriminalitätsdaten und einer Bürgerbefragung zum Sicherheitsgefühl in der Kommune*. kassel university press.
- Saavedra, F. F. (2006). *Graphitfragen. Una mirada reflexiva sobre el graffiti*. Minobitia.
- Sackmann, R., & Universität Halle-Wittenberg, Philosophische Fakultät I Sozialwissenschaften und historische Kulturwissenschaften, Institut für Soziologie (Ed.) (Eds.). (2006). *Graffiti zwischen Kunst und Ärgernis: empirische Studien zu einem städtischen Problem* (Der Hallesche Graureiher : Forschungsberichte des Instituts für Soziologie 2006-1.). Halle: gesis. Retrieved from <http://nbnresolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-113506>
- Sackmann/Kison/Horn. (2008). *Graffiti Kontrovers: Die Ergebnisse der ersten mitteldeutschen Graffitistudie*. Mitteldeutscher Verlag.
- Sampson, R. (2013). When disaster strikes, it's survival of the sociable. *Science* (New York, N.Y.), (2916). Retrieved from http://scholar.harvard.edu/files/sampson/files/when_disaster_strikes.pdf [Accessed: 22-June-2014].
- Sampson, R., & Scott, M. S. (1999). *Tackling Crime and Other Public-Safety Problems: CASE STUDIES IN PROBLEM-SOLVING*. Washington D.C. Retrieved from http://www.cops.usdoj.gov/html/cd_rom/inaction1/pubs/Problemsolvingcasestudy/IntroChapter1-3.pdf [Accessed: 22-June-2014].
- San Diego Police Department. (2000). *Graffiti Prevention and Suppression—WINNING PROJECT* (p. 11). San Diego. Retrieved from [http://www.popcenter.org/library/awards/goldstein/2000/00-28\(W\).pdf](http://www.popcenter.org/library/awards/goldstein/2000/00-28(W).pdf) [Accessed 21-May-2014].
- Scheepers, I. (2004). *Graffiti and Urban Space* (Honours Thesis). University of Sydney. Retrieved from http://www.graffiti.org/faq/scheepers_graf_urban_space.html [Accessed: 14-June-2014].
- Schierz, S. (2009). *Wri(o)te: Graffiti, Cultural Criminology und Transgression in der Kontrollgesellschaft*. Vechta: Vechtaer Verlag für Studium, Wissenschaft und Forschung.
- Schumacher, O. (2013). *Graffitischäden bei der Deutschen Bahn* (p. 3). Berlin: Deutsche Bahn AG.
- Schram, J. & O'Neill, N. (2014, May 17). NYPD told to carry spray paint to cover graffiti. *New York Post* (online). Retrieved from <http://nypost.com/2014/05/17/nypd-told-to-carry-spray-paint-to-cover-graffiti/> [Accessed 16-May-2014].
- Shaftoe, H. (2005). *Convivial urban spaces : creating effective public places*. London: Sterling, VA : Earthscan in association with the International Institute for Environment and Development.
- Shaftoe, H. (2011, May 27). *A graffiti dialogue - artistic or offensive?- presentation for the DACRC ESRC workshop 3 "Codes of practice linked to the Dark Side of Creativity."* Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=d-hQcsIV8Mo> [Accessed: 09-May-2014].
- Signal. (2014). *SIGNAL Project*. Retrieved from www.signalproject.com [Accessed: 14-July-2014].

- Signal Project. (2009). *Signal's Christmas Graffiti Mural in Stanwell presentation, for the Dialogues with Graffiti for 21st Century Cities DACRC ESRC Network, Workshop 1: Connected Environments, Communities, Materials and Technologies*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qFyNL855CEE> [Accessed: 03-May-2014]
- Silver, T., & Chalfant, H. (1983). *Style Wars: The Documentary*. *Style Wars*. Retrieved from <http://stylewars.com/documentary> [Accessed: 28-May- 2014].
- Sinclair, I. (1997). *Lights out for the Territory* (2nd ed.). Granta Books.
- Sinclair, N. (2010). *Five Cities*. London : Royal Academy of Arts ; New York : Distributed in the United States and Canada by Harry N. Abrams.
- Sofia.bg. (n.d.-a). ON! Fest,. City of Sofia. Retrieved from [http://sofia.bg/pressecentre/foto/ON!Fest_SO_GraffitiMural_PressRelease_17%2009%2013%20\(2\).pdf](http://sofia.bg/pressecentre/foto/ON!Fest_SO_GraffitiMural_PressRelease_17%2009%2013%20(2).pdf) [Accessed 21-May-2014]
- Sofia.bg. (n.d.-b). Sofia News. From <http://press.sofia.bg/press.asp?page=search&open=0> [Accessed 12-June-2014]
- Spicer, V. (2005). *Couch Surfing in Vancouver. An aggregated study of the Vancouver graffiti suspect network*. Simon Fraser University.
- Spiegel Online. (2013, May 26). Luftüberwachung: Deutsche Bahn setzt Drohnen gegen Graffiti-Sprüher ein. *Spiegel Online*. Berlin. Retrieved from <http://www.spiegel.de/wirtschaft/unternehmen/deutsche-bahn-will-graffiti-sprueher-mit-drohnen-filmen-a-901973.html> [Accessed: 14-July-2014].
- Spok (graffiti writer). (2009, January 27). Spok (Madrid). Retrieved from <http://www.velvetliga.com/2009/01/entrevistas-spok-madrid.html> [Accessed: 14-July-2014].
- Stafford, J., Petterson, G., Young, H., & Mather, A. (1998a). *Get on Board: An agenda for improving personal security - Guidance* (pp. 1 – 18). United Kingdom: Department of Transport. Retrieved from http://www.activcameras.com/downloads/dft_mobility_pdf_503809.pdf [Accessed: 14-July-2014].
- Stafford, J., Petterson, G., Young, H., & Mather, A. (1998b). *Young people and crime on public transport* (pp. 29 – 97). United Kingdom: Department of Transport. Retrieved from http://www.activcameras.com/downloads/dft_mobility_pdf_503832.pdf [Accessed: 14-July-2014].
- Stafford, J., & Pettersson, G. (2000). *Vandalism, graffiti and environmental nuisance -Literature review*. Department for Transport Prepared by Crime Concern. Retrieved from <http://kb.keepbritaintidy.org/criminaldamage/publications/litreview.pdf> [Accessed: 14-July-2014].
- Stahnke-Jungheim, D. (2000). *Graffiti in Potsdam aus Sicht von Sprayern und jugendlichen Rezipienten im Land Brandenburg* (Johannes Gordes, Hartmut Salzwedel., Vol. Sozialwissenschaften Band 3). Frankfurt/M; Berlin, Bern, Bruxelles, New York: Peter Lang

Verlag.

- Stanton, Z. (2010a). Topic : Antisocial behaviour & vandalism reduction. Retrieved from <http://graffitidialogues.ning.com/page/zoe-stanton-uscreates-workshop> [Accessed: 14-July-2014].
- Stanton, Z. (2010b, December). *Dialogues with Graffiti for 21st Century Cities- presentation for the DACRC ESRC workshop 1 "Connected Environments, Materials and Technologies"*. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pT1hYa_4H2o [Accessed: 06-May-2014].
- Stephenson, B. (2011, February 11). *Dialogues with Graffiti for 21st Century Cities- presentation for the DACRC ESRC workshop 2 "Social Policy, Criminal and Restorative Justice."* Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1thEWfLNoVk#t=48> [Accessed: 08-May-2014].
- Stevens, J. R. (2014). Primates and patience: Evolutionary roots of self control -- ScienceDaily. Retrieved May 15, 2014, from <http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2014/05/140513204637.htm> [Accessed: 15-May-2014].
- Stik (2011). *Dialogues with Graffiti for 21st Century Cities- presentation for the DACRC ESRC workshop 1 "Connected Environments, Communities, Materials and Technologies"*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4lclQWJya3k&list=UUILUIKFQIWzzKYz0GeJXHKw> [Accessed: 22-May-2014].
- Stocker, S. (2013). *Graffitikunst - einfach cool: Kreative Unterrichtsideen und Materialien zur sonderpädagogischen Förderung (5. bis 9. Klasse)*. Persen Verlag.
- Stocker, T. L., Dutcher, L. W., Hargrove, S. M., & Cook, E. A. (1972). Social Analysis of Graffiti. *The Journal of American Folklore*, 85(338), 356–366. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/539324> [Accessed: 14-July-2014].
- Strutton, J. (2011, February 11). *Dialogues with Graffiti for 21st Century Cities- presentation for the DACRC ESRC workshop 2 "Social Policy, Criminal and Restorative Justice"*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BLyblWzhsjE> [Accessed: 06-June-2014].
- Strutton, J. (2013). *Graffiti Dialogues Network presentation for the Graffiti Impact 2013 Event: Is there space for graffiti?* Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dWMA6KDTlwU> [Accessed: 20-May-2014].
- Sutton, A., Cherney, A., & White, R. (2008). *Crime Prevention Principles , perspectives and practices*. Cambridge University Press.
- Teng, H. H., Puli, A., Karakouzian, M., & Xu, X. (2012, August). *Identification of Graffiti Countermeasures for Highway Facilities*. Presented at the 8th International Conference on Traffic and Transportation Studies, Changsha, China. Retrieved from http://ac.els-cdn.com/S1877042812010233/1-s2.0-S1877042812010233-main.pdf?_tid=0a061b46-dc27-11e3-866a-00000aabb0f27&acdnat=1400154778_060d4cf00839aaf3fe99c6ec98e9fab2 [Accessed: 12-June-2014].
- Theis, F. (2013a). Von Graffiti zur Urban Art. 03.04.2013, p. 1. Retrieved from http://www.tageswoche.ch/de/2013_13/kultur/527745/von-graffiti-zur-urban-art.htm [Accessed: 21/May/2014].

- Thompson, K. (2012). *From broken windows to a renovated research agenda: A review of the literature on vandalism and graffiti in the rail industry*. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0965856412000663> [Accessed 14-July-2014].
- Tobin, K. (1995). A Modern Perspective on Graffiti. Retrieved from <http://www.graffiti.org/faq/tobin.html> [Accessed 14-July-2014].
- Toth, G. (2011). *Are Complete Streets Incomplete?* Retrieved from <http://www.pps.org/blog/are-complete-streets-incomplete/> [Accessed 20-June-2014]
- Trafikkontoret. (n.d.). Klotter [text]. From <http://www.stockholm.se/TrafikStadsplanering/Gator-och-torg/Stadning/klotter> [Accessed 11-May 11-2014]
- U.S. Department of Justice, & Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. (1998). Wipe Out Vandalism and Graffiti. *Youth in Action*, 2. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles/94600.pdf> [Accessed 14-July-2014].
- Uitermark, J. (2009). An in memoriam for the just city of Amsterdam. *City: Analysis of Urban Trends, Culture, Theory, Policy, Action*, 13(2-3), 347 – 361. Retrieved from <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13604810902982813#.U0VZzqhdV40> [Accessed 14-July-2014].
- Uncategorised. (2006). You Suck Until Further Notice. A Graffiti Teachings. Retrieved from <http://artzeroprodarktionprojekt.wordpress.com/2006/09/15/you-suck-until-further-notice-a-graffiti-teachings/> [Accessed 14-July-2014].
- Valerie, S. (2007). *The Portrait of a Vandal How Vancouver reduced graffiti by 80% over 3 years*. Vancouver. Retrieved from http://www.popcenter.org/conference/conferencepapers/2007/vancouver_graffiti.pdf [Accessed 22-June-2014].
- Valle, I., & Weiss, E. (2010). Participation in the figured world of graffiti. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(1), 128–135. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2009.05.006
- Varnedoe, K., & Gopnik, A. (1991). *High & Low : modern art, popular culture*. New York City: New York: Museum of Modern Art. Distributed by H.N.Abrams.
- Vaughan, C. (2011). Institutional Change, the Concept of the Avant-Garde and the Example of Graffiti. *Proceedings of the European Society for Aesthetics*, 3, 281–293.
- Vitiello, R., & Willcocks, M. (2011). Destination branding and the urban Lexicon: London, New York, and Barcelona. doi:10.1016/B978-0-08-096930-5.10022-9
- Waclawek, A. (2011). *Graffiti and street art*. Thames & Hudson.
- Wainwright, O. (2014, April 21). Spraycopter: the drone that does graffiti. Retrieved from <http://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/architecture-design-blog/2014/apr/21/drone-does-graffiti-street-art> [Accessed 14-July-2014].
- Walker, P. (2011, May 27). *Dialogues with Graffiti for 21st Century Cities- -presentation for the DACRC*

- ESRC workshop 3 “Codes of practice linked to the Dark Side of Creativity.” Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=c7MYRrne2e8> [Accessed 14-July-2014].
- Weisel, D. L. (2009). *Graffiti - Problem Oriented Policing - Guide No. 9* (No. 9) (p. 68). U.S. Dept. of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services. Retrieved from <http://www.popcenter.org/problems/pdfs/Graffiti.pdf> [Accessed 14-July-2014].
- Whitehead, Jessie. (2004). Graffiti - The Use of the Familiar. *Art Education*, 57, 25–32. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/27696041?uid=3737864&uid=2&uid=4&sid=21104190369283> [Accessed 14-July-2014].
- Wickert, C. (2011). Moses & Taps – International Top-Sprayer – zur Ökonomie des Graffiti-Sprühens. 06.06.2011, 1. Retrieved from <http://criminologia.de/2011/06/moses-taps-international-top-sprayer-zur-okonomie-des-graffiti-spruhens/> [Accessed 14-July-2014].
- Wignal, T. (2008). Murals lift communities The opposite of graffiti. *CPTED Newsletter Perspective*, vol.7, Issue 3, 1–7. Retrieved from <http://www.cpted.net//PDF/newsletters/perspective3.pdf> [Accessed 14-July-2014].
- Williams, K. (2011). *Dialogues with Graffiti for 21st Century Cities- presentation for the DACRC ESRC workshop 2 “Social Policy, Criminal and Restorative Justice”*. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lim_neinY68 [Accessed 14-July-2014].
- Wilson, P. (1987). *Research brief: Graffiti and vandalism on public transport (trends & issues in crime and criminal justice)*. Canberra Australia: AUSTRALIAN INSTITUTE OF CRIMINOLOGY. Retrieved from <http://www.aic.gov.au> [Accessed 14-July-2014].
- Wilson, P., & Healy, P. (1986a). *Graffiti and vandalism. A report to the State Rail Authority of New South Wales*. Australian Institute of Criminology.
- Wilson, P., & Healy, P. (1986b). *Graffiti and vandalism. A report to the State Rail Authority of New South Wales* (No. 121624) (pp. 40 – 42 / 59 – 64). Canberra, Australia: Australian Institute of Criminology. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/Digitization/121624NCJRS.pdf> [Accessed 14-July-2014].
- Wilson, P., & Healy, P. (1987). *Graffiti and vandalism on public transport*. (Research Brief No. 6) (pp. 1 – 4). Canberra, Australia: Australian Institute of Criminology. Retrieved from <http://www.aic.gov.au/documents/4/C/C/%7B4CC88782-6505-40C3-B598-3812F6247A31%7Dt06.pdf> [Accessed 14-July-2014].
- Wilson, S. and M. Lipsey (2007) ‘School-Based Interventions for Aggressive and Disruptive Behavior Update of a Meta-Analysis’. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 33: S130-S143.
- Woodward, J. (2009). *Why is graffiti a problem for sustainable initiatives ? Reviewing solutions for the 21 st century*. University of Leeds.
- Worpole, K., & Knox, K. (2007). *The social value of public spaces* (p. 16). Joseph Rowntree Foundation. Retrieved from <http://www.jrf.org.uk/sites/files/jrf/2050-public-space-community.pdf> [Accessed 14-July-2014].
- Wortley, R. (2008) ‘Situational precipitators of crime’, in Wortley, R. and Mazerolle, L. (eds) *Environmental Criminology and Crime Analysis*. Cullompton: Willan.

- Xavier Ballaz, C. D. (2010, December). *Dialogues with Graffiti for 21st Century Cities- workshop 1.Presentation for the DACRC ESRC workshop 1 "Connected Environments, Communities, Materials and Technologies"*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NMxlVle3-BY#t=11> [Accessed 14-July-2014].
- Xavier Ballaz, C. D. (2010, December). *Dialogues with Graffiti for 21st Century Cities- workshop 1.Presentation for the DACRC ESRC workshop 1 "Connected Environments, Communities, Materials and Technologies"*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=urF7NQXFEHk> [Accessed 14-July-2014].
- Yieke, F. A. (n.d.). *GRAFFITI: VANDALISM OR EXPRESSION OF ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND INTELLECTUALISM AT UNIVERSITIES IN KENYA?* (pp. 1–2). Egerton University, Kenya. Retrieved from <http://www.codesria.org/IMG/pdf/Yieke.pdf> [Accessed 13-June-2014].
- Young, A. (2010). Negotiated consent or zero tolerance? Responding to graffiti and street art in Melbourne. *City*, 14(1), 99–114. <http://www.informaworld.com/openurl?genre=article&doi=10.1080/13604810903525215&magic=crossref|D404A21C5BB053405B1A640AFFD44AE3> [Accessed 15-05-2014]
- Young, A. (2013). *Street Art and the Contemporary City*. Retrieved from <http://backdoorbroadcasting.net/2013/01/alison-young-street-art-and-the-contemporary-city/> [Accessed 14-July-2014].
- Young, A. (2014). *Street Art, Public City Law, Crime and the Urban Imagination* (1st ed.). Oxon: Routledge.
- Young, I. (1990). *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. NJ: Princeton University Press.

8 APPENDICES

Appendices Contents

- 8.1 Keywords
- 8.2 Annotated Bibliography Example
- 8.3 Annotated Summary Example
- 8.4 Working Glossary for Graffolution
- 8.5 Graffolution Actor Typology

8.1 Keywords

Proposed Keywords to use	Analogous terms
Actor Agendas	Diverse actors; diverse agendas; range (of perspectives, approaches)
Actors	stakeholders; dutyholders; related and affected communities
Anti-social	ASB
Appropriation & Play	Play
Categorisation	Graffiti types/categories
Cleaning & Removal	Surface Protection; Maintenance; Coatings; cleaning products; cleaning services
Citizenship	Negotiating definitions of citizenship; Public forming; Society forming
Collaboration	Co-working
Community & Identity	Graffiti helping to develop a communal identity ; Graffiti's positive influence on the general public; representing the culture of a specific place / identity of subcultures; Bringing a community together
Commodification	graffiti commercialisation; brand appropriation
Cost-Reduction	Cost effectiveness

Creative Practice	Graffiti as a creative practice & Creative design practices for solving social problems
Crime frameworks	CPTED; SCP; 5Is; Conjunction of Graffiti Opportunity; others
Descriptions of Value	Local-; community-; legal-; enforcement-; community-; economic-; social value
Disorder	Civil disobedience; anti-establishment; incivic; deviance
Education	Training; Discipline; Welfare activities
Equality	Spatial equality
Graffiti / Street art as commodity	commercialization
Graffiti History	Art history
Graffiti tools	Spray; stencil; chalk; posca pens; charcoal; laser; installation; poster; sticker, reverse graffiti; etc.
Graffiti value indicators: Aesthetic	Aesthetic
Graffiti Vandalism: Defining	Concepts; definitions; understandings of; interpretations
Graffiti Vandalism: Reducing	Law Enforcement, (covers negative connotations)
Impact (worthwhile / what next?)	5Is; Reach; community safety; transformation; transferability; saleability
Implementation (How?)	5Is; methods
Intelligence (Why?)	5Is; causes (and theories) of criminal or non-criminal events
Intervention (What?)	5Is; principles/ mechanisms
Involvement (Who?)	5Is; addresses how to mobilise people and organisations to undertake crime prevention roles and tasks
Planning	Urban Planning
Pro-social	Positive impact
Public Areas	Public Space; Urban Space;
Questioning Hegemony: advertising / branding	advertising; right of property; profit; dominant cultural and social order; resistance; revolt against dominant ideologies

Questioning Hegemony: right of property	ownership; permissions
Reframing the problem	Redefinition of the problem
Social innovation	Social Innovation
Statistics	Quantitative data
Taxonomy	Typology; Category
Technology & Internet	Cleaning technologies; spray cap differences; web; web sharing platforms & peer to peer sharing/learning; spectatorship; virtual; digital; new digital technologies
Transport	Transit; Public Transport

8.2 Annotated Bibliography Example

Category Group				Source Type		
Graffiti writers / Graffitists / Street Artists - perspectives and projects				Website		
Reference Source				Priority rating		
In-text: (Graffiti.org, 2014)				1 - high		
Bibliography: Graffiti.org, (2014). <i>Art Crimes: Critical Terms for Graffiti Study</i> . [online] Available at:						
http://www.graffiti.org/faq/critical_terms_sonik.html [Accessed 26 May. 2014].						
120 – 150 word annotation						
This Website presents a taxonomy analysis, outlining how the terminology surrounding graffiti shifts over time. It describes anger felt by writers at how commercial advertising sells harmful ideals and products to society such as alcohol or unrealistic & negative portrayals of body images (in for example an underwear advert) but that graffiti artists are condemned for illegally painting ‘art’ on the urban environment. The text cites text Jim Prigoff, as author of the ‘seminal work Spraycan Art’ in describing that ‘graffiti is all about risk and reward’. Author Caleb Neelon (whose tag name is Sonik) says that ‘civil disobedience is one of the ways by which we as a society can cure ourselves of the misuse and underuse of public and private property’. He argues that since graffiti moved out of the subway and onto the streets writers have used seven different modes of selecting their locations, these include; ‘gettable’ (reachable, risk v reward), ‘audience’ (who will see the work), ‘surface’ (cement/ concrete etc), ‘placement’ (does it escape the boundaries?), ‘permanence’(How quickly will it get painted over etc), ‘originality’(surprise factor) and ‘sensory intangibles’ (smell/ sound what doesn’t show in a photo).						
Top 5 Keywords		Question Hegemony: Advertising/ branding	Categorisation	Public Areas	Question Hegemony: Right of property	Involvement
Additional keyword(s) (if needed): No						
Justification for additional Keywords: No						

8.3 Summary Example

Summary of sources reviewed by UAL for

Category 1 – Graffiti writers / Graffitists / Street Artists - perspectives and projects

The literature focusing on Spraying and Graffiti artist's perspectives and projects, evidences the pluralism of values at play within the practice of graffiti writing. This literature challenges negative and destructive connotations associated with writing and explores a range of perspectives from the point of view of writers and commentators on the practice. It also provides extended descriptions of value in relation to four key themes: aesthetics, self-expression, activism, and community identity.

Within these perspectives we observe arguments on how graffiti is criticised too harshly and the work is categorised by negative connotations where graffiti writers are seen as vandals. An alternative is to see the practice – under certain circumstance – as an expression of self (Austin 2010; Valle & Weiss 2010). The discussions here suggest that the harsh law enforcement towards graffiti writers are linked to the values of modern capitalist social system, which centres around right of property, ownership and profit. It is argued that graffiti writers face severe punishment for not obeying these fundamental values of capitalist societies. It is also noted that this creates an unfair system where the aesthetic tastes of “graffiti victims” are valued more than the lives of “graffiti artists” (Colt45 2010; Austin 2010). Another point here is that the capitalist system values profit more than creation of culture, and that graffiti artists cater for this gap in the system. This takes us to the discussions of value – aesthetics, culture production/production of culture and community identity.

The literature illustrates the systems of quality management existing within the community of practice. Accounts of self-policing are cited. Within the practice there are certain taboos when writing. For example it is argued that memorials, private properties and places of worship are typically respected by graffiti writers/ artists and are usually not targeted (You Suck Until Further Notice 2006; Colt45 2010).

Similarly, according to these systems of quality management within graffiti practitioners, the quality of work needs to be good otherwise other graffiti artists will write over it. If the work is perceived to have high value than other artists/ writers will respect the work and endeavour not to write over or deface the work of another artist (Rahn 2002; You Suck Until Further Notice 2006). The literature in this context provides evidence that it is not the intention within practice to functionally damage where for example writers are conscious of and respect critical signage.

The literature points to perceptions of graffiti as a form of creative activism. Writers are active in protest to the privatisation of public space and changes to definitions of public space. Challenges are made to advertising, signage and question the legitimacy of over exposing the urban environments with commercial signifiers where expressive and artistic practices are oppressed (McNichols 2006).

While these perspectives point towards descriptions of value, the literature also points to a somewhat snowball mentality. For example descriptions of fair game – i.e. if something is tagged it signifies that that area/ surface is fair game.

With a focus on other positive aspects of graffiti writing as a practice, the literature contains accounts where writing has a community building and regenerative affect. Such perspectives present a challenge to the detrimental and disruptive connotations of the practice. There are some accounts where we observe how graffiti writing is used to build community and identity among writers. This identity extends beyond the writers as a specific community of practice into local environments. The literature contains examples where this contributes to the identity of local communities and municipality (Rahn 2002; Gilani 2011; McAuliffe 2013; Cullinane 2011). This leads on to discussions that focus on graffiti as a regenerative device. The literature evidences a number of legal programmes: legal graffiti spaces and how these sites actually contribute to the reduction of vandalism. This is linked to the respect for good work, high quality writing and simple pragmatics – writers need spaces to practice their work.

The literature relates to the structure of the Graffolution research in two ways. It suggests that the existent categorisation of graffiti vandalism relies primarily on one specific group's perspectives - the authorities or the citizens who dislike graffiti and/or street art, and a social system that centres around right of property and commercialisation of public space than culture or self-expression (see for example, Colt45 2010; Austin 2010; McNichols 2006). A similar argument on the frictions between culture and/or individual against right of property comes across in *Category 4.2 Design, Urbanism and Urban Policy*.

Lastly and significantly, the texts suggest that more diverse value indicators (artistic, self-expression, activism, taste, pro-social activity, in addition to crime and anti-social indicators) need to be taken into account in developing a new categorisation model (see for example, Rahn 2002; Gilani 2011; McAuliffe 2013; Cullinane 2011).

8.4 Working Glossary for Graffolution

Term	Description
Actors	During Graffolution deliverables and outputs, we refer to human Actors, as representing either Dutyholders or Stakeholders (see below for definitions), in relation to graffiti. ⁵ More detail on breakdown of actor groupings used within Graffolution is given in the Graffolution Actor Typology (ref D2.1 Appendix: 8.5).
Agendas	Key priorities, driving factors or ambitions, which determine how a stakeholder or dutyholder responds to a given issue, system or scenario. Mapping agendas can help compare priorities to more deeply understand the relations of actors in a system.
Anti-social / Anti Social Behaviour (ASB)	Term used to focus on mitigating actions understood to harm or lack consideration for the well-being of others (Berger, 2003). Typically referred to by those perceiving or seeking to control potentially disorderly activities of many kinds - referring to littering, people being drunk or disorderly conduct in public spaces and is surveyed together with other forms of vandalism and damage to property, including graffiti. The term has been used increasingly since the late 1990's/early 2000's. ASB is used similarly to 'incivic actions' / incivismo (in Spain). Critiques of the term (such as Iveson, 2008) observe that caution is needed where the assumption is that those who perform anti social activities are distinctly 'unsocial', while who are not performing such activities are distinctly 'more social'. In the UK Anti Social Behaviour Orders (ASBOs) were abolished from 2014, being replaced mainly by 'Community Remedy' approaches, aimed at involving the local policing authorities and victim more closely in the processes of responding.
Assets	Existing available resources such as time, skills, funds, capital, knowledge, tools, access to information, social and professional networks and more, which a given actor can particularly bring to a system.
Awareness	The use of the term 'awareness' through Graffolution is intended to refer to increased capacities to perceive the multiple agendas, harms and benefits which may occur in parallel, within any one instance of graffiti, or a given response to it. It is not meant to suggest an instructional approach to 'teaching' a singular approach, rather to empower people to respond more sensitively to the problems, challenges or opportunities according to different contexts.
Civic code / Civismo	Regional byelaws for promoting positive civic behaviour (in Spain, for example). Related to interventions intended to tackle 'anti-social behaviour' but positioned primarily in terms of promoting what is accepted as 'social', in effort to mitigate what is perceived or defined as 'anti-social'.
Control	We can understand a wide array of 'controls' in respect of graffiti. The most appropriate society to focus on – at least to begin with – is the whole local geographical community. Examples controls include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Moral (e.g. guilt at spoiling someone's wall) · Reputational (e.g. this graffiti producer is someone who is prepared to violate private/public property norms) · Institutional (e.g. laws/punishments against criminal damage) · Security (e.g. graffiti-resistant coatings to surfaces) We also note however, that authors including Anna Minton (2012) observe the growth of the 'control' industries as inherently entwined with neoliberal, property-led (rather than community-led) approaches to urban development.
Crime	A category of behaviour or act, which contravenes the criminal law in a given jurisdiction. A more detached description can consider the concept of crime as a formal institutional response by the state to solving societal conflicts, which controls the behaviour of all the parties and prevents those conflicts escalating into interpersonal or intergroup feuds.

⁵ Note - According to Bruno Latour - who popularised such uses of the term 'Actor' following his Actor Network Theory (2005) - Actors include humans - people/organisations (both can be stakeholders or dutyholders) - but also objects and 'things' that may influence a social system or network. For example, how an environment, a newspaper article, web publication, or a fashion brand using a particular style, might each influence perceptions of local graffiti cultures and steps to manage it.

Criminal	Generally, an offender* who has been convicted of a crime* or perhaps cautioned.
CCO / CGO	Conjuncture of Criminal Opportunity / Conjuncture of Graffiti Opportunity
CPTED	Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design
Dutyholders	Actors in a system or network who have a <u>duty of responsibility</u> regarding a particular issue, such as graffiti vandalism. They are typically in paid roles to fulfill this capacity.
Five I's (5Is)	A process model for describing crime prevention and related activities, designed for capturing detailed knowledge of practice, and comprising main task streams of Intelligence (nature, causes and consequences of crime problem), Intervention (action to reduce risk of criminal and related events), Implementation (practical tasks of realising the interventions), Involvement (people- and organisation-related actions e.g. partnership or mobilisation to get them to implement the intervention) and Impact (outcome and process evaluation). Each of these tasks can be characterised by finer detail. See http://5Isframework.wordpress.com .
GDN	Graffiti Dialogues Network - www.graffitidialogues.com
Graffiti	In context of Graffolution the broadest references to graffiti are intended to encompass all kinds of uncommissioned or unsolicited visual interventions/works (largely two dimensional) in public areas and transport contexts, including both permitted and non-permitted/illegal forms. Most commonly this implies painted (sprayed or brushed) words or images, which make a conscious or subconscious association to the movement that emerged from New York during the 1960's-80's. This in some cases incorporates particular instances of street art, too. In many cases Graffiti distinguishes itself from Street Art in that its primary intended audiences are often limited peer groups of other graffiti writers, before other communities or publics.
Graffiti Vandalism	'Graffiti' and 'graffiti vandalism' are often used as synonyms in many sources. Those actors with a duty of paid responsibility towards graffiti prevention or removal appears to be those who use the term 'graffiti vandalism' the most. Here the term refers to defacing of public or private property without the owner's permission and considered as criminal damage (Islington Council, 2014). It covers issues around damage to, or devaluation of property, rights and permissions of property owners, raising or lowering feelings of insecurity, gang-problems, interpretations of anti-social behaviour and activities which may link to further criminal activity, following associations with broken windows theory (U.S. Department of Justice, 1999; McGovern, 2013; Stafford et al., 2003; Gray et al., 2008; Keizer et al., 2008). However, the notion of graffiti vandalism is paradoxical as one person's interpretation of vandalism is another person's affirmation of life in the city (Iveson, 2008).
Graffiti Writer	The person making graffiti in any capacity, legal or illegal (no positive or negative bias intended where used within Graffolution). Other terms include but not limited Graffitiist; Graffiti Vandal; Graffiti producer; Graffiti Artist and others.
Intervention	Interventions represent a pivotal frame in Eblom's 5I's framework (2011), where in the context of crime prevention, they encompasses objectives, principles <i>and</i> methods. Interventions may be driven by a desire for local or community-driven senses of 'justice' (for e.g. Ministry of Justice, 2012), by a third-party for 'collective good' (for e.g. see Sampson, 2012), or by personal motivation (e.g. of a graffiti writer). Preventive interventions interrupt, weaken or deflect the causes of criminal events, frustrate offenders' goals and/or disrupt, dismantle or sow distrust in their groups, organisations or networks. This is a narrow focus which excludes Involvement-type actions, for example publicity campaigns of the 'What is your teenage son doing when out with friends?' kind – the campaign is an Involvement activity, which mobilises the parents to act as crime preventers and Implement the Intervention (which is checking on their son). Interventions can be described in terms of practical methods (e.g. limiting sale of spray cans to youngsters) or more generic principles (e.g. restricting the resources for offending).
Journeys	The identifiable key steps taken by a given actor, in order to achieve their goals / meet their agendas in relation to an issue such as graffiti vandalism
Mapping	The process of creating separate but inter-related visual maps, which each show respective layers of a wider system* such as those related graffiti vandalism. Mapping can be undertaken in order

	to identify Actors, Assets, Activities, Journeys, Opportunities, Challenges, Scripts and Script Clashes, Graffiti Activity Locations and more.
Motivation	Reasons behind the impulse to do engage in graffiti. What moves a person to write graffiti, which reasons, which drivers, which situations, people, etc.
Offence	An act by a person or group that is forbidden by law, and usually intentional rather than committed in ignorance; although absolute offences do not need the intention, only the behaviour, to be so classified in law.
Offender	The person, in law, who commits a criminal offence; occasionally offenders can be corporate. Potential offenders are those, in crime prevention parlance, who have not yet committed an offence but may do so if not stopped.
Parole	The release of a person from prison before the end of the sentence imposed, with a promise or condition that no more crimes will be committed. In a number of cases it also involves socio-educative measures.
Personas	Invented characters, with detailed characteristic descriptions, as part of a series of personas, who represent typical stakeholder or dutyholder individuals within a system
Piece	An instance of Graffiti that has usually been designed first, and worked-up over longer periods. Falls in a less clear position being seen as negative for many dutyholders yet can be more accepted by others. Also known as murals in certain European contexts, particularly when granted permission.
Prevention	Reduction in the risk of criminal and related events, where risk covers possibility (the nature of the undesired events), probability and harm, by advance interventions.
Probation	The status of a convicted offender who has been allowed to go free under the supervision of a probation officer or panel of community workers
Pro-social / Pro-Social Behaviour	Term used to identify or promote socially-positive actions ('socially-positive' from the perspective(s) taken by the actor(s) in question, be they crime preventers, graffiti writers, or others), in relation to graffiti. Pro-social models for management and other responses to graffiti, include those interventions and actions whose primary driver is constructive - either generative, regenerative or restorative among the communities and environments affected. Such approaches are about promoting socially beneficial aspects either through, or in spite of, graffiti-related activities. They can in parallel have a crime-reductive effect, often in terms of 'activity support' - as of crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) principle. The notion in terms of graffiti being that promoting more opportunities and attention on facilitating activities, with for example, graffiti writers and street artists engaging wider communities about what they do like as well as what they don't like, can help promote reductions in the adverse effects and instances of problematic graffiti.
Regeneration	The term covers many efforts to 'improve' or otherwise change city life: physical (aesthetic and practical), economic, social and environmental. It involves the renewal of urban areas and settlements. <i>Urban</i> regeneration is primarily concerned with regenerating cities and suburbs suffering forms of 'decline'. However it should be noted that there is growing scepticism over who is served by some regenerative acts. Scholars such as Ben Campkin, point out that <i>"Inequality, displacement, polarisation and a reduction of social diversity can, and do, arise from urban regeneration, particularly when the focus is on stimulating economic growth and land values rather than placing people at the heart of what we think the term 'regeneration' actually means"</i> (Capkin, 2013).
Response	'Response' as used in Graffolution is a broader term which could include Intervention, Implementation and Involvement (as the R in SARA of Problem-Oriented Policing) as subsets, but also actions which are less tightly coupled to the particular process of doing crime prevention and is also equally relevant for non-crime perspectives. The term incorporates diverse notions of 'solution' (referred to in the initial project description(s) but seeks further to accommodate additional approaches or proposals, which pursue context-specific actions suited to a given situation but may, as yet, be untested. The term 'response' acknowledges, without individually claiming to fully 'solve' challenges, that useful and effective innovations can be still be made in

	addressing or responding-to graffiti from different and limited perspectives. This applies, even where it is not always clear which specific ethical drivers, or stakeholder agendas, a practitioner should/can be responsible to.
Restorative Justice (RJ)	Restorative Justice [RJ] is a “problem-solving approach to crime, which involves the parties themselves and the community generally, in an active relationship with statutory agencies” and it is “a process whereby all the parties with a stake in a particular offence come together to resolve collectively how to deal with the aftermath of the offence and its implications for the future”(Marshall, 1995). RJ is an alternative to penalty strengthening or prosecution. It aims to “restore harm by including affected parties in a (direct or indirect) encounter and a process of understanding through voluntary and honest dialogue” (Gavrielides 2007, p.139). These interventions do not use graffiti or street art as a conflict resolution tool although they create a legal framework positive to society especially at a community level. Voluntary participation by offenders is maximised; coercion and exclusion are minimised (Zehr & Mika, 1998).
Retribution	A theory of justice that considers punishment, if proportionate, to be the best response to crime.
Scenario	A given instance or sequence of activity or intervention related to graffiti, irrespective of bias for, against or neutral. Other related terms include: Journey; Context; Script; Scene; Situation
Scripts	Cognitive scripts are a way of describing the procedure for undertaking some, usually purposive, behaviour that normally requires a number of steps to complete. Some scripts may have variations known as ‘tracks’ – alternative means to achieve the desired end or subsidiary goal. Crime scripts are those which are performed when preparing for or committing a crime.
Script Clashes	Script clashes are where two parties (e.g. offender and preventer) perform behavioural procedures, in a setting common to them both, which have conflicting goals. There are likely to be just a few archetypal clashes - e.g. pursue vs escape, conceal vs detect, challenge vs give acceptable explanation, use force vs resist force. The designer’s task is to adjust the setting, the objects in it, or procedures normally undertaken in it, to favour the preventers or legitimate owners/users over the offenders.
Service design	The activity of planning and organizing people, infrastructure, communication and material components of a service in order to improve its quality and the interaction between service provider (dutyholders) and affected or effecting communities (stakeholders).
Stakeholders	Actors in a system or network who take a personal interest regarding particular issue, such as graffiti vandalism. They may either affect or be affected by the given issue. They are not typically paid in this capacity.
Strategy	Structured or semi-structured forms for deciding priorities and planning what to do.
Street Art	Street Art could be argued to distinguish itself from Graffiti in that its primary intended audiences are more often multiple, wider and unknown (to the artist) communities, publics, or arts practitioners, as opposed to the limited peer groups who may be the primary audiences of graffiti writers. Street art is often assumed to represent the ‘legal’ compared to graffiti’s ‘illegal’ activities, although this is variable. Street Art can be more pictorial, at least than letter-based forms of graffiti (though not always). In some instances it includes murals and muralism practices, in others the practice is more closely related to fine arts on-street, yet elsewhere street art can remain very informal, situational, or opportunistic, crossing over closely with some graffiti approaches.
System	Set of interdependent elements (actors*), which operate in relationship around particular agendas*, such as reducing the system of graffiti vandalism, or promoting systems of unsolicited urban art with regenerative impacts.
Tag	The ‘signature’ or ‘sign’ of an individual or group of graffiti writers. This is typically be the most rejected form of graffiti, most frequently associated to vandalism (as it is considered dirty, quick and without recognisable aesthetic value) by numerous publics. Tags often form the basis from which many graffiti writers develop their approach, style and working methods.
Typology	The study and organisation of types. For Graffolution, we refer most commonly to the ‘response

	typology' - as a collection of types of response to graffiti that we have identified (be that a preventative plan, or a visual intervention). These response-types also relate in given cases different primary drivers of different actors.
--	--

8.5 Graffolution Actor Typology

Actor Categories	Subcategories	Alternative terms within a Subcategory	Notes
Graffiti Writers (G)			
[G - Stakeholders]	Graffiti Writers	Graffers; Graffitists; Graffiti Producers; Sprayers (internal term)	Top-level, near-as-possible neutral description for any graffiti practitioner (actor). A person who makes graffiti: legal or illegal.
	Graffiti Vandals	Graffiti offenders; Young offenders; Scrawlers	Those involved in illegal (non-permitted) graffiti activity. Most significantly those who make destructive, devaluative, use-inhibiting or offensive graffiti.
	Graffiti Taggers	Graffers; Bombers	Mostly paint 'tags', 'dubs', or 'throw ups' (bubble letters, scrubs, etc.), rather than 'pieces', 'wildstyle', etc. Typically focussed on recognition from peer-audiences rather than non-peer/external publics. Taggers operate in both legal and illegal contexts.
	Graffiti Artists	Graffiti burners; Graffiti writers	Graffiti writers who seek to develop, or have already developed, distinctive graffiti styles, or worked-up pieces, recognisable as their own: in public areas; on transport; and/or in galleries. Typically make seek wider audiences (non-peer as well as peer) than taggers. Legal or illegal.
	Train Writers / Taggers	Train Bombers/ Train Burners	People who focus their graffiti painting on train vehicles and transport environments. Predominantly illegal graffiti activities. Taggers and Bombers make quicker less developed interventions than Writers and Burners.



	Street Artists	Contemporary muralists; Urban artists	Includes some kinds of 'graffiti artist' but also other artistic practitioners who make work in street environments using different materials or techniques. Legal or illegal.
	Crews	Gangs	Group(s) of associated writers of graffiti who often work together.
Public Administrations (A)			
[A - Dutyholders]	Local Authorities	Local area or neighbourhood municipalities; Town councils (small to medium).	Covering towns and surrounding areas/villages; or particular urban districts; wards neighbourhoods, etc.
	City Municipalities (or large urban areas)	City councils and other urban administrations, sub-regional authorities	Administrations and authorities covering built up urban areas (BUAs).
	Regional Authorities	Provincial; County	Regional, Provincial or County authorities and Government.
	State Authorities	National; State or Federal municipalities, authorities and Government.	Those administrations normally organised at state or country level.
Police & Law Enforcement (PLE)			
[PLE - Dutyholders]	Police – Local		Public authorities principally charged with city, town, or neighbourhood policing.
	Police -Transport		Principally involved with policing of transport environments including trains, buses, trams, stations, stops and also roadways

			and related properties and services. Can be fully public but are often public-privately funded.
	Police - Regional		Provide policing services for whole regions, counties, provinces, etc. Structures vary between countries, according to geographic and demographic organisation.
	Private Security or other Law Enforcement Agents		Security staff who take on policing responsibilities, on behalf of private companies, such as property developers business district partnerships, etc.
	Site Managers		Staff charged with responsibility for safety/security/logistics of an individual property or specific collection of properties.
Transport Operators/Authorities (O)			
[O - Dutyholders]	Public: Local/Regional Transport	Transport Service Providers; Rail/Bus Authority	
	State/National Transport Authority		
	Private, Regional or PPP Transport/Rail Authority		
	Transport Security (contracted)	Rail security guards; managers	
[O - Stakeholders]	Other transport Service Providers (contracted)	Engineers; Transport Planners	



	Non-Transport Infrastructure Providers		Electricity, Telecoms, Gas, etc.
Transport travellers [O - Stakeholders]	Passengers	Commuters; Customers	
Social Work, Cultural & Civil Society (SWC)			
[SWC - Dutyholders]	Social Workers		
	Educational / community officers		
	Culture Industry Providers		
[SWC - Stakeholders]	Community Leaders/ Advocate Groups		
	Community Interest Groups /Publics		Remote or Presential (in-person) communities, connected by common interests.
	Residential Communities		
	Neighbourhood Watch Schemes		
	Housing Associations/Tenants and Residents' Associations		



	Individual Property Tenants		
	Visitors/Tourists		
	Internet /Social Networks Users		
	Educational Organisations		Schools; universities; extra-curricular activities, etc.
	Parents		
	Other citizens		
Enterprises (E)			
[E - Dutyholders]	Property owners, & developers	Business property owners; Constructors	
	Owners and managers of cultural heritage property /provision	Private and Third Sector/ Charity owned.	
	Urban infrastructure providers/ owners		
	Local business owners/managers	Includes Business Improvement Districts (BIDs); Central Business Districts (CBDs).	
[E – Stakeholders]	Commercial urban designers, architects & land planners		



	Private home owners		
	Cleaning companies/restoration enterprises		
	Industry Representatives	Industry associations; groups; anti-graffiti associations; crime-prevention associations, etc.	
	Anti-graffiti producers and anti-graffiti material suppliers		
	Contractors	Other employed professionals with business-interest in graffiti. E.g. writers, journalists, commissioned researchers, workshop service providers, etc.	