



Department of

Justice

www.dojni.gov.uk

Statistics and Research Branch

**Perceptions of Policing,
Justice, Organised Crime
and Anti-Social
Behaviour:
Quarterly Update to
March 2011**

August 2011

INTRODUCTION

This update presents the most recent statistics on the level of public confidence in policing and the criminal justice system in Northern Ireland as well as public perceptions of both organised crime and anti-social behaviour. The data are drawn from the Northern Ireland Crime Survey (NICS) and are primarily based on interviews conducted during the period 1 April 2010 to 31 March 2011.

NICS in-year results (i.e. quarterly updates based on the 12-months to June, September and December) are provisional and are subject to revision during end-of-year validation procedures.

End-of-year NICS 2009/10 results (covering the period 1 April 2009 to 31 March 2010) on perceptions of policing, justice, organised crime (Freel and Toner, 2010) and anti-social behaviour (Freel *et al.*, 2011), including socio-demographic analyses, have been published in separate statistical bulletins.

CONFIDENCE IN POLICING

Public confidence in the police and police accountability arrangements (referred to collectively as 'policing') was measured through a series of questions contained within the NICS with the aim of maintaining the high level of confidence in policing in Northern Ireland (until 31 March 2011) observed through a composite baseline of 79.4% in NICS 2007/08.

The overall confidence measure is derived from responses to seven individual strands as outlined in Table 1. This same measure was used to form a previous target within the SR 2004 Public Service Agreement (PSA) (French, 2008).

- ◆ At 78.3%, the proportion of people who expressed overall confidence in policing in the 12-months to March 2011 showed no statistically significant change ($p < 0.05$) to that observed at baseline (79.4%; NICS 2007/08) (Table 1).
- ◆ However, while the overall confidence rating remained stable between NICS 2007/08 and NICS 2010/11, statistically significant decreases ($p < 0.05$) were recorded, against baseline (2007/08), in the level of confidence within three of the seven individual strands: 'police provide an ordinary day-to-day service' (from 83.4% to 81.3%); 'Policing Board is independent of the police' (77.0% to 73.7%); and 'Police Ombudsman is independent of the police' (90.0% to 86.0%) (Table 1).

Table 1: Confidence in the police and police accountability arrangements¹

% confident that the...	Baseline NICS 2007/08	NICS 2009/10	NICS 2010/11	Statistically significant change since baseline? ²
Overall confidence rating³	79.4	79.2	78.3	
Police provide an ordinary day-to-day service for all the people of NI	83.4	81.5	81.3	** ↓
Police do a very or fairly good job in NI as a whole	66.4	67.5	67.9	
Police treat Catholics and Protestants equally in NI as a whole	81.5	81.7	79.9	
Policing Board (NIPB) is independent of police	77.0	76.3	73.7	** ↓
Policing Board (NIPB) helps ensure police do a good job	81.7	82.1	81.5	
Police Ombudsman (OPONI) is independent of police	90.0	88.3	86.0	** ↓
Police Ombudsman (OPONI) helps ensure police do a good job	87.4	88.1	87.0	

1. All figures exclude don't knows and refusals.

2. Statistical significance of change at the 5% level (two-tailed test) is indicated by a double asterisk (**).

3. This measure is the weighted mean of the responses to the seven individual confidence strands listed in the table. Greater weighting is given to the three questions on the police.

CONFIDENCE IN ENGAGEMENT

A set of questions relating to levels of public confidence in the local police working with other agencies, including district councils, to address local anti-social behaviour (ASB) and crime issues was added to the NICS in October 2007. Results from two separate questions on 'seeking' and 'dealing with' these issues were used to form a composite rating to measure overall confidence in engagement with local communities with the aim of achieving a statistically significant increase in the level of engagement by 31 March 2011, from a composite NICS 2007/08 baseline of 42.4%.

- ◆ Based on the composite measure, overall confidence in engagement has fallen ($p < 0.05$) from 42.4% in 2007/08 (baseline) to 38.2% in the 12-months to March 2011 (Table 2).
- ◆ Much of this overall decrease in confidence is accounted for by a fall in the proportion of respondents who agree that the local police and other agencies seek people's views about the ASB and crime issues that matter. This indicator has dropped ($p < 0.05$) from 46.0% in 2007/08 (baseline) to 38.0% in the 12-months ending March 2011 (Table 2).
- ◆ In contrast, the apparent decrease (since baseline) in the proportion agreeing that the local police and other agencies are dealing with ASB and crime issues (from 38.9% to 38.4%) is not statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) (Table 2).

Table 2: Confidence in the level of engagement by the local police and other agencies¹

% agreeing that the police and other agencies, including district councils...	Baseline NICS 2007/08 ²	NICS 2009/10	NICS 2010/11	Statistically significant change since baseline? ³
Overall engagement rating⁴	42.4	39.7	38.2	** ↓
Seek people's views about the ASB and crime issues that matter in the local area	46.0	42.3	38.0	** ↓
Are dealing with the ASB and crime issues that matter in the local area	38.9	37.0	38.4	

1. All figures exclude don't knows and refusals.
2. Baseline drawn from fieldwork 1 October 2007 to 31 March 2008.
3. Statistical significance of change at the 5% level (two-tailed test) is indicated by a double asterisk (**).
4. This measure is the arithmetic mean of the responses to the two individual engagement strands in the table.

CONFIDENCE IN THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM

In conjunction with the CSR 2007 'Justice For All' PSA, a set of questions designed to measure confidence in the fairness and effectiveness of the criminal justice system (CJS) was introduced to the NICS, replacing those questions used to construct a six-strand composite measure adopted as part of the SR 2004 PSA (French, 2008).

- ◆ Based on interviews conducted during NICS 2010/11, findings indicate that the proportions of respondents who expressed confidence that the CJS as a whole is effective (37.6%) and fair (57.2%), show no statistically significant change ($p < 0.05$) to those observed at baseline (35.6% and 58.0% respectively) (Table 3).

Table 3: Confidence in the criminal justice system¹

% confident that the...	Baseline NICS 2008 ^{2,3}	NICS 2009/10	NICS 2010/11	Statistically significant change since baseline? ⁴
CJS as a whole is effective	35.6	37.3	37.6	
CJS as a whole is fair	58.0	57.6	57.2	

1. All figures exclude don't knows and refusals.
2. Effectiveness baseline drawn from NICS fieldwork 1 January 2008 to 31 December 2008.
3. Fairness baseline drawn from NICS fieldwork 1 July 2008 to 31 December 2008.
4. Statistical significance of change at the 5% level (two-tailed test) is indicated by a double asterisk (**).

PERCEPTIONS OF THE HARM CAUSED BY ORGANISED CRIME

In association with the CSR 2007 'Make Communities Safer' PSA, a set of questions was devised and introduced to the NICS in June 2008 to gauge the perceived level of harm caused by organised crime in Northern Ireland. The results contributed to a Crime Harm And Risk Measurement (CHARM) matrix, a methodology developed specifically to monitor progress against this indicator.

- ◆ Latest findings indicate that two-thirds of people (67.8%) feel that organised crime overall generates a minimal level of harm in the local area. In contrast, 5.9% of respondents consider organised crime to result in a great level of harm. These figures compare with 63.5% and 8.5% (respectively) in 2008/09 (Table 4).
- ◆ Of the various types of organised crime examined, drug trafficking, either the selling or buying of illegal drugs, was most commonly cited as promoting a great level of harm (15.2%), while respondents were least likely to consider immigration crime (3.8%) as promoting a great level of harm (Table 4).

Table 4: Perceived level of harm caused by organised crime (%) in the local area¹

Perceived level of harm (%) caused by...	NICS 2008/09 ²			NICS 2009/10			NICS 2010/11		
	Minimal	Moderate	Great	Minimal	Moderate	Great	Minimal	Moderate	Great
Organised crime overall	63.5	28.0	8.5	65.9	27.5	6.6	67.8	26.2	5.9
People selling or buying illegal drugs	51.8	30.7	17.5	58.1	26.7	15.1	58.6	26.2	15.2
People selling or buying counterfeit or smuggled goods	60.5	30.3	9.2	65.4	26.1	8.5	66.9	26.5	6.6
Money laundering and fraud ³	-	-	-	74.1	19.3	6.6	77.6	17.2	5.2
Fuel laundering and smuggling ³	-	-	-	74.4	19.7	5.9	77.2	18.3	4.5
Protection or extortion racketeering	73.6	17.9	8.5	77.7	15.4	7.0	79.2	15.2	5.6
Armed robbery	75.3	16.4	8.3	76.7	16.3	7.0	78.3	16.4	5.3
Immigration crime including human trafficking / smuggling ⁴	-	-	-	-	-	-	85.2	11.0	3.8

¹ denotes variable was not included in the survey.

1. All figures exclude don't knows and refusals.
2. NICS 2008/09 figures are based on the period June 2008 to March 2009.
3. Individual questions on money and fuel laundering were introduced to the NICS in May 2009.
4. Question on immigration crime was introduced to the NICS in April 2010.

- ◆ Over two-thirds (68.1%) of NICS respondents interviewed during the 12-months to March 2011 believed the level of harm caused by organised crime in the local area had not changed during the previous 12 months, a statistically significant increase ($p < 0.05$) since 2008/09 (62.7%) (Table 5).
- ◆ This increase is predominantly accounted for by a statistically significant reduction ($p < 0.05$), since baseline (2008/09), in the proportion of respondents who considered the level of harm caused by organised crime to have fallen (from 17.2% to 12.4%) during the previous 12 months (Table 5).

Table 5: Perceived change in the level of harm caused by organised crime (%) in the past 12 months¹

% perceiving...	Baseline NICS 2008/09 ²	NICS 2009/10	NICS 2010/11	Statistically significant change since baseline? ³
More harm	20.1	18.5	19.4	
About the same	62.7	65.9	68.1	** ↑
Less harm	17.2	15.6	12.4	** ↓

1. All figures exclude don't knows and refusals.
2. NICS 2008/09 figures are based on the period June 2008 to March 2009.
3. Statistical significance of change at the 5% level (two-tailed test) is indicated by a double asterisk (**).

PERCEPTIONS OF ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR

Respondents to the NICS are asked to rate how much of a problem different types of anti-social behaviour (ASB) are in their area. Since NICS 2003/04, responses to seven individual ASB strands, as outlined in Table 6, have been used to form a composite measure to gauge the overall perceived level of ASB in the local area.

- ◆ Findings from NICS 2010/11 show that the proportion of respondents who perceived a high level of ASB in their local area (13.0%) showed no statistically significant change ($p < 0.05$) to that observed through NICS 2009/10 (14.2%) (Table 6).
- ◆ Of the seven ASB indicators that make up the composite measure, three showed a statistically significant decrease ($p < 0.05$) since the previous year: 'people being drunk or rowdy in public places' (from 22.1% to 20.2%); 'teenagers hanging around on streets' (25.9% to 22.5%); and 'vandalism, graffiti and other deliberate damage to property' (22.1% to 19.9%). The remaining four indicators were unchanged between NICS 2009/10 and 2010/11 (Table 6).

Table 6: Perceived level of anti-social behaviour in the local area^{1,2}

	NICS 2003/04	NICS 2005	NICS 2006/07	NICS 2007/08	NICS 2008/09	NICS 2009/10	NICS 2010/11	Statistically significant change, 2009/10 to 2010/11? ⁴
Perceived high level of ASB³	18.1	16.9	15.0	14.6	14.3	14.2	13.0	
Abandoned or burnt-out cars	10.5	8.4	6.8	6.0	5.1	5.4	5.1	
Noisy neighbours or loud parties	7.8	9.6	8.3	7.9	8.1	8.1	8.3	
People being drunk or rowdy in public places	23.5	25.0	23.4	24.6	24.1	22.1	20.2	** ↓
People using or dealing drugs	30.7	28.1	25.8	25.5	23.7	23.0	22.3	
Teenagers hanging around on streets	30.7	29.1	27.4	27.7	25.7	25.9	22.5	** ↓
Rubbish or litter lying around	29.2	27.9	27.1	26.6	28.0	27.6	27.1	
Vandalism, graffiti and other deliberate damage to property	28.2	25.8	23.4	22.2	23.1	22.1	19.9	** ↓

1. All figures exclude don't knows and refusals.

2. NICS 2003/04 and 2009/10 figures have been revised and may differ from those previously published.

3. ASB: Anti-social behaviour (measure derived from responses to the seven individual strands in the table).

4. Statistical significance of change at the 5% level (two-tailed test) is indicated by a double asterisk (**).

REFERENCES

French, B. (2008). *Confidence in Policing and the Criminal Justice System: Findings from the 2007/08 Northern Ireland Crime Survey*. NIO Research and Statistical Bulletin 15/2008. Belfast: NIO.

Freel, R. and Toner, S. (2010). *Perceptions of Policing, Justice and Organised Crime: Findings from the 2009/10 Northern Ireland Crime Survey*. DOJ Research and Statistical Bulletin 3/2010. Belfast: DOJ.

Freel, R., Quigley, D. and Toner, S. (2011). *Perceptions of Crime: Findings from the 2009/10 Northern Ireland Crime Survey*. DOJ Research and Statistical Bulletin 2/2011. Belfast: DOJ.

FURTHER INFORMATION

For further information on the Northern Ireland Crime Survey please contact: Statistics and Research Branch, Massey House, Stormont Estate, Belfast BT4 3SX; Telephone: 028 9052 7157; Email: statistics.research@dojni.x.gsi.gov.uk

This update and other Department of Justice research and statistical publications are available at: www.dojni.gov.uk

Further information on the CSR 2007 PSA is available on the NIO website:

http://www.nio.gov.uk/justice_for_all_delivery_agreement_version_2.pdf

http://www.nio.gov.uk/comprehensive_spending_review-public_service_agreement-make_communities_safer.pdf

TECHNICAL NOTES

Selecting only one person at each address means that individuals living in large households have a lower chance of being included in the sample than those living in small households. Accordingly, the data presented in this publication have been weighted by household size to prevent a bias towards small households.

Don't knows, refusals and non-valid responses have been excluded from the analyses. Percentages may not always sum to 100 due to the effect of rounding to the nearest whole number, or because respondents could give more than one response.

Because of a combination of both sampling and non-sampling error, any sample is unlikely to reflect precisely the characteristics of the population.

Statistical significance tests have been carried out on a range of group differences observed between different sweeps of the NICS. These tests are used to establish the degree of confidence with which we can infer the observed findings as an accurate reflection of the perceptions of the population.

For the purposes of this update, where differences have emerged as being statistically significant, these have been reported at the 5% ($p < 0.05$) level of probability (two-tailed tests). This means that, for any observed result that is found to be statistically significant, one can be 95% confident that this has not happened by chance.

NOTES

Department of Justice

Justice Policy Directorate

Statistics and Research Branch

Massey House

Stormont Estate

Belfast

BT4 3SX

Email: statistics.research@dojni.x.gsi.gov.uk

Telephone: 028 9052 7157

Facsimile: 028 9052 7532

www.dojni.gov.uk