

**Evaluation of National Reassurance  
Policing Programme**

**Technical Report  
March 2005**

Prepared for:  
**Home Office**

Prepared by:  
**BMRB Social Research  
Part of BMRB International Limited**

BMRB/JT/45103111  
Quality System Registered by BSI  
BSI Certificate of Registration No: FS 28348

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>1.</u>	<u>Background and Objectives.....</u>	<u>1</u>
<u>2.</u>	<u>Sampling .....</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>3.</u>	<u>Contact procedure .....</u>	<u>6</u>
<u>4.</u>	<u>Questionnaire design and piloting .....</u>	<u>8</u>
<u>5.</u>	<u>Fieldwork.....</u>	<u>8</u>
<u>6.</u>	<u>Response .....</u>	<u>12</u>
<u>7.</u>	<u>Appendices .....</u>	<u>24</u>

# 1. Background and Objectives

Although crime in England and Wales has been reducing over much of the last decade, many members of the public believe crime is increasing and are concerned about problems in their communities and their own safety. The objective of the National Reassurance Project is to test the premise that there are certain cues or signals denoting social or physical disorder which have a disproportionate negative impact on public feelings of safety. Funding by the Police Standards Unit allowed pilot reassurance projects to be implemented in sixteen pilot areas in eight Police Force Areas. Projects included a variety of measures to increase feelings of safety and security, increase satisfaction with, and improve confidence in local policing.

In October 2003 the Home Office commissioned BMRB Social Research to carry out two telephone surveys with representative samples of the adult (16+) population in these 16 pilot areas.

Interviews for the first survey (Wave 1) were carried out in the pilot wards prior to the full implementation of the projects in order to provide baseline measures. The second survey (Wave 2) was carried out approximately 12 months later, and provides comparable measures after the interventions had taken place.

The results of the two surveys provide pre-implementation and post-implementation measures of public perceptions, attitudes and behaviour as inputs to the evaluation of the projects. In as many cases as possible the same respondents were interviewed in the two waves.

Both surveys cover the following topics:

- Feelings of safety and security
- Confidence in the Police Force
- Satisfaction with the Police Force
- Visibility, Accessibility and Familiarity of Policing
- Community Engagement

In addition to the interviews in the pilot wards, interviews were also carried out in six control wards. These control wards were selected to give a reasonable match to six of the pilot wards across a range of area and demographic characteristics based on the 2001 Census small area statistics. Interviews were carried out in the control wards during both waves of the project and thus provide comparable pre and post data in areas where no reassurance initiatives took place.

Table 1.1 below lists the pilot wards by force area. Table 1.2 provides a comparison of the key statistics used to select the control wards: population density, ethnic profile and proportion of ward population classified as managers (those aged 16-74 and classified as National Statistics Socio Economic Classifications 1.1 – Large employers and managerial occupations; 1.2 – higher professional occupations and 2 – lower managerial and professional occupations).

**Table 1.1: Pilot wards and corresponding Control wards.**

<b>Police Force Area</b>	<b>Pilot Ward (LAD)</b>
<b>Greater Manchester</b>	Failsworth West (Oldham) St. Mary's (Oldham)
<b>Lancashire</b>	Ingol (Preston) Brunswick (Blackpool)
<b>Leicestershire</b>	New Parks (Leicester)
<b>Merseyside</b>	Town Centre (St. Helen's) West Park (St. Helen's)
<b>Metropolitan/City of London</b>	East Wickham / Falconwood and Welling (Bexley) St. Helier (Merton) Upper Edmonton (Enfield) Colville (Kensington and Chelsea)
<b>Surrey</b>	Ash Wharf (Guildford) Walton North (Elmbridge)
<b>Thames Valley</b>	Burghfield (West Berkshire) Greenham (West Berkshire)
<b>West Midlands</b>	Aston (Birmingham)

**Table 1.2: Comparison of key statistics for pilot wards and corresponding control wards \*.**

Police Force Area	Ward	Population Density (People per hectare)	Ethnicity (%White)	%Managers
Greater Manchester	<b>Failsworth West</b>	<b>42.0</b>	<b>96.6</b>	<b>16.7</b>
	Control	34.2	96.7	15.5
Lancashire	<b>Ingol</b>	<b>36.3</b>	<b>96.4</b>	<b>21.7</b>
	Control	38.3	97.5	23.3
Leicestershire	<b>New Parks</b>	<b>33.5</b>	<b>91.5</b>	<b>11.8</b>
	Control	48.6	94.8	10.1
Metropolitan / City of London	<b>East Wickham</b>	<b>47.8</b>	<b>92.4</b>	<b>25.2</b>
	<b>Falconwood &amp; Welling</b>	<b>63.1</b>	<b>93.7</b>	<b>26.0</b>
	Control	59.6	92.4	25.1
Surrey	<b>Ash Wharf</b>	<b>18.9</b>	<b>97.7</b>	<b>31.8</b>
	Control	27.2	96.5	30.6
Thames Valley	<b>Burghfield</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>97.4</b>	<b>46.1</b>
	Control	2.9	97.5	44.0

\*Pilot wards are shown in bold

## 2. Sampling

The sample was designed to produce a representative sample of adults aged 16 and over in each of the selected wards. In each wave the target was to achieve 300 interviews per ward. (East Wickham and Falconwood & Welling in Bexley are adjacent to each other.

These two wards had lower targets of 150 each per wave). The methodology used to select i) a random sample of households and ii) a random individual from within each household telephoned is explained below.

## **2.1 Source of telephone numbers**

A high proportion of telephone subscribers – 40-50%, are now ex-directory. It is recognised that unlisted households may be demographically different from the general population, so using only directory based sample would be inappropriate. To obtain a representative sample for the surveys it was therefore necessary to generate additional numbers using a procedure known as Random Digit Dialling (RDD). This involves randomising the final four digits of telephone numbers known to be operational within the relevant STD exchange areas. Because STD areas are much larger than the wards, it was known that a high proportion of the numbers generated would fall outside the ward boundaries, and this was taken into account in the design of the study (see section 2.2 below).

Using this method to create numbers also produces a substantial proportion of ‘deadwood’ numbers such as business numbers, fax lines, non-existent or disconnected lines, and this was allowed for when deciding on the total number of telephone numbers to issue. The full breakdown of response is given in Section 5.

In Wave 1 there were separate target numbers of interviews for RDD generated sample and Listed sample, reflecting the proportion of ex-directory households in each ward. For example, just over 40% of households in Ash Wharf are ex-directory and therefore the target was to achieve 121 ‘RDD’ interviews and 179 ‘Listed’ interviews.

In Wave 2 the target was to achieve as many interviews as possible with respondents who took part in Wave 1. Ninety five per cent of Wave 1 respondents gave us permission to re-contact them at Wave 2. It was known that a certain proportion of these respondents would prove to be un-contactable or unwilling to be re-interviewed and so the target was to achieve 200 re-contact interviews per ward (100 in East Wickham and Falconwood and Welling). The remaining interviews were generated from ‘fresh’ sample using a combination of Listed sample and RDD sample. As at Wave 1 there were separate targets for Listed sample and RDD sample, based on the proportion of the households in the wards which are ex-directory. However, in several wards the available Listed sample was exhausted, or almost exhausted at Wave 1 meaning that at Wave 2 it was necessary to boost the proportion of interviews generated from RDD sample.

**Table 2.1 Percentage of ex-directory households in each ward\*.**

<b>Pilot Wards</b>		<b>Control Wards</b>	
Ash Wharf	40%	Burghfield control	39%
Aston	72%	New Parks control	47%
Brunswick	48%	Ash Wharf control	51%
Burghfield	39%	Ingol control	56%
Colville	54%	East Wickham & Falconwood control	61%
East Wickham	51%	Failsworth West control	70%
Failsworth West	38%		
Falconwood Welling	53%		
Greenham	48%		
Ingol	45%		
New Park	46%		
St Helier	57%		
St Marys	55%		
Town Centre	58%		
Upper Edmonton	66%		
Walton North	49%		
West Park	75%		

\*These figures were provided by UK Changes who searched for the numbers of all households on the electoral roll within the selected wards.

## **2.2 Establishing eligibility**

For all Wave 1 interviews and for ‘fresh’ interviews at Wave 2 it was then necessary to establish whether or not the households contacted fell within the desired geographical area for the survey. All respondents were therefore told, at the beginning of the interview, that we were only interviewing people in certain areas and were asked to give their postcode. Postcodes were entered into a database containing all the relevant addresses for each ward, and interviews were terminated at this point should the household prove to be outside the desired area. Where the contacts were unable to recall their postcode it was suggested by the interviewer that they look it up on a bill or letter. Where this proved difficult it was also possible for interviewers to enter addresses into the database.

## **2.3 Selection of individuals**

The above methodology aims to produce a representative sample of residential households. After establishing that a household was located within one of the desired wards, the next step was to select one eligible adult (aged 16+) from the household for interview. This was carried out by the interviewer using the ‘last birthday’ selection procedure whereby the adult with the most recent birthday in the household is selected for interview. This method ensures that all eligible household members have an equal chance of selection, and it is less intrusive than methods such as the Kish grid selection

which involves the interviewer asking for the names or initials of everyone in the household.

### 3. Contact procedure

#### Wave 1 and Wave 2 ‘fresh’ interviews.

Achieving high response rates to telephone surveys can be difficult, especially when interviewers need to cold-call households where no prior contact has been made (as was the case for all Wave 1 interviews and Wave 2 ‘fresh’ interviews.) A number of steps were taken, therefore, to ensure that respondents could be reassured that they were taking part in a *bona fide* survey. Two forms of reassurance were offered:

- A letter was prepared by the Home Office outlining the purpose and nature of the research, and reassuring respondents of the confidentiality of the findings.
- In Wave 1 a freephone number for the Market Research Society (MRS) was offered to respondents which they could call to confirm that BMRB was a genuine research company.
- In Wave 2 respondents were offered the telephone number of the Home Office researcher responsible for the project. They were able to provide any further information which respondents may have wanted and could confirm that the research was of a genuine nature.

The Wave 1 survey and Wave 2 ‘fresh’ interviews were introduced by the interviewer as follows:

*“Good evening, my name is... calling from BMRB Social Research, an independent research company in London. We are carrying out an important survey for the Home Office about crime and policing in your area.*

*May I ask you some questions for the survey?”*

If necessary interviewers then added:

*“The results will help the Police to improve their service in the future, taking local peoples’ views and experiences into account.*

*The survey will take around 15-20 minutes depending on your answers.*

*Your answers will be treated in the strictest confidence”.*



If respondents seemed hesitant, they were offered the letter from the Home Office, although very few respondents actually took this offer up. If they did not want to receive the letter but were still unsure about the survey, they were asked if they wanted the telephone number for the MRS (Wave 1) or the telephone number for the Home Office researcher (Wave 2). In the case of accepting either the letter or the telephone number, respondents were given the option of continuing with the interview at that point, or waiting until they had received the letter or phoned the MRS / Home Office.

The contact procedure was complicated by the fact that there were up to three phases. The first task of the interviewer was to persuade the person who picked up the phone to co-operate. Then the household's eligibility had to be confirmed. Once this was established, the interviewer would then carry out the selection procedure, which might result in another household member being selected. If so, the interviewer would then need to persuade this second person to co-operate, either during the same telephone contact or at a later stage if the selected person was not present.

All respondents who completed an interview, but who were not offered a letter or telephone number during the contact stage, were asked at the end of the interview if they would like the MRS number so they could call for further reassurance.

## **Wave 2 're-contact' interviews**

In order that Wave 1 and Wave 2 responses could be accurately compared it was essential that the same individual was interviewed in both waves. The Wave 1 respondent's name and age were displayed on the contact screen so that the interviewer knew who they needed to ask for. If the Wave 1 respondent was no longer present in the household then the household was deemed ineligible for the Wave 2 survey. Where contact was made with the Wave 1 respondent it was also necessary to ensure that they were still living at the same address. Respondents who had moved house in the last twelve months were also deemed ineligible for the Wave 2 survey.

Wave 2 re-contact interviews were introduced as follows:

*“Good afternoon / evening, my name is .... calling on behalf of BMRB Social Research, an independent research company in London. About a year ago you took part in a survey for the Home Office about crime and policing in your local area. We are now following up this survey and would like to ask you some more questions”.*

## 4. Questionnaire design and piloting

### Wave 1

The questionnaire was developed in consultation with the Home Office and many of the questions were the same as or were adapted from the British Crime Survey. The questionnaire was translated into our CATI (Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing) program and a pilot session was held to test it. A small number of minor changes were then made before the questionnaire was finalised.

The average interview length was just under 20 minutes.

### Wave 2

The majority of the Wave 2 questionnaire remained the same as the Wave 1 questionnaire. The principle changes were:

- An additional set of questions towards the end of the questionnaire which asked about the respondent's experiences of some of the initiatives which had been introduced as part of the reassurance programme (such as the introduction of Police Community Support Officers and public meetings about priorities for local improvement).
- Re-contacted respondents whose answers to certain key questions were different in Wave 2 to those given at Wave 1 were asked open-ended questions where they were asked to explain why their views had changed.

As in Wave 1 there was a piloting session to test the revised questionnaire. Again a number of small changes were made to the questionnaire before it was finalised.

The average interview length remained unchanged at just under 20 minutes.

The full CATI script for the Wave 1 and Wave 2 surveys can be found in Appendix A.

## 5. Fieldwork

### Wave 1

Interviewing in the pilot wards ran from 19<sup>th</sup> November 2003 to 18<sup>th</sup> January 2004. A small number of interviews were carried out in the control wards during this period but the majority of control ward interviews took place between 19<sup>th</sup> January 2004 and 8<sup>th</sup> March 2004. In total 4,780 interviews were carried out in the pilot wards with a further 1,805 interviews in the control areas.

Figure 5.1 shows the number of interviews achieved in each ward by sample type in Wave 1.

**Figure 5.1 Number of interviews achieved by ward**

	<b>Number of interviews</b>
<b>Pilot Wards</b>	
Ash Wharf	299
Aston	300
Brunswick	296
Burghfield	299
Colville	299
East Wickham	130
Failsworth West	297
Falconwood & Welling	194
Greenham	297
Ingol	300
New Parks	300
St. Helier	301
St. Marys	297
Town Centre	300
Upper Edmonton	299
Walton North	272
West Park	300
<b>Control Wards</b>	
Burghfield control	300
New Parks control	300
Ash Wharf control	300
Ingol control	300
East Wickham & Falconwood control	300
Failsworth West control	305

## Wave 2

Interviewing was carried out simultaneously in pilot and control wards between the 1<sup>st</sup> November 2004 and the 1<sup>st</sup> February 2005. In total 4,785 interviews were carried out in the pilot wards with a further 1,778 interviews in the control areas.

Figure 5.2 shows the total number of interviews and the number of re-contact interviews achieved in each ward.

**Figure 5.2 Number of re-contact interviews and total number of interviews achieved by ward**

	<b>Total no. of re-contact interviews</b>	<b>Total no. of Wave 2 interviews</b>
<b>Pilot Wards</b>		
Ash Wharf	191	294
Aston	150	295
Brunswick	175	300
Burghfield	205	299
Colville	159	299
East Wickham	80	143
Failsworth West	190	299
Falconwood & Welling	126	170
Greenham	186	297
Ingol	194	300
New Parks	178	304
St. Helier	173	297
St. Marys	156	300
Town Centre	174	264
Upper Edmonton	173	297
Walton North	168	296
West Park	184	331
<b>Control Wards</b>		
Burghfield control	199	296
New Parks control	176	292
Ash Wharf control	198	299
Ingol control	192	291
East Wickham & Falconwood control	184	299
Failsworth West control	175	301

The target was to achieve 200 ‘re-contact’ interviews in each ward (150 in East Wickham and Falconwood and Welling). It was known that some telephone numbers on which we completed interviews at Wave 1 would have gone out of use by Wave 2. However, the proportion of numbers which had gone out of use was larger than was anticipated at 8.5 per cent. In addition a further 4 per cent of ‘re-contact’ numbers were found to be ineligible as the respondent who carried out the survey at Wave 1 was no longer a member of the household.

## **Loss of interviews**

When the sample was supplied by the sample provider each record was labelled with the ward in which it was anticipated that the household would fall out. This ward according to the sample file was stored within the data. When the interviewer entered the respondent's postcode at the beginning of the survey this was matched to a database containing the eligible postcodes within each ward. This database was used to determine which ward the respondent's household actually fell in. It should have been the case that the ward according to the sample file and the ward according to the postcode database were the same (unless the two wards were adjacent to each other which was only the case for the two wards in Bexley and the two wards in St.Helen's). This check was made after the completion of Wave 2 interviews and it was revealed that the two ward variables differed for 63 interviews from Wave 1 (some of which had been re-contacted as part of the panel sample in Wave 2) and 15 'fresh' interviews from Wave 2. The only possible course of action was to remove these interviews from the data as we could not be sure that the respondents were living in the relevant wards.

A further 15 're-contact' interviews had to be removed from the Wave 2 data when it was revealed that there were different contact names for the respondents in Wave 1 and Wave 2.

## 6. Response

### Wave 1 – Pilot Wards

Figure 6.1 shows the total response breakdown for the fieldwork conducted in the pilot wards. Calculating the response rate is complicated by the fact that for many contacts it was not established whether the household was eligible to take part in the survey. In such cases assumptions of eligibility have been calculated based on the actual eligibility levels which had been established in each ward. The eligibility rate for numbers generated from the Listed sample was obviously far higher than for numbers generated from the RDD sample and so the assumptions of eligibility were calculated separately.

Overall eligibility in the pilot wards was 85.4% for the Listed sample and 10.5% for the RDD sample. Such a low RDD eligibility rate was not expected and caused some difficulty in meeting the target number of interviews. In the pilot wards it took 563,212 calls to achieve the 4,780 interviews.

For the Pilot survey 124,494 numbers were issued. Of these 102,397 (91%) were deemed to be out of scope. The majority of these non-relevant contacts were unobtainable numbers (numbers created by RDD which did not exist); ineligible numbers (contacts where the respondent's post code was not within the target ward) and assumed ineligible numbers (numbers where eligibility was not established but were assumed ineligible based on the calculation described above). Also excluded as out of scope were those numbers to which 10 or more calls had been made without the number being answered. This is because arguably these lines will never be answered, if they are not answered after 10 calls. A proportion of randomly generated working lines will never answer because they are public call box lines. Similarly some of the numbers classified as non-answering are likely to be business lines which will not be answered during evenings and weekends when the majority of calls were made. There will also be a small proportion of lines which are second homes and unoccupied most of the time.

This left 10,978 numbers in scope (5,643 numbers where eligibility was established and 5,335 numbers where eligibility was assumed). Full interviews were achieved with 4,780 respondents and in total there were 5,364 refusals and 834 contacts where interviews were not achieved for other reasons such as unfulfilled appointments or the respondent being unavailable during fieldwork.

Figure 6.1 shows two response rates. The first response rate is based only on those numbers which are known to be eligible. This gives a figure of just under 85 per cent. If the numbers assumed to be eligible are also included then the response rate is calculated at 43.54%.

Figure 6.1 – Wave 1 Response Breakdown for Pilot Wards

	TOT	%of Total	
<b>Total Issued Sample</b>	124494		
<b>Non Relevant Contacts (including those assumed ineligible)</b>	<b>113516</b>	<b>91.10%</b>	
<b>TOTAL DEADWOOD</b>	<b>102397</b>	<b>82.20%</b>	
Business Number	5394	4.30%	
Fax/Computer Line	4306	3.50%	
Unobtainable Number	42289	34.00%	
Duplicate	314	0.30%	
Ineligible (postcode not in ward)	26659	21.40%	
Dialler Hang Up	335	0.30%	
Out of Quota for ward	79	0.10%	
Assumed Ineligible	23021	18.50%	
<b>TOTAL NON CONTACT</b>			
No reply after 10 calls	11119	<b>8.90%</b>	
		%of eligible	%of eligible and assumed eligible
<b>Relevant Contacts (KNOWN TO BE ELIGIBLE)</b>	<b>5643</b>	100%	
<b>Relevant Contacts (including those assumed eligible)</b>	<b>10978</b>		100%
<b>TOTAL REFUSAL (KNOWN TO BE ELIGIBLE)</b>	<b>533</b>	<b>9.45%</b>	<b>4.86%</b>
Refusal after eligibility established but before selection	47		
Refusal by selected person	29		
Proxy refusal on behalf of selected person	114		
Interview started but abandoned (and not recovered)	343		
<b>OTHER NON RESPONSE (KNOWN TO BE ELIGIBLE)</b>	<b>330</b>	<b>5.85%</b>	<b>3.01%</b>
Hearing/Language Problem	20		
Unavailable during fieldwork	50		
No reply/engaged/answering machine	98		
Unfulfilled appointment	18		
General Call Back	61		
Partial (Stopped Interview)	83		
<b>TOTAL REFUSAL (ASSUMED TO BE ELIGIBLE)</b>	<b>4831</b>		<b>44.01%</b>
<b>OTHER NON RESPONSE (ASSUMED TO BE ELIGIBLE)</b>	<b>504</b>		<b>4.57%</b>
<b>FULL INTERVIEWS</b>	<b>4780</b>	<b>84.71%</b>	<b>43.54%</b>

## Wave 1 – Control Wards

Figure 6.2 shows the total response breakdown for the control wards. Assumed eligibility levels are calculated in exactly the same way. The overall eligibility rate for the Listed sample was slightly higher in the control wards than the pilot wards at 87.9%. The overall RDD eligibility rate was slightly lower at 10%. It took 223,285 calls to achieve the 1,805 interviews.

For the Control survey 54,548 numbers were issued in total. Of these 50,423 (92%) were deemed out of scope. This left 4,125 numbers in scope (1,976 where eligibility was established and 2,149 where eligibility was assumed). Full interviews were achieved with 1,805 respondents and in total there were 2,117 refusals and 203 contacts where interviews were not achieved for other reasons.

As before Figure 6.2 shows two response rates. The first response rate, based only on those numbers known to be eligible is 91 per cent which is slightly higher than in the Pilot wards. When the numbers which are assumed to be eligible are also included then the response rate is calculated at just under 44 per cent (as in the Pilot wards).



Figure 6.2 – Wave 1 Response Breakdown for Control Wards

Total Issued Sample	TOT 54548	%of Total	
<b>Non Relevant Contacts (including those assumed ineligible)</b>	<b>50423</b>	<b>92.44%</b>	
<b>TOTAL DEADWOOD</b>	<b>45066</b>	<b>82.62%</b>	
Business Number	2646	4.85%	
Fax/Computer Line	1406	2.58%	
Unobtainable Number	21012	38.52%	
Duplicate	127	0.23%	
Ineligible (postcode not in ward)	9868	18.09%	
Dialler Hang Up	1621	2.97%	
Out of Quota for ward	158	0.29%	
Assumed Ineligible	8228	15.08%	
<b>TOTAL NON CONTACT</b>			
No reply after 10 calls	<b>5357</b>	<b>9.82%</b>	
		%of eligible	%of eligible and assumed eligible
<b>Relevant Contacts (KNOWN TO BE ELIGIBLE)</b>	<b>1976</b>	100%	
<b>Relevant Contacts (including those assumed eligible)</b>	<b>4125</b>		100%
<b>TOTAL REFUSAL (KNOWN TO BE ELIGIBLE)</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>6.99%</b>	<b>3.35%</b>
Refusal after eligibility established but before selection	19		
Refusal by selected person	3		
Proxy refusal on behalf of selected person	5		
Interview started but abandoned (and not recovered)	111		
<b>OTHER NON RESPONSE (KNOWN TO BE ELIGIBLE)</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>1.67%</b>	<b>0.80%</b>
Hearing/Language Problem	1		
Unavailable during fieldwork	3		
No reply/engaged/answering machine	6		
Unfulfilled appointment	1		
General Call Back	6		
Partial (Stopped Interview)	16		
<b>TOTAL REFUSAL (ASSUMED TO BE ELIGIBLE)</b>	<b>1979</b>		<b>47.99%</b>
<b>OTHER NON RESPONSE (ASSUMED TO BE ELIGIBLE)</b>	<b>170</b>		<b>4.12%</b>
<b>FULL INTERVIEWS</b>	<b>1805</b>	<b>91.35%</b>	<b>43.76%</b>

## Wave 2 – Pilot Wards – Fresh Sample

Figure 6.3 shows the total response breakdown for the fieldwork conducted in the pilot wards in Wave 2 using fresh sample. As in Wave 1 there were many contacts where eligibility was not established. Assumptions of eligibility were made about these contacts in exactly the same way.

Overall eligibility in the pilot wards was 31.39% for the Listed sample and 10.34% for the RDD sample. The eligibility of the RDD sample was much the same as it was in Wave 1, whereas the eligibility of the Listed sample was considerably lower. This drop in overall Listed eligibility was caused by the fact that the sample supplier was unable to provide Listed sample with the same degree of precision in several wards. The reason for this is currently being investigated.

In total 42,086 fresh sample numbers were issued in the pilot wards. This was made up of 4396 numbers from Listed sample and 37690 from RDD sample. A lot less sample was issued than in Wave 1 as the bulk of the interviews were to come from re-contact sample which was already known to be eligible and had given us permission to re-contact them.

38002 (90%) numbers were deemed out of scope. This left 4,084 numbers in scope (2,139 where eligibility was established and 1,945 where eligibility was assumed). Full interviews were achieved with 1923 respondents and in total there were 1729 refusals and 432 contacts where interviews were not achieved for other reasons. Figure 6.5 shows the full fresh sample response breakdown for Wave 2 pilot wards. Two response rates are shown as before. The response rate based only on those contacts where eligibility was established was just under 90%. This represented an increase of just over 5 per cent on the comparable response rate achieved at Wave 1. When the numbers which are assumed to be eligible are included then the response rate is calculated at just over 47%, an increase of just under 3.5% on the equivalent response rate achieved at Wave 1.

Figure 6.3 Wave 2 Fresh Sample Response Breakdown for Pilot Wards

	Fresh	%of Total	
<b>Total Issued Sample</b>	<b>42086</b>		
<b>Non relevant contacts (Including those assumed ineligible)</b>	<b>38002</b>	<b>90.30%</b>	
<b>Total Deadwood</b>	<b>34669</b>	<b>82.38%</b>	
Business Number	2029	4.82%	
Duplicate Number	52	0.12%	
Computer / Fax Line	1785	4.24%	
Postcode ineligible	14015	33.30%	
Out of quota for ward	318	0.76%	
Dialler Hang Up	121	0.29%	
Unobtainable	4334	10.30%	
Assumed Ineligible	12015	28.55%	
<b>Non Contacts</b>			
No reply after 10 calls	3333	7.92%	
		<b>% of eligible</b>	<b>% of eligible and assumed eligible</b>
<b>Relevant Contacts (Eligibility established)</b>	<b>2139</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	
<b>Relevant contacts (Eligibility established + Eligibility Assumed)</b>	<b>4084</b>		<b>100.00%</b>
<b>TOTAL REFUSAL (KNOWN TO BE ELIGIBLE)</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>5.42%</b>	<b>2.84%</b>
Refusal from Selected Person	3		
Refusal after eligibility established - before selection process	32		
Proxy Refusal	26		
Abandoned Interview (not recovered)	55		
<b>Total Refusals - Eligibility Known</b>			
<b>Other Non Response (KNOWN TO BE ELIGIBLE)</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>4.67%</b>	<b>2.45%</b>
Unfulfilled Appointment	7		
General Call Back	36		
No reply / engaged / answer machine	22		
Unavailable during fieldwork	1		
Hearing / Language Problem	6		
Stopped (Partial interview)	28		
<b>Total Refusals - Eligibility assumed</b>	<b>1613</b>		<b>39.47%</b>
<b>Total Other Non Response - Eligibility assumed</b>	<b>332</b>		<b>8.12%</b>
<b>Full Interviews</b>	<b>1923</b>	<b>89.90%</b>	<b>47.09%</b>

## **Wave 2 – Pilot Wards – Recontact Sample**

Figure 6.4 shows the total response breakdown for the fieldwork conducted in the pilot wards using 're-contact' sample.

In total 4,745 re-contact numbers were issued in the pilot wards. Of these, 727 (15%) were deemed out of scope. The majority of these out of scope numbers were either 'unobtainable' (where the number had gone out of use between Wave 1 and Wave 2) or households in which the Wave 1 respondent no longer lived. There were an additional 48 numbers where we were unable to get a reply after calling on at least ten occasions. The unobtainable numbers, computer / fax lines and business numbers were all reactivated on 3 occasions to make absolutely sure that the numbers were coded correctly.

This left 4,018 numbers in scope. There were 918 refusals and 238 numbers where we were unable to get an interview for some other reason. 2,862 full interviews were completed giving a response rate of just over 71 %.

Figure 6.4 Wave 2 Re-contact Sample Breakdown for Pilot Wards

	Re-contact Sample	% of Total
<b>Total Issued Sample</b>	<b>4745</b>	
<b>Non relevant contacts</b>	<b>727</b>	<b>15.32%</b>
<b>Total Deadwood</b>	<b>679</b>	<b>14.31</b>
Business Number	8	0.17%
Duplicate Number	1	0.02%
Computer / Fax Line	31	0.65%
Ineligible - Wave 1 respondent no longer in household	207	4.36%
Unobtainable	432	9.10%
<b>Non Contacts</b>		
No reply after 10 calls	48	1.01%
		<b>% of eligible</b>
<b>Relevant Contacts</b>	<b>4018</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
<b>Total Refusals</b>	<b>918</b>	<b>22.85%</b>
Refusal from Selected Person	794	
Abandoned Interview (not recovered)	73	
Refused to reveal whether Wave 1 respondent still in household	51	
<b>Total Other Non Response</b>	<b>238</b>	<b>5.92%</b>
Unfulfilled Appointment	18	
General Call Back	47	
No reply / engaged / answer machine	82	
Unavailable during fieldwork	61	
Hearing / Language Problem	28	
Stopped (Partial interview)	2	
<b>Full Interviews</b>	<b>2862</b>	<b>71.22%</b>

## **Wave 2 – Control Wards – Fresh Sample**

Figure 6.5 shows the total response breakdown for the fieldwork conducted in the control wards in Wave 2 using fresh sample.

Overall eligibility in the control wards was 60.88% for the Listed sample and 10.12% for the RDD sample. The eligibility of the RDD sample was much the same as the eligibility of the RDD sample in the pilot wards but the eligibility of the Listed sample was much higher than in the pilot wards although still lower than the eligibility rate in Wave 1 (Again this is being investigated with the sample provider).

In total, 14,473 fresh sample numbers were issued in the control wards. This was made up from 1061 Listed numbers and 13,412 RDD numbers.

12,891 (89%) numbers were deemed out of scope. This left 1,582 numbers in scope (723 where eligibility was established and 1,945 where eligibility was assumed). Full interviews were achieved with 654 respondents. There were 812 refusals and 116 contacts where interviews were not achieved for other reasons.

The response rate based on sample which was established as eligible was 90.46% which was slightly higher than in the pilot wards. The second response rate which includes the sample which was assumed to be eligible was just over 41% which was lower than that achieved in the pilot wards and lower than the comparable response rate achieved in Wave 1.

Figure 6.5 Wave 2 Fresh Sample Response Breakdown for Control Wards

	Fresh	%of Total	
<b>Total Issued Sample</b>	<b>14473</b>		
<b>Non relevant contacts (Including those assumed ineligible)</b>	<b>12891</b>	<b>89.07%</b>	
<b>Total Deadwood</b>	<b>12013</b>	<b>83.00%</b>	
Business Number	558	3.86%	
Duplicate Number	156	1.08%	
Computer / Fax Line	532	3.68%	
Postcode ineligible	4703	32.49%	
Out of quota for ward	76	0.53%	
Dialler Hang Up	20	0.14%	
Unobtainable	1226	8.47%	
Assumed Ineligible	4742	32.76%	
<b>Non Contacts</b>			
No reply after 10 calls	<b>878</b>	<b>6.07%</b>	
			<b>% of eligible and assumed eligible</b>
<b>Relevant Contacts (Eligibility established)</b>	<b>723</b>	<b>100%</b>	
<b>Relevant contacts (Eligibility established + Eligibility Assumed)</b>	<b>1582</b>		<b>100.00%</b>
<b>TOTAL REFUSAL (KNOWN TO BE ELIGIBLE)</b>			
Refusal from Selected Person	1		
Refusal after eligibility established - before selection process	11		
Proxy Refusal	15		
Abandoned Interview (not recovered)	15		
<b>Total Refusals - Eligibility Known</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>5.81%</b>	<b>2.65%</b>
<b>Other Non Response (KNOWN TO BE ELIGIBLE)</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>3.73%</b>	<b>1.71%</b>
Unfulfilled Appointment	2		
General Call Back	5		
No reply / engaged / answer machine	4		
Unavailable during fieldwork	0		
Hearing / Language Problem	2		
Stopped (Partial interview)	14		
<b>Total Refusals - Eligibility assumed</b>	<b>770</b>		<b>48.67%</b>
<b>Total Other Non Response - Eligibility assumed</b>	<b>89</b>		<b>5.63%</b>
<b>Full Interviews</b>	<b>654</b>	<b>90.46%</b>	<b>41.34%</b>

## **Wave 2 – Control Wards – Re-contact Sample**

Figure 6.6 shows the total response breakdown for the fieldwork conducted in the control wards in Wave 2 using re-contact sample.

In total 1,781 re-contact numbers were issued in the control wards. Of these, 209 (12%) were deemed out of scope. As in the pilot wards the majority of these out of scope numbers were either ‘unobtainable’ (where the number had gone out of use between Wave 1 and Wave 2) or households in which the Wave 1 respondent no longer lived. There were an additional 13 numbers where we were unable to get a reply after calling on at least ten occasions. Unobtainable numbers, computer / fax lines and business numbers were all reactivated on 3 occasions to make absolutely sure that the numbers were coded correctly.

This left 1,582 numbers in scope. There were 383 refusals and 65 numbers where we were unable to get an interview for some other reason. 1,124 full interviews were achieved in total giving a response rate of just over 71 % (the same as the response rate achieved in the pilot wards).



Figure 6.6 Wave 2 Re-contact Sample Breakdown for Control Wards

	Re-contact Sample	% of Total
<b>Total Issued Sample</b>	<b>1781</b>	
<b>Non relevant contacts</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>11.73%</b>
<b>Total Deadwood</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>11.01%</b>
Business Number	3	0.17%
Duplicate Number	7	0.39%
Computer / Fax Line	2	0.11%
Ineligible - Wave 1 respondent no longer in household	54	3.03%
Unobtainable	130	7.30%
<b>Non Contacts</b>		
No reply after 10 calls	13	0.73%
		<b>% of eligible</b>
<b>Relevant Contacts</b>	<b>1582</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Total Refusals</b>	<b>383</b>	<b>24.21%</b>
Refusal from Selected Person	348	22.00%
Abandoned Interview (not recovered)	24	1.52%
Refused to reveal whether Wave 1 respondent still in household	11	2.87%
<b>Total Other Non Response</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>4.11%</b>
Unfulfilled Appointment	3	0.19%
General Call Back	14	0.88%
No reply / engaged / answer machine	17	1.07%
Unavailable during fieldwork	21	1.33%
Hearing / Language Problem	10	0.63%
Stopped (Partial interview)	0	0.00%
<b>Full Interviews</b>	<b>1124</b>	<b>71.04%</b>

## 7. Appendices

## **Appendix A – Questionnaire**

## **Evaluation of National Restoring Reassurance Programme – Questionnaire**

This version of the questionnaire covers both the Wave 1 and Wave 2 versions. All changes between the two waves are clearly marked.

SECTION A – SCREENING AND SELECTION

SECTION B – PERCEPTIONS OF LOCAL AREA

SECTION C – CONCERNS ABOUT CRIME

SECTION D – VICTIMISATION/SATISFACTION WITH POLICE

SECTION E – POLICE ACTIVITIES IN LOCAL AREA

SECTION F – DEMOGRAPHICS

SECTION G – RE-CONTACTING

## **SECTION A – SCREENING AND SELECTION**

### **CONTACT SCREEN - Wave 1 and Wave 2 ‘Fresh’ Interviews.**

Good evening, my name is .....calling from BMRB Social Research, an independent research company in London. We are carrying out an important survey for the Home Office about crime and policing in your local area.

May I ask you some questions for the survey?

#### **IF NECESSARY, ADD:**

The results will help the Police to improve their service in the future, taking local peoples’ views and experiences into account.

The survey will take around 15-20 minutes depending on your answers.

Your answers will be treated in the strictest confidence.

*Unless someone refuses completely to do the survey, select ‘Proceed with interview’, even if they are hesitant about taking part, to enter screening phase.*

#### **QAPCODE**

First, so I can check you are in the right area for the survey, please can you tell me your full postcode?

IF NECESSARY: This is just so we can compare the views and experiences of people living in different neighbourhoods.

*AANN NAA*

Don’t know

Refused

#### **IF DON’T KNOW POSTCODE:**

**QAPCHEC**

INTERVIEWER: SUGGEST TO RESPONDENT THAT THEY MAY BE ABLE TO LOOK UP THEIR POSTCODE ON A LETTER, BILL, BANK STATEMENT OR SIMILAR THING SENT TO THEM.

IF THEY WANT TIME TO LOOK IT UP, ARRANGE TO CALL BACK AND SUSPEND

OTHERWISE CODE HERE IF THEY ARE ABLE TO FIND POSTCODE OR NOT

Found postcode	JUMP BACK TO <b>QAPCODE</b>
Unable to find postcode	ASK NEXT QUESTION

***IF DON'T KNOW POSTCODE:***

Can you tell me the name of the street you live in?

*Use lookup database to check postcode/street.*

**IF POSTCODE/STREET IS NOT WITHIN AREAS OF INTEREST:**

'Thank you, we are surveying a number of areas and have already completed surveying in your area. We are sorry to have taken your time, and thank you once again for your help'.

PLEASE ALLOW THE RESPONDENT ENOUGH TIME TO RAISE ANY CONCERNS BEFORE HANGING UP. IF THE RESPONDENT RAISES CONCERNS ADVISE THEM THEY CAN CONTACT ALEXIS POOLE AT THE HOME OFFICE ON 0207 2733005 TO CONFIRM THIS IS A LEGITIMATE PIECE OF GOVERNMENT RESEARCH.

**S1. QAINIT INITIAL OUTCOME**

POSTCODE/STREET IS IN SCOPE – TRY FOR INTERVIEW

CODE INITIAL OUTCOME HERE:

Respondent agrees to continue	<b>(CONTINUE WITH E1.)</b>
Respondent seems hesitant and may be about to refuse	<b>(GOTO S2.)</b>

IF HESITANT OR REFUSAL IMMINANT ASK:

## **S2. QALETT**

If you would like, I have a letter from the Home Office that I could send you. It explains the research we are doing. Would you like to receive a copy of the letter?

INTERVIEWER: CODE 'OK TO CONDUCT INTERVIEW' ONLY IF THE RESPONDENT AGREES TO DO SO WITHOUT PROMPTING

Yes, send letter	<b>(GOTO S3.)</b>
No, do not send letter	<b>(GOTO S6.)</b>
No, OK to conduct interview	<b>(CONTINUE WITH E1.)</b>

**IF YES AT S2. ASK:**

## **S3. QALETWH**

Would you like to carry out the interview now, or would you prefer to wait until you have received the letter?

Carry out interview now	<b>(GOTO S5.)</b>
Wait until received letter	<b>(GOTO S4.)</b>

**IF WAIT AT S3.**

## **S4. QALETAD**

In that case, we will send you a letter and will phone back in a few days time. Can I take your name and address please?

RECORD FULL NAME AND ADDRESS ON PAPER

Thank you very much for your time. We shall be in touch again once you have received the Home Office letter.

INTERVIEWER: CODE AS A CALLBACK IN A FEW DAYS TIME (ALLOW FOR WEEKENDS) AND SUSPEND HERE. PASS ADDRESS ON TO SUPERVISOR

WHEN RESUMING INTERVIEW, CODE 1 TO CONTINUE

1. CONTINUE

**IF CONTINUE NOW AT S3:**

**S5. QALETW2**

Before I continue with the interview, can I take your name and address so I can send you the letter from the Home Office?

RECORD FULL NAME AND ADDRESS ON PAPER

PASS ADDRESS ON TO SUPERVISOR AT END OF INTERVIEW

WHEN COLLECTED ADDRESS, CODE 1 TO CONTINUE

1. CONTINUE

**(CONTINUE WITH E1.)**

**IF NO, BUT STILL HESITANT AT S2. ASK:**

**S6. QANUMB – WAVE 1 VERSION**

If you prefer, I have the freephone telephone number of the Market Research Society. They will be able to confirm that we are an independent research organisation and that all your answers will be treated in the strictest confidence. Would you like this phone number?

Yes – NUMBER IS **(GOTO S7.)**

No **(GOTO S9.)**

**S6. QANUMB – WAVE 2 VERSION**

If you prefer, I can give you the telephone number of the Home Office researchers in charge of this research. They will confirm that we are a genuine research company working on behalf of the Home Office and will be able to answer any questions you have about the research.

Would you like the number?

Yes – Number is **(GOTO S7.)**

No **(GOTO S9.)**



**IF YES AT S6. ASK:**

**S7. QANUMW - WAVE 1 VERSION**

NUMBER IS

Would you like to continue with the interview now, or would you rather wait until you have spoken to the Market Research Society?

Carry out the interview now (CONTINUE WITH E1.)  
Wait until have spoken with the MRS (GOTO S8.)

**S7. QANUMW - WAVE 2 VERSION**

NUMBER IS

Would you like to carry out the interview now, or would you rather wait until you have spoken to the Home Office?

Continue with the interview now (CONTINUE WITH E1.)  
Wait until have spoken with the Home Office (GOTO S8.)

**IF WAIT AT S7.**

**S8. QANUMW2**

In that case, we will call you back once you have had time to phone the Market Research Society (Wave 1) / Home Office (Wave 2).

Thank you very much for your time.

INTERVIEWER: SUSPEND HERE AND CALL BACK IN ONE DAY

WHEN RESUME, IF THEY HAVE MADE THE CALL THEN CODE 1 BELOW TO CONTINUE

1. CONTINUE

**IF NOT (S2 = OK TO CONDUCT INTERVIEW or S5 = CONTINUE or S7 = CONTINUE)**

**S9. QAASK**

Would you like to carry out the interview now?

IF NO, ASK: Would you like to make an appointment to do so?

AND SUSPEND HERE IF SO

CODING NO BELOW WILL TERMINATE THE INTERVIEW

Yes - **(CONTINUE WITH E1.)**  
No – INTERVIEW WILL TERMINATE **(THANK AND CLOSE)**

## **SELECTION OF RESPONDENT AT RANDOM USING ‘LAST BIRTHDAY’ RULE**

### **E1. QABIRTH**

To check who I should be speaking to, I need to ask a few questions. To make sure we interview a representative sample of people, I need to speak to the ADULT in your household who is aged 16 or over and had the most recent birthday. Is that yourself or is it someone else?

IF SOMEONE ELSE, PROBE FOR NAME

NOTE RESPONDENT MUST BE AGED 16+

Respondent is aged 16 or over and had last birthday **(PROCEED TO MAIN INTERVIEW)**  
Other person in the household is aged 16 or over and had last birthday **(PROBE FOR NAME)**  
Refused **(THANK AND CLOSE)**

IF OTHER PERSON HAD LAST BIRTHDAY AT E1.

### **E2. QASWAP**

May I speak to [the adult in your household who had his or her birthday most recently]?

USE THEIR NAME IF YOU KNOW IT

Yes, available – CODE HERE WHEN SPEAKING TO THEM **(REPEAT SCREENING FROM INTRODUCTION AND S1.)**

No – not available

Proxy refusal **(THANK AND CLOSE)**

**IF NO NOT AVAILABLE AT E2:**

INTERVIEWER: TAKE NAME OF OTHER SELECTED PERSON

SUSPEND HERE AND MAKE APPOINTMENT – RECORD NEW NAME IN CALL  
RECORD COMMENTS

CODE BELOW WHEN SPEAKING TO THIS PERSON

1. SPEAKING TO CORRECT RESPONDENT (**REPEAT SCREENING WITH  
PERSON FROM INTRODUCTION AND S1.**)

## **CONTACT SCREEN – Wave 2 Panel Respondents**

### **INTRODUCTION FOR PANEL RESPONDENTS:**

Good afternoon / evening, my name is ..... calling from BMRB Social Research, an independent research company in London. About a year ago you took part in a survey for the Home Office about crime and policing in your local area. We are now following up this survey and would like to ask you some more questions.

### **ASK IF PANEL RESPONDENT**

**qAadd** Can I just check that you are living at the same address as you were 12 months ago?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Refused

### **IF qAadd = No OR Refused**

I'm sorry but we need to speak to people who are still living at the same address they were 12 months ago.

### **THANK AND CLOSE**

## **SECTION B – PERCEPTIONS OF LOCAL AREA**

### **(Q0) [ASK ALL]**

Now moving on to the main interview.....

Firstly, can I just check, have you had the regular use of a car, van or other motor vehicle at any time in the last 12 months?

1. Yes
2. No

### **INTRO**

I'd like to start by asking you some questions about your local area. By local area I mean the area within 15 minutes walk of your home.

### **(Q1) [ASK ALL]**

How long have you lived in this area?

### **INTERVIEWER: PROMPT IF NECESSARY**

#### **CODE ONE ONLY.**

1. Less than 12 months
2. 12 months but less than 2 years
3. 2 years but less than 3 years
4. 3 years but less than 5 years
5. 5 years but less than 10 years
6. 10 years but less than 20 years
7. 20 years or longer

(DK)

(REF)

**(Q2) [ASK ALL]**

Would you say that you know....**READ OUT**

**CODE ONE ONLY.**

1. Many of the people in your local area
2. Some of the people
3. A few of the people
4. Or none of the people in your local area?
5. (DO NOT READ OUT) Just moved here

(DK)

(REF)

**(Q3) [ASK ALL]**

And are you a member of...**READ OUT AND CODE ALL THAT APPLY.**

1. A neighbourhood watch scheme
2. A local church, mosque or other religious group
3. Another local or voluntary community organisation (e.g. tenants / residents / parents organisation)
4. None of these

(DK)

(REF)

**(Q4) [ASK ALL]**

Please tell how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about your local area. First, do you agree or disagree that....

This area is a close, tight knit community

**IF AGREE:** Is that strongly agree or tend to agree?

**IF DISAGREE:** Is that strongly disagree or tend to disagree?

1. Strongly agree
2. Tend to agree
3. Tend to disagree
4. Strongly disagree

(DK)

(REF)

**(Q5) [ASK ALL]**

And do you agree or disagree that...

If any of the children or young people around here are causing trouble, local people will tell them off.

**IF AGREE:** Is that strongly agree or tend to agree?

**IF DISAGREE:** Is that strongly disagree or tend to disagree?

1. Strongly agree
2. Tend to agree
3. Tend to disagree
4. Strongly disagree

(DK)

(REF)

**(Q6) [ASK ALL]**

In general, what kind of area would you say you live in? Would you say it is an area where people try to help each other, or one in which people mostly go their own way?

**CODE ONE ONLY.**

1. Help each other
2. Go own way
3. (SPONTANEOUS ANSWER ONLY) Mixture

(DK)

(REF)

**(Q7) [ASK ALL]**

Would you say that you can trust....**READ OUT**

**CODE ONE ONLY.**

1. Many of the people in your local area
2. Some of the people
3. A few of the people
4. Or none of the people in your local area?
5. (DO NOT READ OUT) Just moved here

(DK)

(REF)

**(Q8) [ASK ALL]**

How safe do you feel walking alone in your local area during the day?

Do you feel....**READ OUT**

**INTERVIEWER: IF RESPONDENT NEVER GOES OUT WALKING ALONE DURING THE DAY**

**PROBE: How safe WOULD you feel?**

**CODE ONE ONLY.**

1. Very safe
2. Fairly safe
3. A bit unsafe
4. Or Very unsafe?
5. (DO NOT READ OUT) – NOT APPLICABLE.

(DK)

(REF)

*NOTE: CODE 5 WAS ADDED TO THE WAVE 2 SCRIPT TO ALLOW DIFFERENTIATION BETWEEN PEOPLE WHO ACTUALLY DO GO OUT WALKING ALONE IN THE DAY AND THOSE WHO ARE ANSWERING THE QUESTION HYPOTHETICALLY. THE INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION WAS AMENDED TO:*

*IF RESPONDENT SAYS THEY NEVER GO OUT WALKING ALONE IN THE DAY CODE NOT APPLICABLE.*

*RESPONDENTS WHO CODED 'NOT APPLICABLE' WERE THEN ASKED Q88.*



**(Q88) [ASK IF Q8 = 5 WAVE 2 ONLY]**

How safe WOULD you feel if you did go out walking alone in your local area in the day?

1. Very safe
  2. Fairly safe
  3. A bit unsafe
  4. Or Very unsafe?
- (DK)  
(REF)

**(Q9) [ASK ALL]**

How safe do you feel walking alone in your local area after dark?

Do you feel....**READ OUT**

**INTERVIEWER: IF RESPONDENT NEVER GOES OUT WALKING ALONE AFTER DARK**

**PROBE: How safe WOULD you feel?**

**CODE ONE ONLY.**

1. Very safe
  2. Fairly safe
  3. A bit unsafe
  4. Or Very unsafe?
  5. (DO NOT READ OUT) – NOT APPLICABLE
- (DK)  
(REF)

*NOTE: AS ABOVE, CODE 5 WAS ADDED TO THE WAVE 2 SCRIPT TO ALLOW DIFFERENTIATION BETWEEN PEOPLE WHO ACTUALLY DO GO OUT WALKING ALONE AFTER DARK AND THOSE WHO ARE ANSWERING THE QUESTION HYPOTHETICALLY. THE INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION WAS AMENDED TO:*

*IF RESPONDENT SAYS THEY NEVER GO OUT WALKING ALONE AFTER DARK CODE NOT APPLICABLE.*

*RESPONDENTS WHO CODED 'NOT APPLICABLE' WERE THEN ASKED Q89.*

**(Q89) [ASK IF Q9 = 5 WAVE 2 ONLY]**

How safe WOULD you feel if you did go out walking alone in your local area after dark?

1. Very safe
  2. Fairly safe
  3. A bit unsafe
  4. Or Very unsafe?
- (DK)  
(REF)

**(Q10) ASK IF Q9 = 3 OR 4 (OR IF Q89 = 3 OR 4 ON WAVE 2)**

Can you tell me why you (would) feel unsafe walking alone in your local area after dark?

**DO NOT PROMPT. CODE ALL THAT APPLY.**

1. I'm old
  2. I'm sick/disabled/can't walk easily/unsteady
  3. Fear of being mugged, robbed or physically attacked
  4. Fear of the dark/night
  5. Fear of going out alone
  6. Fear of being attacked or harassed because of skin colour, ethnic origin or religion
  7. Lot of crime in the area
  8. Lot of vandalism in the area
  9. Hooligans/"Yobs" /Gangs causing trouble in the area
  10. Teenagers/Young people/Kids hanging around in the area
  11. Problems with guns / shootings / gun crime
  12. Poor / insufficient lighting
  13. Lack of police presence / not enough police / no police
  14. Pubs in area / problems with pubs in area
  15. Reports in papers / on radio / on television / media
  16. general reference to being female / woman
  17. don't know who is about / don't know who will bump into
  18. Other – specify
- (DK)  
(REF)

*NOTE: AT WAVE 1 ONLY CODES 1-10 WERE AVAILABLE TO THE INTERVIEWER AS PRE-CODES. CODES 11-17 WERE ADDED DURING CODING OF WAVE 1 RESPONSES. THESE CODES WERE ADDED TO THE WAVE 2 SCRIPT AS PRE-CODES.*

*NOTE: Q90 AND Q91 WERE ADDED AT WAVE 2 AND WAS ASKED OF PANEL RESPONDENTS WHO HAD CHANGED THEIR MIND ABOUT HOW SAFE THEY FELT WALKING ALONE IN THEIR LOCAL AREA AFTER DARK SINCE WAVE 1.*

**(Q90) [ASK IF PANEL RESPONDENT WHO FELT SAFER AT WAVE 1]**

The last time we interviewed you, you said that you felt ..... safe walking alone after dark in your local area after dark. Could you tell me why you now feel less safe?

INTERVIEWER: DO NOT READ OUT. IF RESPONDENT GIVES A REASON FOR CHANGING THEIR VIEW USE CODE 3 AND RECORD OPEN RESPONSE.

1. Respondent is unaware they have changed their mind or believes that last years response may have been recorded wrongly
2. Respondent acknowledges they have changed their view but does not have a reason
3. Respondent gives a reason for changing their view (Specify)

(DK)

(REF)

**(Q91) [ASK IF PANEL RESPONDENT WHO FELT LESS SAFER AT WAVE 1]**

The last time we interviewed you, you said that you felt ..... safe walking alone after dark in your local area after dark. Could you tell me why you now feel more safe?

INTERVIEWER: DO NOT READ OUT. IF RESPONDENT GIVES A REASON FOR CHANGING THEIR VIEW USE CODE 3 AND RECORD OPEN RESPONSE.

1. Respondent is unaware they have changed their mind or believes that last years response may have been recorded wrongly
2. Respondent acknowledges they have changed their view but does not have a reason
3. Respondent gives a reason for changing their view (Specify)

(DK)

(REF)

**(Q11) [ASK ALL]**

How safe do you feel when you are alone in your own home at night?

Do you feel....**READ OUT**

IF RESPONDENT NEVER ALONE IN OWN HOME AT NIGHT

PROBE: How safe WOULD you feel?

**CODE ONE ONLY.**

1. Very safe
2. Fairly safe
3. A bit unsafe
4. Or Very unsafe?
5. (DO NOT READ OUT) – NOT APPLICABLE  
(DK)  
(REF)

*NOTE: AS ON Q8 AND Q9, CODE 5 WAS ADDED TO THE WAVE 2 SCRIPT TO ALLOW DIFFERENTIATION BETWEEN PEOPLE WHO ACTUALLY ARE SOMETIMES ALONE IN THEIR HOME AT NIGHT AND THOSE WHO ARE ANSWERING THE QUESTION HYPOTHETICALLY. THE INTERVIEWER INSTRUCTION WAS AMENDED TO:*

*IF RESPONDENT SAYS THEY ARE NEVER AT HOME ALONE AT NIGHT CODE NOT APPLICABLE.*

*RESPONDENTS WHO CODED 'NOT APPLICABLE' WERE THEN ASKED Q92.*

**(Q92) [ASK IF Q11 = 5 WAVE 2 ONLY]**

How safe WOULD you feel alone in your own home at night?

1. Very safe
2. Fairly safe
3. A bit unsafe
4. Or Very unsafe?  
(DK)  
(REF)

**[ASK ALL]**

I'd now like you to say how much of a problem the following things are in your local area. Again, by area I mean within 15 minutes walk from your home.

So firstly ... ROTATE ORDER (EXCEPT THAT ITEM 4 MUST COME AFTER ITEM 3, IE. NOT ASKED FIRST)

- (Q12) Teenagers hanging around on the streets
- (Q13) Rubbish or litter lying around
- (Q14) Vandalism to bus shelters or public telephones?
- (Q15) Vandalism to other types of property?
- (Q16) Graffiti on public buildings?
- (Q17) People being attacked or harassed because of their skin colour, ethnic origin or religion
- (Q18) People using or dealing drugs
- (Q19) People being drunk or rowdy in public places

Would you say this is.....**READ OUT**

A very big problem

A fairly big problem

Not a very big problem

OR Not a problem at all in your local area?

(DK)

(REF)

**(Q20) [ASK ALL]**

And how much is YOUR OWN quality of life affected by ALL THESE TYPES of problems? Please use a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 is no effect and 10 is a total effect on your quality of life.

1.(No effect).....10. (Total effect)

(DK)

(REF)

*NOTE: Q20 WAS ONLY ASKED ON WAVE 1.*

**SECTION C – WORRY ABOUT CRIME**

I'd now like to move on and ask you some questions about crime in your local area. Again, by local area I mean the area within 15 minutes walk of your home.

**(Q21) [ASK ALL]**

How much would you say the crime rate in your area has changed over the last 12 months? In your area, would you say there is more crime, less crime or about the same amount of crime as 12 months ago?

**IF RESPONDENT IS NOT SURE OR HAS NOT LIVED IN THE AREA FOR 12 MONTHS SAY:** Please just give your best guess.

**IF MORE:** Is that a lot or a little more crime?

**IF LESS:** Is that a lot or a little less crime?

**CODE ONE ONLY.**

- 1. A lot more crime
- 2. A little more crime
- 3. About the same
- 4. A little less crime
- 5. A lot less crime

(DK)

(REF)

**(Q22) [ASK ALL]**

And how much is YOUR OWN quality of life affected by CRIME? Please use a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 is no effect and 10 is a total effect on your quality of life.

1.(No effect).....10. (Total effect)

(DK)

(REF)

*NOTE: Q22 WAS ONLY ASKED ON WAVE 1.*

**[ASK ALL]**

Most of us WORRY at some time or other about being the victim of a crime. I would like to ask you how worried you are about different types of crimes. Some of the crimes I am going to ask you about are very serious. Please let me know if you would prefer not to answer these questions when I get to them.

So firstly, how worried are you about ..... **READ OUT EACH ITEM IN TURN. DO NOT ROTATE ORDER**

- (Q24)** Being insulted or pestered by anybody, while in the street or any other public place?
- (Q25)** (Filter on Q0) Having your car or van stolen?
- (Q26)** (Filter on Q0) Having things stolen from your car or van?
- (Q27)** Having your home broken into and something stolen?
- (Q28)** Being mugged or robbed?
- (Q29)** Being physically attacked by strangers?
- (Q30)** Being subject to a physical attack because of your skin colour, ethnic origin or religion?
- (Q31)** Being sexually assaulted?

(Repeat for each iteration)

Would you say you are.....**READ OUT**

Very worried

Fairly worried

Not very worried

OR Not at all worried about being a victim of this type of crime?

(DK)

(REF)

**IF VERY OR FAIRLY WORRIED ABOUT ANY CRIMES AT WORVIC THEN ASK:**

**(Q32)**

Because of your concern about crime, have you done any of these things IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS?

**READ OUT FULL LIST. CODE ALL THAT APPLY. IF ANY APPLY, CHECK THAT THESE HAVE BEEN DONE IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS AND HAVE BEEN DONE BECAUSE OF CONCERN ABOUT CRIME.**

1. Protected your property – for example, by fitting alarms or locks to your home or car
2. Protected yourself – for example, by carrying a personal security device or something you could use in self-defence
3. Kept out of harm's way – for example, by avoiding certain places or activities
4. Done anything else in last 12 months because of your concern about crime? (Specify)

5. Not done anything in last 12 months

(DK)

(REF)

**[ASK ALL]**

I am now going to read out a list of things and for each one I would like you to tell me, how likely you think it is that this WILL happen to you in the NEXT 12 MONTHS.

So, firstly...**READ OUT EACH ITEM IN TURN**

**(Q33)** How likely do you think you are to be approached on the street by someone begging in the next 12 months?

**(Q34)** And how likely do you think you are to see graffiti in your local area in the next 12 months?

**(Q35)** And how likely do you think you are to see damage to bus shelters or public telephone boxes in your local area in the next 12 months?

**(Q36)** And how likely do you think you are to have your property damaged by vandals in the next 12 months?

**(Q37)** (Filter on Q0)And how likely do you think you are to have your car or van stolen in the next 12 months?

**(Q38)** (Filter on Q0)And how likely do you think you are to have things stolen from your car or van in the next 12 months

**(Q39)** And how likely do you think you are to have your home burgled in the next 12 months?

**(Q40)** And how likely do you think you are to be mugged or robbed in the next 12 months?

(Repeat for each iteration)

Would you say this is.....**READ OUT**

Very Likely

Fairly Likely

Fairly Unlikely

OR Very Unlikely to happen to you in the next 12 months?

(DK)

(REF)

*NOTE: Q33 AND Q35 WERE ASKED ON WAVE 1 ONLY*

## **SECTION D – VICTIMISATION/CONTACT WITH THE POLICE**

I'd now like to ask you some questions about being a victim of crime

**[ASK ALL]**

Have any of these things happened to you during the LAST 12 MONTHS, not just in your local area but anywhere at all.?



Have you .....**READ OUT EACH ITEM IN TURN**

- (Q41) Been insulted or pestered by anybody while in the street or any other public place (in the last 12 months)?
- (Q42) Had your property damaged by vandals (in the last 12 months)?
- (Q43) (Filter on Q0) Had things stolen from your car or van (in the last 12 months)?
- (Q44) Had someone trying to break into your home (in the last 12 months)?
- (Q45) (Filter on Q0) Had your car or van stolen (in the last 12 months)?
- (Q46) Had your home broken into and something stolen (in the last 12 months)?
- (Q47) Been threatened with physical attack or violence by a stranger (in the last 12 months)?
- (Q48) Been mugged or robbed (in the last 12 months)?
- (Q49) Been physically attacked by a stranger for some reason other than being mugged or robbed (in the last 12 months)?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- (DK)
- (REF)

**(Q50)[ASK IF RESPONDENT HAS NOT BEEN VICTIM OF ANY OF THE ABOVE CRIMES]**

Have you been a victim of any OTHER crime in the last 12 months?

- 3. Yes
- 4. No
- (DK)
- (REF)

**(Q106) [ASK IF Q50 = YES]**

What crime were you victim of?

OPEN ENDED

- (DK)
- (REF)

*NOTE: Q106 WAS ASKED ON WAVE 2 ONLY*

**IF NO TO ALL AT Q41-49 AND NO Q50 - GO TO Q57.**

**IF YES TO ANY Q41-49 OR YES AT Q50 - GO TO Q51.**

*CRIMES AT Q41-49 ARE ORDERED ACCORDING TO 'SERIOUSNESS'. FILTERING FOR NEXT QUESTION IS BASED ON THIS PRIORITY ORDERING AND ONLY THE MOST SERIOUS CRIME IS ASKED ABOUT. (NATURE OF THIS CRIME IS RECORDED IN dDprior).*

**PRIORITY ORDER:**

1. Been physically attacked by a stranger for some other reason
2. Been mugged or robbed
3. Been threatened with physical attack or violence by a stranger
4. Had your home broken into and something stolen
5. (Filter) Had your car stolen
6. Had someone trying to break into your home
7. (Filter) Had things stolen from your car
8. Had your property damaged by vandals
9. Been insulted or pestered by anybody while in the street or any other public place

**(Q51) [ASK IF YES TO ANY Q41-49 OR YES AT Q50]**

You said that you had [TYPE OF CRIME/MOST SERIOUS CRIME] in the last 12 months. Thinking about the last time [this happened to you (if only one crime) /you were mugged, had something stolen from your car etc (if more than one crime)], did you or someone on your behalf report it to the police?

1. Yes
  2. No
- (DK)  
(REF)

**(Q52) [ASK IF Q51 = YES]**

Overall, were you satisfied or dissatisfied with the way the police handled this matter?

**IF SATISFIED ASK:** Is that Very satisfied or Fairly satisfied?

**IF DISSATISFIED ASK:** Is that A bit dissatisfied or Very dissatisfied?

1. Very satisfied
  2. Fairly satisfied
  3. A bit dissatisfied
  4. Very dissatisfied
  5. **(DO NOT READ OUT)** Too early to say
- (DK)  
(REF)

**(Q53) [ASK IF Q51 = YES]**

How much INTEREST did the police show in what you had to say? Was it...

**READ OUT BOTH ANSWERS BEFORE CODING ONE**

1. as much as you thought they should
  2. OR less than you thought they should?
- (DK)  
(REF)

**NOTE: Q53 WAS ASKED ON WAVE 1 ONLY**

**(Q54) [ASK IF Q51 = YES]**

How much EFFORT would you say the police put into dealing with this matter? Was it...

**READ OUT BOTH ANSWERS BEFORE CODING ONE**

1. as much as you thought they should
  2. OR less than you thought they should?
- (DK)  
(REF)

**(Q55) [ASK IF Q51 = YES]**

How well did they keep you informed of the progress of their investigation. Was it...**READ OUT**

1. Very well
  2. Fairly well
  3. Not very well
  4. OR not at all well?
  5. (SPONTANEOUS MENTION ONLY) Police have not investigated
- (DK)  
(REF)

**(Q56) [ASK IF Q51 = YES]**

Do you think the police should have kept you better informed?

**CODE ONE ONLY.**

1. Yes
  2. No
  3. (SPONTANEOUS MENTION ONLY) Not necessary - no investigation going on
  4. (SPONTANEOUS MENTION ONLY) Not necessary - did not want to be informed
  5. (SPONTANEOUS MENTION ONLY) Police had no information
- (DK)  
(REF)

*NOTE: Q56 WAS ASKED ON WAVE 1 ONLY*

**(Q57) [ASK ALL]**

Have you contacted the police in the last 12 months other than as a victim of crime, for any of these reasons.....

**READ OUT AND CODE ALL THAT APPLY**

**IF RESPONDENT ASKS:** This includes all kind of contact, whether by 'phone, letter, email or by personal visit.

1. To report any type of disturbance, noise, nuisance (including car / house alarms)
2. To report any other suspicious circumstances or persons
3. To report a missing person or lost or found property
4. To report a traffic accident or other emergency
5. To provide other information
6. To ask for information or advice
7. For any other reason? (specify)

(DK)

(REF)

**(Q58) [ASK IF Q57 = 1-7]**

Overall, the last time you contacted the police, were you satisfied or dissatisfied with the way the police handled the matter?

**IF SATISFIED ASK:** Is that Very satisfied or Fairly satisfied?

**IF DISSATISFIED ASK:** Is that A bit dissatisfied or Very dissatisfied?

1. Very satisfied
2. Fairly satisfied
3. A bit dissatisfied
4. Very dissatisfied
5. **(DO NOT READ OUT)** Too early to say

(DK)

(REF)

**(Q59) [ASK IF Q57 = 1-7]**

How much INTEREST did the police show in what you had to say? Was it...

**READ OUT BOTH ANSWERS BEFORE CODING ONE**

1. as much as you thought they should
2. OR less than you thought they should?

(DK)

(REF)

*NOTE: Q59 WAS ONLY ASKED ON WAVE 1.*

**(Q60) [ASK IF Q57 = 1-7]**

How much EFFORT would you say the police put into dealing with this matter? Was it...

**READ OUT BOTH ANSWERS BEFORE CODING ONE**

1. as much as you thought they should
  2. OR less than you thought they should?
- (DK)  
(REF)

**(Q61) [ASK ALL]**

Have you been approached or stopped by the police in the last 12 months?

1. Yes
  2. No
- (DK)  
(REF)

**(Q62) [ASK IF Q61 = YES]**

How satisfied were you with the conduct of the officers?

**IF SATISFIED ASK:** Is that Very satisfied or Fairly satisfied?

**IF DISSATISFIED ASK:** Is that A bit dissatisfied or Very dissatisfied?

1. Very satisfied
  2. Fairly satisfied
  3. A bit dissatisfied
  4. Very dissatisfied
  5. **(DO NOT READ OUT)** Too early to say
- (DK)  
(REF)

## **SECTION E – POLICE ACTIVITIES IN LOCAL AREA**

### **Wave 1 introduction to Section E:**

I'd now like to ask you some questions about police activities in your local area.

### **Wave 2 introduction to Section E.**

I'd now like to ask you some questions about police activities in your local area. Policing might be carried out by both police officers and police community support officers.

If police community support officers work in your local area please include them in your answers.

INTERVIEWER: IF RESPONDENT ASKS, GIVE DEFINITION BELOW:

POLICE COMMUNITY SUPPORT OFFICERS ARE EMPLOYED BY POLICE FORCES. THEY WEAR A UNIFORM SIMILAR TO POLICE OFFICERS AND DEAL WITH SOME TASKS THAT DO NOT REQUIRE POLICE OFFICER'S EXPERIENCE OR POWERS.

### **(Q63) [ASK ALL]**

Do you know any of the police officers who work in your local area by name, sight or both?

***NOTE: IN WAVE 2 THE QUESTION WAS ALTERED TO READ:***

Do you know any of the police who work in your local area by name, sight or both?

### **CODE ONE ONLY.**

1. Yes - Both (by name and sight)
  2. Yes – by Name only
  3. Yes – by Sight only
  4. No – neither
- (DK)  
(REF)

**(Q64) [ASK ALL]**

On average, how often do you see a police officer ON FOOT PATROL in your local area?

*NOTE: IN WAVE 2 THE QUESTION WAS ALTERED TO READ:*

On average, how often do you see the police ON FOOT PATROL in your local area?

Would you say it was ..... **READ OUT**

1. More than once a day
  2. Once a day
  3. About once a week
  4. About once a month
  5. Less than once a month
  6. Never
- (DK)  
(REF)

**(Q65) [ASK ALL]**

And on average, how often do you see a police officer IN A VEHICLE in your local area?

Would you say it was ..... **READ OUT**

*NOTE: IN WAVE 2 QUESTION WAS ALTERED TO READ:*

And on average, how often do you see the police IN A VEHICLE in your local area?

1. More than once a day
  2. Once a day
  3. About once a week
  4. About once a month
  5. Less than once a month
  6. Never
- (DK)  
(REF)

**(Q66) [ASK ALL]**

Taking everything into account, how good a job do you think the police in your local area are doing?

**READ OUT AND CODE ONE ONLY**

1. Excellent
2. Good
3. Fair
4. Poor
5. Very poor

(DK)

(REF)

**[ASK ALL]**

The police are involved in lots of different activities on a day to day basis. I'd like to know how effective you think your local police are at each of these activities.

First, can you tell me how effective you think the police in your local area are at.....**READ OUT EACH ITEM IN TURN.**

Would you say they are.....**READ OUT**

1. Very effective
2. Fairly effective
3. Not very effective
4. OR Not at all effective at .....?

(DK)

(REF)

**IF NECESSARY, ADD:** It doesn't matter if you have had no direct contact with your local police, it's just your impression of them I want to know.

**ROTATE ORDER**

- (Q67) ..... solving crimes?  
(Q68) ..... working with the community?  
(Q69) ..... preventing crime?  
(Q70) ..... keeping order on the streets?  
(Q71) ..... responding to emergencies?

*NOTE: Q67, Q69 AND Q70 WERE ONLY ASKED ON WAVE 1*



[ASK ALL]

**RANDOMISE**

**(Q72)** Do you know how to contact your local police in a non-emergency (apart from dialling 999)?

**(Q73)** Do you know how to complain about your local police if you wanted to?

**(Q74)** Do you know what the police plan to do in your local area?

**(Q75)** Do you know what progress the police are making on reducing crime in your local area?

**(Q76)** Do you know how to get your views across to the police in your local area?

**For each iteration:**

1. Yes

2. No

(DK)

(REF)

*NOTE: Q72 AND Q75 WERE ASKED ON WAVE 1 ONLY.*

**(Q77) [ASK ALL]**

In your local area, how willing are the police to listen and respond to people's views?

Would you say they are....**READ OUT**

1. Very willing

2. Fairly willing

3. Not very willing

4. OR Not at all willing?

(DK)

(REF)

**(Q78) [ASK ALL]**

How much effort do the police in your local area put into finding out what local people think?

Would you say they make....**READ OUT**

1. A lot of effort

2. Some effort

3. OR no effort at all?

(DK)

(REF)

NOTE: THE REMAINING QUESTIONS – Q102, Q103, Q104, Q97, Q98, Q99, Q100 AND Q101 WERE ONLY ASKED ON WAVE 2.

**(Q102) [ASK ALL]**

Have you seen any police community support officers working in your local area?

**INTERVIEWER: IF RESPONDENT ASKS, GIVE DEFINITION BELOW:**

POLICE COMMUNITY SUPPORT OFFICERS ARE EMPLOYED BY POLICE FORCES. THEY WEAR A UNIFORM SIMILAR TO POLICE OFFICERS AND DEAL WITH SOME TASKS THAT DO NOT REQUIRE POLICE OFFICER'S EXPERIENCE OR POWERS.

1. Yes
2. No
3. Respondent does not know what police community support officers are

(DK)

(REF)

**(Q103) [ASK IF Q102 = YES]**

When you have seen police community support officers working in your local area, what were they doing?

**DO NOT PROMPT**

**CODE ALL THAT APPLY**

1. Walking or patrolling
2. In a vehicle
3. Directing traffic
4. Working at the scene of a crime or accident
5. Making door to door enquiries
6. Riding a bicycle
7. Talking to the community
8. Talking to young people
9. At a meeting
10. Other (Specify)

(DK)

(REF)

(

**Q104) [ASK IF Q102 = YES]**

Taking everything into account, how good a job do you think the police community support officers in your local area are doing?

Excellent

Good

Fair

Poor

Very poor

Don't Know

Refused

**(Q97) [ASK ALL]**

Have you heard of the National Reassurance Policing Programme or Reassurance Policing?

1. Yes

2. No

(DK)

(REF)

**(Q98) [ASK ALL]**

Do you know whether the police are holding public meetings about priorities for improvement in your local area?

**INTERVIEWER: PLEASE DO NOT INCLUDE OTHER POLICE EVENTS EG. POLICE SURGERIES.**

1. Yes

2. No

(REF)

**(Q99) [ASK IF Q98 = YES]**

Have you attended any of these meetings in the last 12 months?

1. Yes
2. No

(DK)

(REF)

**(Q100) [ASK IF Q99 = YES]**

How useful did you think the meeting was?

1. Very useful
2. Fairly useful
3. Not very useful
4. Or not at all useful?

(DK)

(REF)

**(Q101) qEdoor**

Has a police officer or police community support officer knocked on your door to discuss your local area in the last 12 months?

1. Yes
2. No

(DK)

(REF)

## **SECTION F – DEMOGRAPHICS**

To analyse the results of this survey, we want to look at the views of different types of households. To help us, can you give me a little information about yourself and your household?

### **(Q79) [ASK ALL]**

Could you tell me how many, adults aged 16 or over, live in your household, including yourself?

#### **CODE ONE ONLY.**

1. 1
  2. 2
  3. 3
  4. 4
  5. 5
  6. 6
  7. 7
  8. 8
  9. 9
  10. 10 or more
- (DK)  
(REF)

### **(Q80) [ASK ALL]**

And how many children under 16 live in your household?

#### **CODE ONE ONLY.**

1. 1
  2. 2
  3. 3
  4. 4
  5. 5
  6. 6
  7. 7
  8. 8
  9. 9
  10. 10 or more
- None  
(DK)  
(REF)

**(Q81) [ASK ALL]**

Do you own your home with a mortgage or outright, or is it rented, or something else?

**PROMPT IF NECESSARY.**

**CODE ONE ONLY.**

1. Own it outright
2. Buying with the help of mortgage or loan
3. Pay part rent and part mortgage (shared ownership)
4. Rented from local authority/council/New Town development
5. Rented from Housing Association/co-operative/charitable trust
6. Rented from private landlord
7. Other (SPECIFY)

(DK)

(REF)

**(Q82) AGE QFage [ASK ALL]**

What was your age last birthday?

TYPE IN AGE

16..99

Refused

**(Q82A)**

**IF REFUSED:** Please could you tell me which of the following age ranges applies to you?

Please stop me when I get to the right one.

**CODE ONE ONLY. QFage2**

1. 16 - 19
2. 20 - 24
3. 25 - 34
4. 35 - 44
5. 45 - 54
6. 55 - 64
7. 65+

(REF)

**(Q23) [ASK ALL]**

**INTERVIEWER, CODE RESPONDENT'S SEX – DO NOT ASK**

**CODE ONE ONLY.**

1. Male
2. Female
3. Cannot determine

**(Q83) [ASK ALL]**

Are you...**READ OUT AND CODE ONE ONLY**

1. Working full-time (30+ hours per week)
2. Working part-time (8-29 hours per week)
3. In education full-time (school/student)
4. Retired (with state pension only)
5. Retired (with private pension)
6. Unemployed
7. Looking after family/home
8. Other (SPECIFY)

(REF)

**(Q84) [ASK ALL]**

What is your marital status? Are you.....**READ OUT AND CODE ONE ONLY**

1. Single, never married
2. Married or living as a couple
3. Married and separated from your partner
4. Divorced
5. Widowed

(REF)

**(Q85)[ASK ALL]**

Do you have any long-standing illness, disability or infirmity? By long-standing I mean anything that has troubled you over a period of time or that is likely to affect you over a period of time.

1. Yes
  2. No
- (DK)  
(REF)

**(Q86) [ASK ALL]**

*NOTE: Q86 WAS NOT ASKED OF WAVE 2 PANEL RESPONDENTS.*

Which of these best describes your ethnic origin?

**READ OUT UNTIL SAY 'YES'. CODE ONE ONLY**

1. White
  2. Black
  3. Asian
  4. Mixed Ethnic Group
  5. Chinese
  6. Another ethnic group (specify)
- Refused

**(Q86A) [ASK IF Q86= 1]**

Would you say you are....

1. White – British
2. White – Irish
3. White – Other White Background

**(Q86B) [ASK IF Q86=2]**

Would you say you are....

1. Black or Black British – Caribbean
2. Black or Black British – African
3. Black or Black British – Other Black Background



**(Q86C) ASK IF Q86 = 3**

Would you say you are....

1. Asian or Asian British – Indian
2. Asian or Asian British – Pakistani
3. Asian or Asian British – Bangladeshi
4. Asian or Asian British – Other Asian Background

**(Q86D) ASK IF Q86 = 4**

Would you say you are....

4. Mixed – White and Black Caribbean
5. Mixed – White and Black African
6. Mixed – White and Asian
7. Mixed – Any Other Mixed Background

**(Q87) [ASK ALL]**

And now I need to ask your household income in broad terms. Is your household's combined income after deductions for tax etc above or below £1,500 per month?

1. Above £1,500 per month
2. Below £1,500 per month

(DK)

(REF)

DEPENDING ON RESPONSE AT Q87: READ OUT ONE:

**Q87B IF CODE 1:** Is it higher or lower than £2,250 per month?

**Q87C IF CODE 2:** Is it higher or lower than £750 per month?

1. Higher than £750 per month
2. Lower than £750 per month
3. Higher than £2,250 per month
4. Lower than £2,250 per month

(DK)

(REF)

## **SECTION G – RECONTACTING**

### **Wave 1 Re-contact question.**

Thank you for taking part in this survey. We may be following up this survey to see how crime and policing are changing in your local area. If we do, would you be happy for us to contact you again in about 12 months time?

1. Yes - CAN RECONTACT
2. No/DK – DO NOT RECONTACT

### **Wave 2 Re-contact question**

Thank you for taking part in this survey. The Home Office might wish to ask BMRB or another research organisation to ask you some follow up questions about crime and policing. BMRB would need your permission to pass on your name, contact details and the answers you have just given. If you agree all the information will be treated in the strictest confidence and only the researchers working on the follow-up research will have access to the information. Giving agreement to pass on your details does not mean that you are obliged to take part if you are contacted to answer follow up questions. Would you be willing for us to do this?

1. Yes - CAN RECONTACT
2. No/DK - DO NOT RECONTACT

IF YES ASK:

### **QGmove**

Do you think you will be moving in the next 12 months?

1. Definitely moving
2. Possibly moving / Don't know if moving
3. Not moving

(REF)

### **QGname**

Please can you tell me your full name?

ENTER FULL NAME

**IF s2 = Yes, send letter and s3 = Carry out interview now and s5 = CONTINUE, display reminder text:**

**INTERVIEWER: DON'T FORGET TO PASS ON THE RESPONDENT'S ADDRESS (WHICH YOU WROTE DOWN ON PAPER) TO A SUPERVISOR, SO WE CAN SEND THEM THE HOME OFFICE LETTER**

*NOTE: ON WAVE 2 THE INTERVIEWER WAS THEN ASKED TO CODE THEIR OWN SEX:*

**QISEX:**

**INTERVIEWER: PLEASE CODE YOUR SEX**

1. Male
2. Female

I'd like to thank you very much for your time today –it's very much appreciated. I would just like to confirm that my name is ..... calling from BMRB Social Research, and that this research was commissioned by the Home Office. All your replies will be treated in the strictest confidence. If you would like to check any of the details about the survey I can give you a couple of telephone numbers to call. Would you like to take a note of the numbers?

**IF YES**

First if you would like to verify that BMRB is a registered Market Research organisation which is bound by a professional Code of Conduct, you can contact the Market Research Society's Verification Service on freephone

0500 36 69 99 – which will connect you without charge.

Or if you would like further reassurance about this particular research, you can contact our Telephone Unit Manager, Lynn Stirling during office hours on Freephone:

0800 015 3526

I can also offer you the number of Alexis Poole, the Home Office researcher in charge of this research, who will be able to answer any questions you have about the research:

0207 273 3005

*NOTE: THE HOME OFFICE RESEARCHER'S NUMBER WAS ONLY OFFERED ON WAVE 2.*

## Appendix B - Final Codeframes

**Q10.**

Can you tell me why you (would) feel unsafe walking alone in your local area after dark?

DO NOT PROMPT. CODE ALL THAT APPLY

**CODES IN BOLD WERE ONLY ADDED AT WAVE 2.**

1. I'm old
  2. I'm sick/ disabled/ can't walk easily/ unsteady
  3. Fear of being mugged, robbed or physically attacked
  4. Fear of the dark/ night
  5. Fear of going out alone
  6. Fear of being attacked or harassed because of skin colour, ethnic origin or religion
  7. Lot of crime in the area
  8. Lot of vandalism in the area
  9. Hooligans/'yobs'/ gangs causing trouble in the area
  10. Teenagers/ young people/ kids hanging around in the area
  11. Problems with guns/shootings/gun crime
  12. Problems with drugs/drug users/drug sellers/drug related crimes
  13. Poor/insufficient lighting
  14. Lack of police presence/not enough police/no police
  15. Pubs in area/problems with pubs in area
  16. Reports in papers/on radio/on television/media
  17. General reference to being female/woman
  18. Don't know who is about/don't know who you will bump into
  - 19. Rural / isolated / quiet area**
  - 20. Drunk people/drinking in area**
  - 21. Past experience of being attacked / victimised**
  - 22. Proximity to council estates**
  - 23. Respondent refers to specific incidents which have occurred in the neighbourhood**
  - 24. Because of the character/type of people in the area**
  25. Other (Specify)
- (DK)
- (REF)

**Q90.**

Reason respondent gives for feeling less safe when walking alone after dark than they did at Wave 1. (Only asked on Wave 2.)

1. More young people/teenagers hanging around in area
  2. More gangs/hooligans/yobs causing trouble in area
  3. More vandalism/burnt out cars/graffiti/rubbish
  4. More pubs in area/more alcohol related problems
  5. Increase in drug dealing/drug taking/drug related problems
  6. Crime rate has increased/respondent refers to recent incidents in area (where respondent was not victim)
  7. More burglaries in area/friends or neighbours have been burgled
  8. Change in composition of local population/people have moved away/new people have moved into area
  9. Area has gone downhill/things have got worse/area now less safe
  10. Respondent has recently been victim of crime(other than burglary)
  11. Respondent has been a victim of burglary
  12. Reports in paper/on radio/television/media
  13. Respondent had not lived in local area for very long/was not familiar with local area
  14. Respondent is older
  15. Respondent's health/fitness has deteriorated/respondent has had an accident/respondent now has a disability
  16. Respondent's circumstances have changed
  17. Respondent's home is left empty more often/respondent goes out more
  18. Respondent does not protect themselves/does not take necessary precautions
  19. Less street lighting/street lighting broken
  20. CCTV cameras have not been installed in local area
  21. Alley gates have not been installed/alleyways have not been blocked off
  22. Less police in area/police take longer to respond to calls
  23. Absence of community support officers/ neighbourhood wardens
  24. Police not clamping down on trouble makers/police not tackling local problems
  25. Absence of neighbourhood watch/community groups/residents association
  26. Respondent now feels more vulnerable/less confident/general feeling of anxiety
  27. Fear of the dark/fear of going out at night
  28. Respondent has not taken out insurance
  29. Respondent has valuable possessions
  30. Respondent's answer seems to indicate that they actually feel more safe
  31. Respondent does not think/worry about crime
  32. Other (Specify)
- (DK)
- (REF)

## Q91.

Reason respondent gives for feeling safer when walking alone after dark than they did at Wave 1. (Only asked on Wave 2.)

1. Less young people/teenagers hanging around in area
  2. Less gangs/hooligans/yobs causing trouble in area
  3. Less vandalism/burnt out cars/graffiti/rubbish
  4. Less pubs in area/less alcohol related problems
  5. Less drug dealing/drug taking/drug related problems
  6. Crime rate has decreased/less incidents in local area
  7. Less burglaries in local area/respondent has not heard of anyone in local area being burgled in last 12 months
  8. Change in composition of local population/people have moved away/new people have moved into area
  9. Area has improved/things have got better/area has got safer/quieter
  10. Respondent has not had any problems in last 12 months/has not been victim of crime/respondent had been victim of crime prior to previous wave of survey(not including burglary)
  11. Respondent has not been a victim of burglary in the last 12 months/respondent had been a victim of burglary prior to previous wave of survey
  12. Reports in papers/on radio/television/media
  13. Respondent has lived in area for longer/knows more people in area/better ties with neighbours/neighbours look out for each other
  14. Respondent is older
  15. Respondents health/fitness has improved
  16. Respondent's circumstances have changed.
  17. Respondent does not leave home empty as much as/respondent does not go out much
  18. Respondent now protects themselves/takes precautions
  19. Better street lighting/better lighting in area
  20. CCTV cameras have been installed in local area
  21. Alley gates have been installed/alleyways have been blocked off
  22. Increased police presence
  23. Presence of community support officers/neighbourhood wardens
  24. New police initiatives/more information from police/police clamping down on trouble makers/curfews/antisocial behaviour orders
  25. Respondent has set up/become involved in neighbourhood watch/community group/residents' association
  26. Respondent now feels more confident/more secure/no feelings of anxiety
  27. No fear of the dark/no fear of going out at night
  28. Respondent has taken out insurance
  29. Respondent has no valuable possessions
  30. Respondent's answers seem to suggest that they actually feel less safe
  31. Respondent does not think/worry about crime
  32. Other (Specify)
- (DK)
- (REF)

**Q93.**

Reason respondent gives for feeling less worried about having their home broken into and something stolen than they did at Wave 1. (Only asked on Wave 2.)

1. Less young people/teenagers hanging around in area
  2. Less gangs/hooligans/yobs causing trouble in area
  3. Less vandalism/burnt out cars/graffiti/rubbish
  4. Less pubs in area/less alcohol related problems
  5. Less drug dealing/drug taking/drug related problems
  6. Crime rate has decreased/less incidents in local area
  7. Less burglaries in local area/respondent has not heard of anyone in local area being burgled in last 12 months
  8. Change in composition of local population/people have moved away/new people have moved into area
  9. Area has improved/things have got better/area has got safer/quieter
  10. Respondent has not had any problems in last 12 months/has not been victim of crime / respondent had been victim of crime prior to previous wave of survey (not including burglary)
  11. Respondent has not been a victim of burglary in the last 12 months/respondent had been victim of burglary prior to previous wave of survey
  12. Reports in papers/on radio/television/media
  13. Respondent has lived in area for longer/knows more people in area/better ties with neighbours/neighbours look out for each other
  14. Respondent is older
  15. Respondent's health/fitness has improved
  16. Respondent's circumstances have changed e.g. no longer lives alone
  17. Respondent does not leave home empty as much/respondent does not go out as much
  18. Respondent has protected their property-e.g installed alarm/double glazing/new fencing/security lighting
  19. Better street lighting/better lighting in area
  20. CCTV cameras have been installed in local area
  21. Alley gates have been installed/alleyways blocked off
  22. Increased police presence
  23. Presence of community support officers/neighbourhood wardens
  24. New police initiatives/more information from police/police clamping down on trouble makers/curfews/anti-social behaviour orders
  25. Respondent has set up/become involved in neighbourhood watch/community group/residents' association
  26. Respondent now feels more confident/more secure/no feeling of anxiety
  27. No fear of the dark/no fear of going out at night
  28. Respondent has taken out insurance
  29. Respondent has no valuable possessions/nothing worth stealing
  30. Respondent's answers seems to suggest that they actually are more worried
  31. Respondent does not think/worry about crime
  32. Other (Specify)
- (DK)
- (REF)



#### Q94.

Reason respondent gives for feeling more worried about having their home broken into and something stolen than they did at Wave 1. (Only asked on Wave 2.)

1. More young people/teenagers hanging around in area
2. More gangs/hooligans/yobs causing trouble in area
3. More vandalism/burnt out cars/graffiti/rubbish
4. More pubs in area/more alcohol related problems
5. Increase in drug dealing/drug taking/drug related problems
6. Crime rate has increased/respondent refers to recent incidents in area (where respondent was not victim)
7. More burglaries in area/friends or neighbours have been burgled
8. Change in composition of local population/people have moved away/new people have moved into area
9. Area has gone down hill/things have got worse/area now less safe
10. Respondent has recently been a victim of crime (not including burglary)
11. Respondent has been a victim of burglary
12. Reports in paper/on radio/television/media
13. Respondent had not lived in local area for very long/was not familiar with local area
14. Respondent is older
15. Respondent's health/fitness has deteriorated/respondent has had an accident/respondent now has a disability
16. Respondent's circumstances have changed. e.g. now lives alone
17. Respondent's home is left empty more often
18. Respondent has not protected their property-e.g installed alarm/double glazing/new fencing/security lighting
19. Less street lighting/street lighting broken
20. CCTV cameras have not been installed in local area
21. Alley gates have not been installed/alleyways have not been blocked off
22. Less police in area/police take longer to respond to calls
23. Absence of community support officers/neighbourhood wardens
24. Police not clamping down on trouble makers/police not tackling local problems
25. Absence of neighbourhood watch/community groups/residents' association
26. Respondent now feels more vulnerable/less confident/general feeling of anxiety
27. Fear of the dark/fear of going out at night
28. Respondent has not taken out insurance
29. Respondent has valuable possessions
30. Respondent's answers seems to suggest that they actually are less worried
31. Respondent does not think/worry about crime
32. Other (Specify)

(DK)

(REF)

**Q32.**

You said you had done something else in the last 12 months because of your concern about crime. What was this?

**CODES IN BOLD WERE ONLY ADDED AT WAVE 2.**

1. Protected your property- eg. by fitting alarms or locks to your home or car
2. Protected yourself eg. by carrying a personal security device or something you could use in self defence
3. Kept out of harm's way eg. avoided certain places or activities
4. Reported incidents/crimes/offences to police
5. Contacted council
6. Attend/attended local council or police meetings/forums
7. Set up/involved with neighbourhood watch/community groups/forums/residents association
8. More vigilant/careful/aware
9. Stay indoors/don't go out/stay in after dark
10. Taken out insurance
11. **Carry a mobile phone/ ensure children or other family members carry mobile phone**
12. **Get someone to go out with you**
13. **Use car/ taxi/ bus instead of walking/ make special transport arrangements**
14. Other (Specify)  
(DK)  
(REF)

**Q106**

What crime were you victim of? (Only asked on Wave 2)

1. Been insulted or pestered by anyone while in the street or any other public place
2. Had your property damaged by vandals
3. Had things stolen from your car or van
4. Had someone trying to break into your home
5. Had your car or van stolen
6. Had your home broken into and had something stolen
7. Been threatened with physical attack or violence by a stranger
8. Been mugged or robbed
9. Been physically attacked by a stranger for some reason other than being mugged or robbed
10. Been victim of fraud/ credit card fraud
11. Had something stolen from outside home/ garden/ garage/ shed
12. Had something stolen from pockets or from bag/ case that was being carried (no violence involved)
13. Verbal abuse/harassment/pestering
14. Other (Specify)  
(DK)  
(REF)

**Q57**

What was the other reason you contacted the police in the last 12 months, other than as a victim of crime?

**CODES IN BOLD WERE ONLY ADDED AT WAVE 2.**

1. To report any type of disturbance, noise, nuisance (including car/ house alarms)
  2. To report any other suspicious circumstances or persons
  3. To report a missing person or lost or found property
  4. To report a traffic accident or other emergency
  5. To provide other information
  6. To ask for information or advice
  7. Liaison with police as part of respondent's job
  8. To report a crime
  9. To complain about police
  - 10. To report a death**
  - 11. To apply for a job**
  - 12. To apply for/ renew a firearms licence**
  - 13. In relation to parking tickets/speeding tickets/to take car related documents to the police station**
  - 14. To have property security marked**
  - 15. To discuss parking issues/highway issues**
  16. Other (Specify)
- (DK)
- (REF)

**Q103.**

When you have seen police community support officers working in your local area, what were they doing? (ONLY ASKED ON WAVE 2)

**DO NOT PROMPT CODE ALL THAT APPLY**

1. Walking or patrolling
  2. In a vehicle
  3. Directing traffic
  4. Working at scene of crime/accident
  5. Making door to door enquiries
  6. Riding a bicycle
  7. Talking to the community
  8. Talking to young people
  9. At a meeting
  10. Checking car tax discs/ checking illegally parked cars/ abandoned cars
  11. Helping a member of the public in some way
  12. Delivering leaflets/ putting up posters
  13. Carrying out a survey/ questionnaire
  14. Chatting to each other / hanging around
  15. Liaising with police officers
  16. Other (Specify)
- (DK)
- (REF)

## Appendix C - Advance Letter



HOME OFFICE Research, Development and Statistics Directorate  
Crime and Criminal Justice Unit  
50 Queen Anne's Gate, London, SW1H 9AT

Switchboard

Fax

Dear Sir/Madam,

### **HOME OFFICE CRIME AND POLICING SURVEY**

This letter is to give you more information about the Home Office Crime and Policing Survey. You were telephoned recently in connection with this research by an interviewer from BMRB Social Research. BMRB Social Research is conducting this survey across England on behalf of the Home Office.

The research is designed to collect information about people's attitudes to the police and their concerns about crime in their local area. It will help the Home Office take more effective action against crime and other local problems, by giving a better picture of their true extent.

In all, 7000 people aged 16 and over and living in different areas of England will be interviewed. All interviews will be done by telephone. Telephone numbers have been randomly selected in order to ensure a representative cross section of telephone owners in the area. Because the numbers are randomly selected, the sample will include some unlisted (ex-directory) numbers. The list of numbers selected is not passed on to any other survey or marketing company and all answers given to the interviewer will be treated as strictly confidential. Answers will not be seen by the Home Office, or by anyone outside BMRB in a form that can be linked to your name. Your views will be combined with those of other people, and the report of the survey will not identify anyone in person.

BMRB is an independent and well-respected social research organisation and is regulated by the Market Research Society's professional code of conduct.

I do hope that you will take part in this important Government research study, as we value your views. If you have any further queries about the research, please contact Sarah Wands at BMRB Social Research on 020 8433 4404.

Yours faithfully,

Alexis Poole  
Senior Research Officer

## **Appendix D - Comparison of achieved sample and population profiles**

## Comparison of achieved sample and population profiles:

Population figures are taken from 2001 Census small area statistics and are shown in bold. The achieved sample profiles have been adjusted to take into account the small number of respondents who refused to provide answers to the relevant questions.

**Appendix Table 1: Sex and Age Profiles (Pilot Wards) – Wave 1**

		<b>Male</b>	Male	<b>Female</b>	Female
Ash Wharf	16-24	<b>5.67%</b>	1.35%	<b>5.34%</b>	1.01%
	25-44	<b>18.28%</b>	14.14%	<b>19.37%</b>	17.17%
	45-64	<b>16.18%</b>	21.55%	<b>16.50%</b>	23.23%
	65+	<b>7.82%</b>	8.42%	<b>10.83%</b>	13.13%
Aston	16-24	<b>11.02%</b>	7.82%	<b>12.03%</b>	10.88%
	25-44	<b>20.71%</b>	22.11%	<b>20.48%</b>	25.85%
	45-64	<b>9.94%</b>	10.88%	<b>11.41%</b>	10.88%
	65+	<b>6.97%</b>	4.76%	<b>7.44%</b>	6.80%
Brunswick	16-24	<b>6.61%</b>	4.44%	<b>6.96%</b>	3.75%
	25-44	<b>18.58%</b>	12.63%	<b>19.07%</b>	18.43%
	45-64	<b>15.26%</b>	18.09%	<b>14.80%</b>	19.11%
	65+	<b>7.52%</b>	7.85%	<b>11.20%</b>	15.70%
Burghfield	16-24	<b>5.22%</b>	2.72%	<b>5.92%</b>	3.40%
	25-44	<b>21.65%</b>	16.33%	<b>21.96%</b>	23.13%
	45-64	<b>16.15%</b>	19.73%	<b>15.69%</b>	20.41%
	65+	<b>6.19%</b>	7.82%	<b>7.22%</b>	6.46%
Colville	16-24	<b>5.65%</b>	2.02%	<b>6.51%</b>	4.71%
	25-44	<b>23.21%</b>	17.17%	<b>25.52%</b>	27.95%
	45-64	<b>12.48%</b>	12.79%	<b>14.30%</b>	23.91%
	65+	<b>5.24%</b>	4.04%	<b>7.08%</b>	7.41%
East Wickham / Falconwood and Welling	16-24	<b>6.67%</b>	2.18%	<b>6.03%</b>	0.93%
	25-44	<b>17.53%</b>	12.46%	<b>18.43%</b>	17.45%
	45-64	<b>14.65%</b>	17.45%	<b>15.51%</b>	22.43%
	65+	<b>8.84%</b>	13.40%	<b>12.33%</b>	13.71%
Failsworth West	16-24	<b>5.94%</b>	2.36%	<b>5.96%</b>	3.70%
	25-44	<b>16.12%</b>	8.75%	<b>17.69%</b>	21.55%
	45-64	<b>14.84%</b>	19.53%	<b>16.31%</b>	22.56%
	65+	<b>9.94%</b>	8.75%	<b>13.20%</b>	12.79%

		<b>Male</b>		<b>Female</b>	
Greenham	16-24	<b>6.36%</b>	4.71%	<b>7.29%</b>	2.69%
	25-44	<b>21.64%</b>	18.18%	<b>23.10%</b>	15.82%
	45-64	<b>14.86%</b>	19.87%	<b>14.72%</b>	22.90%
	65+	<b>5.52%</b>	9.43%	<b>6.50%</b>	6.40%
Ingol	16-24	<b>6.74%</b>	2.69%	<b>6.96%</b>	3.03%
	25-44	<b>16.78%</b>	12.79%	<b>17.86%</b>	19.53%
	45-64	<b>15.64%</b>	20.88%	<b>15.98%</b>	19.19%
	65+	<b>8.27%</b>	6.06%	<b>11.77%</b>	15.82%
New Parks	16-24	<b>7.40%</b>	2.68%	<b>8.45%</b>	7.02%
	25-44	<b>16.58%</b>	11.37%	<b>19.29%</b>	20.74%
	45-64	<b>12.62%</b>	14.72%	<b>13.74%</b>	19.40%
	65+	<b>8.58%</b>	9.03%	<b>13.35%</b>	15.05%
St. Helier	16-24	<b>5.85%</b>	2.36%	<b>5.51%</b>	2.70%
	25-44	<b>19.74%</b>	18.24%	<b>20.17%</b>	19.26%
	45-64	<b>12.31%</b>	9.80%	<b>13.02%</b>	17.91%
	65+	<b>9.47%</b>	9.46%	<b>13.93%</b>	20.27%
St. Marys	16-24	<b>9.09%</b>	4.73%	<b>9.89%</b>	7.43%
	25-44	<b>19.04%</b>	14.86%	<b>20.78%</b>	21.62%
	45-64	<b>12.14%</b>	15.20%	<b>12.60%</b>	16.89%
	65+	<b>6.97%</b>	10.81%	<b>9.49%</b>	8.45%
Town Centre	16-24	<b>7.07%</b>	2.34%	<b>7.37%</b>	2.01%
	25-44	<b>18.86%</b>	20.07%	<b>19.34%</b>	22.74%
	45-64	<b>13.4%</b>	13.04%	<b>13.88%</b>	17.39%
	65+	<b>7.88%</b>	7.36%	<b>12.21%</b>	15.05%
Upper Edmonton	16-24	<b>7.55%</b>	7.07%	<b>8.19%</b>	3.70%
	25-44	<b>19.71%</b>	18.52%	<b>23.76%</b>	27.95%
	45-64	<b>12.00%</b>	11.11%	<b>13.75%</b>	16.50%
	65+	<b>6.56%</b>	5.39%	<b>8.49%</b>	9.76%
Walton North	16-24	<b>4.75%</b>	4.09%	<b>5.52%</b>	1.49%
	25-44	<b>23.36%</b>	23.42%	<b>25.80%</b>	22.30%
	45-64	<b>13.36%</b>	11.52%	<b>13.36%</b>	21.93%
	65+	<b>6.12%</b>	7.81%	<b>7.73%</b>	7.43%



		Male		Female	
West Park	16-24	<b>6.24%</b>	3.68%	<b>7.08%</b>	3.34%
	25-44	<b>18.53%</b>	15.38%	<b>19.60%</b>	29.43%
	45-64	<b>14.41%</b>	12.37%	<b>14.76%</b>	17.39%
	65+	<b>8.16%</b>	9.03%	<b>11.22%</b>	9.36%

**Appendix Table 2: Ethnicity profiles - Pilot Wards where white population exceeds eighty-five percent – Wave 1.**

	White	White	Non-white	Non-white
Ash Wharf	<b>97.91%</b>	95.32%	<b>2.09%</b>	4.68%
Brunswick	<b>98.36%</b>	97.30%	<b>1.64%</b>	2.70%
Burghfield	<b>97.70%</b>	97.32%	<b>2.30%</b>	2.68%
East Wickham / Falconwood and Welling	<b>93.58%</b>	91.67%	<b>6.42%</b>	8.33%
Failsworth West	<b>97.65%</b>	96.97%	<b>2.35%</b>	3.03%
Greenham	<b>97.71%</b>	98.32%	<b>2.29%</b>	1.68%
Ingol	<b>97.45%</b>	96.00%	<b>2.55%</b>	4.00%
New Parks	<b>92.64%</b>	92.67%	<b>7.36%</b>	7.33%
St. Helier	<b>85.59%</b>	98.00%	<b>14.41%</b>	2.00%
Town Centre	<b>98.81%</b>	83.06%	<b>1.19%</b>	16.94%
Walton North	<b>94.88%</b>	89.34%	<b>5.12%</b>	10.66%
West Park	<b>98.36%</b>	98.33%	<b>1.64%</b>	1.67%

**Appendix Table 3: Ethnicity profiles - Pilot Wards where ethnic minority population exceeds fifteen percent – Wave 1.**

	White	White	Asian	Asian	Black	Black	Other	Other
Aston	<b>34.75%</b>	29.39189	<b>37.62%</b>	32.09459	<b>22.62%</b>	31.41892	<b>5.01%</b>	7.094595
Colville	<b>73.92%</b>	75.08651	<b>4.08%</b>	2.422145	<b>13.57%</b>	10.72664	<b>8.44%</b>	11.76471
St. Mary's	<b>65.56%</b>	69.17808	<b>31.30%</b>	23.63014	<b>1.62%</b>	3.082192	<b>1.52%</b>	4.109589
Upper Edmonton	<b>61.81%</b>	55.44218	<b>10.56%</b>	9.183673	<b>22.46%</b>	22.44898	<b>5.17%</b>	12.92517

**Appendix Table 4: Sex and Age Profiles - Control Wards – Wave 1**

		<b>Male</b>	Male	<b>Female</b>	Female
Burghfield control	16-24	<b>5.23%</b>	2.68%	<b>4.33%</b>	2.01%
	25-44	<b>16.10%</b>	9.70%	<b>16.10%</b>	14.05%
	45-64	<b>17.32%</b>	17.39%	<b>17.78%</b>	24.75%
	65+	<b>9.51%</b>	13.38%	<b>13.63%</b>	16.05%
New Parks control	16-24	<b>7.01%</b>	3.02%	<b>7.85%</b>	5.03%
	25-44	<b>16.24%</b>	9.06%	<b>18.39%</b>	22.82%
	45-64	<b>11.89%</b>	13.42%	<b>13.67%</b>	18.12%
	65+	<b>10.15%</b>	10.07%	<b>14.80%</b>	18.46%
Ash Wharf control	16-24	<b>6.09%</b>	2.03%	<b>6.56%</b>	3.04%
	25-44	<b>18.72%</b>	16.22%	<b>19.90%</b>	20.95%
	45-64	<b>16.57%</b>	16.89%	<b>16.54%</b>	19.59%
	65+	<b>6.49%</b>	14.53%	<b>9.13%</b>	6.76%
Ingol control	16-24	<b>6.63%</b>	2.68%	<b>5.21%</b>	5.35%
	25-44	<b>20.06%</b>	15.72%	<b>20.53%</b>	17.39%
	45-64	<b>15.98%</b>	16.72%	<b>16.01%</b>	24.08%
	65+	<b>6.73%</b>	9.03%	<b>8.84%</b>	9.03%
East Wickham & Falconwood control	16-24	<b>6.36%</b>	3.34%	<b>6.44%</b>	4.01%
	25-44	<b>19.05%</b>	14.72%	<b>19.45%</b>	19.40%
	45-64	<b>14.91%</b>	15.38%	<b>15.26%</b>	20.40%
	65+	<b>7.89%</b>	10.03%	<b>10.64%</b>	12.71%
Failsworth West control	16-24	<b>6.15%</b>	1.98%	<b>6.85%</b>	4.29%
	25-44	<b>16.61%</b>	11.22%	<b>18.14%</b>	17.16%
	45-64	<b>14.53%</b>	17.16%	<b>15.07%</b>	22.77%
	65+	<b>8.87%</b>	7.92%	<b>13.76%</b>	17.49%

**Appendix Table 5: Ethnicity profiles - Control Wards – Wave 1**

	<b>White</b>	White	<b>Non-white</b>	Non-white
Burghfield control	<b>97.94%</b>	97.33%	<b>2.06%</b>	2.67%
New Parks control	<b>95.63%</b>	96.72%	<b>4.37%</b>	3.28%
Ash Wharf control	<b>96.96%</b>	97.67%	<b>3.04%</b>	2.33%
Ingol control	<b>97.82%</b>	96.33%	<b>2.18%</b>	3.67%
East Wickham & Falconwood control	<b>92.95%</b>	95.33%	<b>7.05%</b>	4.67%
Failsworth West control	<b>97.18%</b>	90.00%	<b>2.82%</b>	10.00%

**Appendix Table 6: Sex and Age Profiles (Pilot Wards) – Wave 2**

		<b>Male</b>	Male	<b>Female</b>	Female
Ash Wharf	16-24	<b>5.67%</b>	1.37%	<b>5.34%</b>	1.37%
	25-44	<b>18.28%</b>	13.06%	<b>19.37%</b>	21.99%
	45-64	<b>16.18%</b>	19.93%	<b>16.50%</b>	20.96%
	65+	<b>7.82%</b>	8.93%	<b>10.83%</b>	12.37%
Aston	16-24	<b>11.02%</b>	4.79%	<b>12.03%</b>	9.59%
	25-44	<b>20.71%</b>	17.81%	<b>20.48%</b>	25.34%
	45-64	<b>9.94%</b>	13.36%	<b>11.41%</b>	16.10%
	65+	<b>6.97%</b>	4.45%	<b>7.44%</b>	8.56%
Brunswick	16-24	<b>6.61%</b>	4.36%	<b>6.96%</b>	2.35%
	25-44	<b>18.58%</b>	13.09%	<b>19.07%</b>	19.80%
	45-64	<b>15.26%</b>	16.11%	<b>14.80%</b>	20.47%
	65+	<b>7.52%</b>	7.38%	<b>11.20%</b>	16.44%
Burghfield	16-24	<b>5.22%</b>	2.36%	<b>5.92%</b>	2.70%
	25-44	<b>21.65%</b>	14.19%	<b>21.96%</b>	25.34%
	45-64	<b>16.15%</b>	20.27%	<b>15.69%</b>	21.28%
	65+	<b>6.19%</b>	7.43%	<b>7.22%</b>	6.42%
Colville	16-24	<b>5.65%</b>	3.39%	<b>6.51%</b>	2.37%
	25-44	<b>23.21%</b>	16.95%	<b>25.52%</b>	27.12%
	45-64	<b>12.48%</b>	15.59%	<b>14.30%</b>	22.37%
	65+	<b>5.24%</b>	3.73%	<b>7.08%</b>	8.47%
East Wickham / Falconwood and Welling	16-24	<b>6.67%</b>	2.90%	<b>6.03%</b>	1.29%
	25-44	<b>17.53%</b>	10.32%	<b>18.43%</b>	17.10%
	45-64	<b>14.65%</b>	16.45%	<b>15.51%</b>	25.16%
	65+	<b>8.84%</b>	10.32%	<b>12.33%</b>	16.45%
Failsworth West	16-24	<b>5.94%</b>	2.35%	<b>5.96%</b>	3.36%
	25-44	<b>16.12%</b>	9.06%	<b>17.69%</b>	17.79%
	45-64	<b>14.84%</b>	16.78%	<b>16.31%</b>	23.83%
	65+	<b>9.94%</b>	11.07%	<b>13.20%</b>	15.77%

		Male		Female	
Greenham	16-24	<b>6.36%</b>	3.03%	<b>7.29%</b>	1.01%
	25-44	<b>21.64%</b>	17.51%	<b>23.10%</b>	21.89%
	45-64	<b>14.86%</b>	18.18%	<b>14.72%</b>	24.24%
	65+	<b>5.52%</b>	7.07%	<b>6.50%</b>	7.07%
Ingol	16-24	<b>6.74%</b>	3.37%	<b>6.96%</b>	1.68%
	25-44	<b>16.78%</b>	12.79%	<b>17.86%</b>	17.51%
	45-64	<b>15.64%</b>	17.51%	<b>15.98%</b>	25.25%
	65+	<b>8.27%</b>	7.07%	<b>11.77%</b>	14.81%
New Parks	16-24	<b>7.40%</b>	2.96%	<b>8.45%</b>	5.26%
	25-44	<b>16.58%</b>	9.54%	<b>19.29%</b>	19.74%
	45-64	<b>12.62%</b>	15.79%	<b>13.74%</b>	20.72%
	65+	<b>8.58%</b>	10.86%	<b>13.35%</b>	15.13%
Town Centre	16-24	<b>7.07%</b>	1.90%	<b>7.37%</b>	1.90%
	25-44	<b>18.86%</b>	15.21%	<b>19.34%</b>	23.95%
	45-64	<b>13.4%</b>	14.45%	<b>13.88%</b>	20.15%
	65+	<b>7.88%</b>	7.60%	<b>12.21%</b>	14.83%
St. Helier	16-24	<b>5.85%</b>	2.72%	<b>5.51%</b>	3.06%
	25-44	<b>19.74%</b>	13.95%	<b>20.17%</b>	20.75%
	45-64	<b>12.31%</b>	12.93%	<b>13.02%</b>	17.69%
	65+	<b>9.47%</b>	9.18%	<b>13.93%</b>	19.73%
St. Marys	16-24	<b>9.09%</b>	3.72%	<b>9.89%</b>	5.07%
	25-44	<b>19.04%</b>	15.20%	<b>20.78%</b>	22.64%
	45-64	<b>12.14%</b>	12.84%	<b>12.60%</b>	18.92%
	65+	<b>6.97%</b>	10.47%	<b>9.49%</b>	11.15%
Upper Edmonton	16-24	<b>7.55%</b>	5.44%	<b>8.19%</b>	4.76%
	25-44	<b>19.71%</b>	19.39%	<b>23.76%</b>	26.87%
	45-64	<b>12.00%</b>	11.90%	<b>13.75%</b>	16.67%
	65+	<b>6.56%</b>	6.46%	<b>8.49%</b>	8.50%

		<b>Male</b>	Male	<b>Female</b>	Female
Walton North	16-24	<b>4.75%</b>	2.39%	<b>5.52%</b>	1.71%
	25-44	<b>23.36%</b>	18.77%	<b>25.80%</b>	23.89%
	45-64	<b>13.36%</b>	16.38%	<b>13.36%</b>	20.48%
	65+	<b>6.12%</b>	7.51%	<b>7.73%</b>	8.87%
West Park	16-24	<b>6.24%</b>	2.44%	<b>7.08%</b>	3.66%
	25-44	<b>18.53%</b>	14.33%	<b>19.60%</b>	25.00%
	45-64	<b>14.41%</b>	16.77%	<b>14.76%</b>	18.29%
	65+	<b>8.16%</b>	8.84%	<b>11.22%</b>	10.67%

**Appendix Table 7: Ethnicity profiles - Pilot Wards where white population exceeds eighty-five percent – Wave 2.**

	<b>White</b>	White	<b>Non-white</b>	Non-white
Ash Wharf	<b>97.91%</b>	96.92%	<b>2.09%</b>	3.08%
Brunswick	<b>98.36%</b>	96.32%	<b>1.64%</b>	3.68%
Burghfield	<b>97.70%</b>	97.99%	<b>2.30%</b>	2.01%
East Wickham / Falconwood and Welling	<b>93.58%</b>	94.84%	<b>6.42%</b>	5.16%
Failsworth West	<b>97.65%</b>	98.32%	<b>2.35%</b>	1.68%
Greenham	<b>97.71%</b>	98.99%	<b>2.29%</b>	1.01%
Ingol	<b>97.45%</b>	97.98%	<b>2.55%</b>	2.02%
New Parks	<b>92.64%</b>	93.33%	<b>7.36%</b>	6.67%
St. Helier	<b>85.59%</b>	99.09%	<b>14.41%</b>	0.91%
Town Centre	<b>98.81%</b>	88.05%	<b>1.19%</b>	11.95%
Walton North	<b>94.88%</b>	93.52%	<b>5.12%</b>	6.48%
West Park	<b>98.36%</b>	98.86%	<b>1.64%</b>	1.14%

**Appendix Table 8: Ethnicity profiles - Pilot Wards where ethnic minority population exceeds fifteen percent – Wave 2.**

	<b>White</b>	White	<b>Asian</b>	Asian	<b>Black</b>	Black	<b>Other</b>	Other
Aston	<b>34.75%</b>	59.11%	<b>37.62%</b>	11.00%	<b>22.62%</b>	19.59%	<b>5.01%</b>	10.31%
Colville	<b>73.92%</b>	77.97%	<b>4.08%</b>	4.07%	<b>13.57%</b>	6.78%	<b>8.44%</b>	11.19%
St. Mary's	<b>65.56%</b>	75.00%	<b>31.30%</b>	18.58%	<b>1.62%</b>	3.38%	<b>1.52%</b>	3.04%
Upper Edmonton	<b>61.81%</b>	38.14%	<b>10.56%</b>	27.84%	<b>22.46%</b>	26.12%	<b>5.17%</b>	7.90%

**Appendix Table 9: Sex and Age Profiles - Control Wards – Wave 2**

		<b>Male</b>	Male	<b>Female</b>	Female
Burghfield control	16-24	<b>5.23%</b>	0.69%	<b>4.33%</b>	0.69%
	25-44	<b>16.10%</b>	10.00%	<b>16.10%</b>	15.86%
	45-64	<b>17.32%</b>	17.24%	<b>17.78%</b>	25.86%
	65+	<b>9.51%</b>	14.14%	<b>13.63%</b>	15.52%
New Parks control	16-24	<b>7.01%</b>	3.09%	<b>7.85%</b>	4.12%
	25-44	<b>16.24%</b>	9.97%	<b>18.39%</b>	20.96%
	45-64	<b>11.89%</b>	14.09%	<b>13.67%</b>	18.21%
	65+	<b>10.15%</b>	13.40%	<b>14.80%</b>	16.15%
Surrey control	16-24	<b>6.09%</b>	0.67%	<b>6.56%</b>	3.34%
	25-44	<b>18.72%</b>	11.37%	<b>19.90%</b>	22.74%
	45-64	<b>16.57%</b>	16.05%	<b>16.54%</b>	24.41%
	65+	<b>6.49%</b>	12.04%	<b>9.13%</b>	9.36%
Ingol control	16-24	<b>6.63%</b>	2.42%	<b>5.21%</b>	2.42%
	25-44	<b>20.06%</b>	17.30%	<b>20.53%</b>	18.69%
	45-64	<b>15.98%</b>	18.69%	<b>16.01%</b>	22.15%
	65+	<b>6.73%</b>	10.38%	<b>8.84%</b>	7.96%
East Wickham & Falconwood control	16-24	<b>6.36%</b>	1.69%	<b>6.44%</b>	2.70%
	25-44	<b>19.05%</b>	18.24%	<b>19.45%</b>	15.20%
	45-64	<b>14.91%</b>	15.88%	<b>15.26%</b>	25.68%
	65+	<b>7.89%</b>	9.12%	<b>10.64%</b>	11.49%
Failsworth West control	16-24	<b>6.15%</b>	2.34%	<b>6.85%</b>	2.34%
	25-44	<b>16.61%</b>	7.69%	<b>18.14%</b>	14.05%
	45-64	<b>14.53%</b>	17.06%	<b>15.07%</b>	28.09%
	65+	<b>8.87%</b>	9.36%	<b>13.76%</b>	19.06%

**Appendix Table 10: Ethnicity profiles - Control Wards – Wave 2**

	<b>White</b>	White	<b>Non-white</b>	Non-white
Burghfield control	<b>97.94%</b>	98.30%	<b>2.06%</b>	1.70%
New Parks control	<b>95.63%</b>	98.27%	<b>4.37%</b>	1.73%
Surrey control	<b>96.96%</b>	94.98%	<b>3.04%</b>	5.02%
Ingol control	<b>97.82%</b>	99.31%	<b>2.18%</b>	0.69%
East Wickham & Falconwood control	<b>92.95%</b>	92.91%	<b>7.05%</b>	7.09%
Failsworth West control	<b>97.18%</b>	98.33%	<b>2.82%</b>	1.67%