



Department of

**Justice**

[www.dojni.gov.uk](http://www.dojni.gov.uk)

---

**Analytical Services Group**

**Perceptions of Policing,  
Justice and  
Anti-Social Behaviour:  
Quarterly Update to  
June 2015**

**December 2015**

## 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 anti-social behaviour. The data are drawn from the Northern Ireland Crime Survey (NICS) with the most recent findings being based on interviews conducted during the period 1 July 2014 to 30 June 2015.

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.

## CONFIDENCE IN THE POLICE AND POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY ARRANGEMENTS

Public confidence in the police and police accountability arrangements across Northern Ireland as a whole (referred to collectively as 'policing') is measured through a series of questions contained within the NICS. An overall (composite) confidence in policing measure is derived from responses to seven individual strands as outlined in Table 1.

- ◆ The proportion of people who expressed overall confidence in policing in the 12-months to June 2015 (81.2%) remained on a par<sup>2</sup> with that observed in the same period the previous year (79.7%) (Table 1).
- ◆ In the year ending June 2015, statistically significant increases ( $p < 0.05$ ) were observed in two of the seven strands relating to confidence in the police and police accountability arrangements: the police treat Catholics and Protestants equally in Northern Ireland as a whole (from 78.1% to 82.5%); and the Policing Board helps ensure the police do a good job (79.1% to 82.1%). The five remaining indicators were unchanged over the same period (Table 1).

**Table 1: Confidence in the police and police accountability arrangements<sup>1</sup>**

% confident that the...	Jul 13 to Jun 14	Jul 14 to Jun 15	Statistically significant change since previous year? <sup>2</sup>
<b>Overall confidence rating<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>79.7</b>	<b>81.2</b>	
Police provide an ordinary day-to-day service for all the people of NI	85.3	85.5	
Police do a very or fairly good job in NI as a whole	74.3	75.1	
Police treat Catholics and Protestants equally in NI as a whole	78.1	82.5	** ↑
Policing Board (NIPB) is independent of police	72.3	70.8	
Policing Board (NIPB) helps ensure police do a good job	79.1	82.1	** ↑
Police Ombudsman (OPONI) is independent of police	86.4	86.0	
Police Ombudsman (OPONI) helps ensure police do a good job	84.7	86.9	

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

2. See Technical Notes. 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 THE LOCAL POLICE

In addition to policing within Northern Ireland as a whole, the NICS also measures the level of public confidence in the local police, both overall and in specific aspects of their work. As part of a series of questions, respondents were asked to what extent they agree / disagree with seven statements concerning the local police; the first six are 'funnel-type' questions leading to a seventh overall confidence measure.

- ◆ At 67.8% in the 12-months to June 2015, the proportion of adults who expressed overall confidence in their local police showed no change ( $p < 0.05$ ) when compared with the previous year (67.2%) (Table 2).
- ◆ Compared with the previous year, none of the six indicators relating to confidence in local police showed a statistically significant change ( $p < 0.05$ ) in the 12-months to June 2015 (Table 2).

**Table 2: Confidence in the local police<sup>1</sup>**

% agreeing that the local police...	Jul 13 to Jun 14	Jul 14 to Jun 15	Statistically significant change since previous year? <sup>2</sup>
<b>Overall confidence in the local police<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>67.2</b>	<b>67.8</b>	
Can be relied on to be there when you need them	53.6	51.3	
Would treat you with respect if you had contact with them	83.9	84.9	
Treat everyone fairly regardless of who they are	65.4	66.7	
Can be relied on to deal with minor crimes	50.4	52.0	
Understand the issues that affect this community	63.7	65.9	
Are dealing with the things that matter to this community	52.2	52.2	

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

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

3. Based on respondents agreeing with the statement, 'Taking everything into account, I have confidence in the police in this area'.

## CONFIDENCE IN ENGAGEMENT

A set of questions relating to levels of public confidence in the local police working in partnership with other agencies, including district councils, to address local anti-social behaviour (ASB) and crime issues is also included within the NICS. Results from two separate questions on 'seeking people's views about' and 'dealing with' local issues have been used to form a composite rating to measure overall confidence in engagement with local communities.

- ◆ At 40.6% in the 12-months to June 2015, overall confidence in engagement showed no statistically significant change ( $p < 0.05$ ) to that observed in the same period the previous year (39.6%) (Table 3).
- ◆ Based on interviews for the year ending June 2015, the proportions of people agreeing that the police and other agencies both 'seek people's views about' (38.8%) and 'are dealing with' (42.5%) the ASB and crime issues that matter in the local area remained on a par<sup>2</sup> with those reported during the previous year (38.3% and 40.8% respectively) (Table 3).

**Table 3: Confidence in the level of engagement by the local police and other agencies<sup>1</sup>**

% agreeing that the police and other agencies, including district councils...	Jul 13 to Jun 14	Jul 14 to Jun 15	Statistically significant change since previous year? <sup>2</sup>
<b>Overall engagement rating<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>39.6</b>	<b>40.6</b>	
Seek people's views about the ASB and crime issues that matter in the local area	38.3	38.8	
Are dealing with the ASB and crime issues that matter in the local area	40.8	42.5	

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

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

3. This measure is the arithmetic mean of the responses to the two individual engagement strands in the table.

## CONFIDENCE IN THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM

Public confidence in both the fairness and effectiveness of the criminal justice system (CJS) is measured through two separate, single questions contained within the NICS. Both questions are preceded by a series of 'lead-in' questions on the fairness and effectiveness of various aspects of the CJS, designed to encourage a considered response.

- ◆ Based on interviews conducted in the 12-months ending June 2015, findings indicate that the proportions of respondents who were confident that the CJS as a whole is both effective (41.8%) and fair (60.0%) showed no statistically significant change ( $p < 0.05$ ) to those observed the previous year (40.0% and 58.6% respectively) (Table 4).

**Table 4: Confidence in the criminal justice system<sup>1</sup>**

% confident that the...	Jul 13 to Jun 14	Jul 14 to Jun 15	Statistically significant change since previous year? <sup>2</sup>
CJS as a whole is effective	40.0	41.8	
CJS as a whole is fair	58.6	60.0	

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

2. See Technical Notes. 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 5, have been used to form a composite measure to gauge the overall perceived level of ASB in the local area.

- ◆ Findings from NICS interviews carried out in the 12-months to June 2015 estimate that 7.8% of respondents perceived there to be a high level of anti-social behaviour in their local area, a statistically significant decrease ( $p < 0.05$ ) from that observed over the same period the previous year (10.2%) (Table 5).
- ◆ Results from interviews carried out in the 12-months ending June 2015 show that, when compared with the same period the previous year, there was a statistically significant decrease ( $p < 0.05$ ) in the proportion of respondents who perceived 'people being drunk or rowdy in public places' to be a problem in their local area (down from 17.1% to 14.8%). The six remaining ASB strands were unchanged ( $p < 0.05$ ) over the same period (Table 5).

**Table 5: Perceived level of anti-social behaviour in the local area<sup>1</sup>**

% saying very / fairly big problem	Jul 13 to Jun 14	Jul 14 to Jun 15	Statistically significant change since previous year? <sup>2</sup>
<b>Perceived high level of ASB<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>10.2</b>	<b>7.8</b>	<b>** ↓</b>
Abandoned or burnt-out cars	3.5	3.2	<b>** ↓</b>
Noisy neighbours or loud parties	7.6	7.4	
People being drunk or rowdy in public places	17.1	14.8	
People using or dealing drugs	23.0	20.7	
Teenagers hanging around on streets	16.9	15.4	
Rubbish or litter lying around	25.6	25.4	
Vandalism, graffiti and other deliberate damage to property	16.0	14.5	

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

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

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

NICS respondents are asked how much their quality of life is affected by anti-social behaviour on a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 is no effect and 10 is a total effect. In order to standardise the results, the following conventions have been used to gauge the effect of anti-social behaviour on quality of life:

1. minimally affected (responded in the range 1 to 3);
2. moderately affected (responded in the range 4 to 7); and
3. greatly affected (responded in the range 8 to 10).

- ◆ Findings for the 12-months to June 2015 show that, when compared with the same period the previous year, no statistically significant changes ( $p < 0.05$ ) were observed in the proportions of respondents who claimed anti-social behaviour has a minimal (87.3% and 86.3% respectively), moderate (11.0% and 11.6%) or great impact (1.7% and 2.1%) on their quality of life (Table 6).

**Table 6: Perceptions of the effect of anti-social behaviour on quality of life<sup>1,2</sup>**

% saying anti-social behaviour has a...	Jul 13 to Jun 14	Jul 14 to Jun 15	Statistically significant change since previous year? <sup>3</sup>
Minimal effect	86.3	87.3	
Moderate effect	11.6	11.0	
Great effect	2.1	1.7	

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

2. This question has been included within the survey since January 2012.

3. See Technical Notes. Statistical significance of change at the 5% level (two-tailed test) is indicated by a double asterisk (\*\*).

## FURTHER INFORMATION

For further information on the Northern Ireland Crime Survey please contact: Analytical Services Group, Department of Justice, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, Laganside House, 23-27 Oxford Street, Belfast, BT1 3LA; Telephone: 028 9072 4529; Email: [statistics.research@dojni.x.gsi.gov.uk](mailto: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](http://www.dojni.gov.uk)

## 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.

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 differences observed between various 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.

Where differences are described as not statistically different, this means that the results do not differ beyond the levels expected by chance fluctuation (as judged at the 5% level).

With effect from April 2014 the sample size of the NICS was reduced from 3,500 interviews to 2,000 interviews. This reduction was occasioned by the need to make savings generally in the levels of Departmental spending. As a result, the confidence limits of any percentages from the survey are now wider than was the case previously and the margin of difference between findings now required to achieve 'statistical significance' has widened accordingly. This means that absolute differences in percentages which would previously have been 'statistically significant' with the larger numbers then sampled (and the much narrower range of error for any findings) may not necessarily now be found to be statistically significant with the reduced sample size.

## ANNEX

**Table A1: Confidence in the police and police accountability arrangements<sup>1</sup>**

% confident that the...	July 10 to June 11	July 11 to June 12	July 12 to June 13	July 13 to June 14	July 14 to June 15
<b>Overall confidence rating<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>79.5</b>	<b>80.3</b>	<b>79.5</b>	<b>79.7</b>	<b>81.2</b>
Police provide an ordinary day-to-day service for all the people of NI	82.7	85.0	85.0	85.3	85.5
Police do a very or fairly good job in NI as a whole	70.4	71.9	71.9	74.3	75.1
Police treat Catholics and Protestants equally in NI as a whole	81.3	83.5	80.1	78.1	82.5
Policing Board (NIPB) is independent of police	73.3	73.3	73.9	72.3	70.8
Policing Board (NIPB) helps ensure police do a good job	82.1	82.6	79.6	79.1	82.1
Police Ombudsman (OPONI) is independent of police	86.4	84.1	84.7	86.4	86.0
Police Ombudsman (OPONI) helps ensure police do a good job	87.4	82.9	84.3	84.7	86.9

1. All figures exclude don't knows and refusals.
2. 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.

**Table A2: Confidence in the local police<sup>1</sup>**

% agreeing that the local police...	July 10 to June 11	July 11 to June 12	July 12 to June 13	July 13 to June 14	July 14 to June 15
<b>Overall confidence in the local police<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>62.2</b>	<b>64.7</b>	<b>66.0</b>	<b>67.2</b>	<b>67.8</b>
Can be relied on to be there when you need them	47.9	51.4	53.1	53.6	51.3
Would treat you with respect if you had contact with them	82.4	84.0	84.2	83.9	84.9
Treat everyone fairly regardless of who they are	65.2	66.0	65.7	65.4	66.7
Can be relied on to deal with minor crimes	48.3	50.3	52.5	50.4	52.0
Understand the issues that affect this community	61.8	62.7	61.5	63.7	65.9
Are dealing with the things that matter to this community	47.7	50.5	51.3	52.2	52.2

1. All figures exclude don't knows and refusals.
2. Based on respondents agreeing with the statement, 'Taking everything into account, I have confidence in the police in this area'.

**Table A3: Confidence in the level of engagement by the local police and other agencies<sup>1</sup>**

% agreeing that the police and other agencies, including district councils...	July 10 to June 11	July 11 to June 12	July 12 to June 13	July 13 to June 14	July 14 to June 15
<b>Overall engagement rating<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>37.8</b>	<b>40.4</b>	<b>41.2</b>	<b>39.6</b>	<b>40.6</b>
Seek people's views about the ASB and crime issues that matter in the local area	36.7	39.0	40.1	38.3	38.8
Are dealing with the ASB and crime issues that matter in the local area	39.0	41.8	42.4	40.8	42.5

1. All figures exclude don't knows and refusals.
2. This measure is the arithmetic mean of the responses to the two individual engagement strands in the table.

**Table A4: Confidence in the criminal justice system<sup>1</sup>**

% confident that the...	July 10 to June 11	July 11 to June 12	July 12 to June 13	July 13 to June 14	July 14 to June 15
CJS as a whole is effective	38.4	41.1	40.9	40.0	41.8
CJS as a whole is fair	58.0	60.5	58.3	58.6	60.0

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

**Table A5: Perceived level of anti-social behaviour in the local area<sup>1</sup>**

% saying very / fairly big problem	July 10 to June 11	July 11 to June 12	July 12 to June 13	July 13 to June 14	July 14 to June 15
<b>Perceived high level of ASB<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>9.7</b>	<b>10.2</b>	<b>7.8</b>
Abandoned or burnt-out cars	5.0	4.0	3.6	3.5	3.2
Noisy neighbours or loud parties	8.0	8.9	7.1	7.6	7.4
People being drunk or rowdy in public places	19.8	20.8	16.6	17.1	14.8
People using or dealing drugs	21.6	23.1	21.1	23.0	20.7
Teenagers hanging around on streets	22.3	21.8	18.3	16.9	15.4
Rubbish or litter lying around	25.2	26.5	24.6	25.6	25.4
Vandalism, graffiti and other deliberate damage to property	18.9	19.7	16.9	16.0	14.5

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

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

**Table A6: Perceptions of the effect of anti-social behaviour on quality of life<sup>1,2</sup>**

% saying anti-social behaviour has a...	July 12 to June 13	July 13 to June 14	July 14 to June 15
Minimal effect	84.7	86.3	87.3
Moderate effect	13.6	11.6	11.0
Great effect	1.7	2.1	1.7

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

2. This question has been included within the survey since January 2012.



---

**NOTES**

**Analytical Services Group**

Department of Justice

1<sup>st</sup> Floor

Laganside House

23-27 Oxford Street

Belfast

BT1 3LA

Email: [statistics.research@dojni.x.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:statistics.research@dojni.x.gsi.gov.uk)

Telephone: 028 9072 4529

[www.dojni.gov.uk](http://www.dojni.gov.uk)