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PUBLIC CONFIDENCE IN THE POLICE: SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS

Key factors associated with public confidence in the police

A question from the British Crime Survey measures confidence in the local police for the Police Performance Assessment Framework (Statutory Performance Indicator 2a).

‘Taking everything into account, how good a job do you think the police in this area are doing?’

- **Neighbourhood policing**
  - Whether the public perceived the police to be dealing with the things that matter to their community was found to be the most important factor associated with public confidence in the local police.

- **Treating people fairly**
  - People who perceived that the local police treat people fairly and with respect had higher odds of being confident than people who did not perceive officers to be equitable and respectful.

- **Perceptions of the neighbourhood**
  - People who perceived low levels of anti-social behaviour and less crime in their neighbourhoods had higher odds of being confident in the local police than people who perceived high levels of crime and anti-social behaviour.

- **Providing a high quality service**
  - People who were satisfied with the way the police dealt with them had higher odds of being confident than people who were not satisfied with the service they received.
  - Having contact with the police was not in itself associated with lower odds of being confident – it was dependent on how satisfied the citizen was with the way the police handled the matter. Satisfactory encounters should maintain or may even improve confidence; unsatisfactory encounters were always associated with lower odds of being confident.

**Ethnicity and confidence**

- **Ethnicity was not associated with public confidence in the local police – independent of other factors.**
  - Factors associated with higher odds of reporting confidence in the local police were similar for people from different ethnic backgrounds.
  - For certain ethnic groups, shared perceptions of the service provided by the police may be an influencing factor in general confidence.

**Other factors to consider**

- This research only considers factors that are measured by the British Crime Survey. Other factors – such as neighbourhood context and collective efficacy; the experiences of friends and family; police visibility and proactive community engagement; and feeling well informed about crime in the local area – have all been found in other research to be associated with public confidence in the police.
**An alternative measure of confidence**

The British Crime survey contains another question that may be used to measure confidence in the local police.

‘Taking everything into account I have confidence in the police in this area’.

- The statement above was tested as a more ‘prospective’ measure of confidence – whether the police are trusted to be able to provide a satisfactory service in the future.

- An almost identical set of factors was associated with higher relative odds of being confident in the local police using this alternative measure, suggesting that this question is not suitable for measuring prospective confidence in the police.

**Implications for policy and practice**

- Neighbourhood policing should continue to be embedded within a wider framework of citizen focus.
  - It appears that the public expect people in their neighbourhood to be treated fairly and with respect by the police.

- Neighbourhood policing teams should concentrate on improving residents’ perceptions of their neighbourhood, by understanding and dealing with things that matter to local people.

- All police officers and staff, including those involved in response policing and investigations, should be aware of the importance of providing a service that is satisfactory to members of the public.

- Work should be undertaken to define precisely what is meant by public confidence in the police and to explore thoroughly measures for aspects of confidence that are associated with trust and legitimacy, as well as confidence in how the police are dealing with existing problems.
  - Developing robust measures of trust in and cooperation with the police, and compliance with the law, will allow testing of the ‘procedural justice’ model (fair and respectful treatment fosters trust and legitimacy, which in turn leads to cooperation and compliance) in a UK context.

**Methodological note**

- This analysis was undertaken with data from the 2005/06 British Crime Survey, using multivariate logistic regression models.

- Logistic regression shows the extent to which specific factors are independently associated with a dependent variable – in this case confidence in the local police. It does not imply a direct causal relationship.
BACKGROUNDBACKGROUND

Research suggests that procedural justice – fair and respectful treatment of citizens – is associated with trust in the police and viewing the police as legitimate. Legitimacy, in turn, is associated with greater willingness to cooperate with the police and assist in preventing and responding to crime, and greater compliance with the law. There is also evidence to suggest that general attitudes to the police – trust and confidence – may impact on people’s satisfaction with specific encounters. Consequently, the importance of public confidence in the police should not be underestimated.

Public confidence in local policing has been measured by the British Crime Survey (BCS) for the Police Performance Assessment Framework (PPAF) as Statutory Performance Indicator (SPI) 2a, using the question ‘Taking everything into account, how good a job do you think the police in this area are doing?’ By this measure, confidence in the local police fell during the 1990s and early 00s. However, there has been a statistically significant increase in confidence in the local police in recent years – from 47% in 2003/04 to 53% in 2007/08.

An evaluation of the National Reassurance Policing Programme (NRPP) shows that neighbourhood policing can impact positively on public confidence in the police, as measured by the SPI 2a question, at ward level. It is less clear what other factors may impact on public confidence. With the success of the NRPP, it may be expected that the national roll-out of neighbourhood policing will increase public confidence more widely. However, the national evaluation of neighbourhood policing was not able to discern any impact on public confidence in the first year. This may be due to the time needed to implement the key delivery mechanisms of neighbourhood policing on a wider scale – forces tended to have implemented targeted foot patrol more easily than community engagement and problem-solving.

Although effective implementation of neighbourhood policing is important, there is a need to understand potential barriers to improving public confidence that may require different interventions. If further increases in public confidence, both in the local police and more generally, are not observed after neighbourhood policing is embedded, the Police Service needs to know what other factors may have to be addressed.

Moreover, it is not clear whether the question used for SPI 2a captures aspects of confidence associated with trust in the police performing their role in the future; or whether it is more of a retrospective measure of the effectiveness of how the police have performed their role to date. The procedural justice model suggests that trust in how the police will perform in the future, as well as how effectively they are performing currently, are key to achieving the desired outcomes of cooperation and compliance.

From April 2008, the Government introduced a new Public Service Agreement (PSA 23 – priority action three) concerned with tackling crime and anti-social behaviour and increasing public confidence in the police and their partners. Specifically, the PSA used

---

1 See Reisig (2007).
2 Brandl et al. (1994).
3 Moley (2008).
4 Tuffin et al. (2006).
5 Quinton and Morris (2008).
6 http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/d/pbr_csr07_psa23.pdf
the BCS to measure the public’s perceptions of how effectively the police and local council were tackling the crime and anti-social behaviour issues of greatest importance in any locality. The Home Office’s policing green paper – *From the neighbourhood to the national: Policing our communities together* – set out plans to adopt the PSA as a measure of public confidence and as a single top-down performance target for the police service.

The research reported here was commissioned by the Neighbourhood Policing Programme Team at the National Policing Improvement Agency (NPIA) to establish factors that are associated with public confidence in the police, as measured by SPI 2a. The research also considers an alternative statement posed by the BCS – ‘Taking everything into account I have confidence in the police in this area’ – to test whether this may be used as a proxy measure for a more ‘prospective’, forward-looking confidence.

The implications of the findings presented in this report can be used to assist police forces looking to implement policies designed to increase public confidence.

**Previous research**

Comparatively few research studies conducted in the United Kingdom (UK) have explored factors associated with public confidence in the police; much of the available evidence comes from the United States (US). Existing studies were reviewed to try to identify key factors that may be expected to affect public confidence in the police in a UK context. Three key sets were identified: factors associated with police practice, factors associated with neighbourhood contexts, and factors associated with public perceptions of neighbourhoods and quality of life.

**Police factors**

Contact with the police can potentially affect public confidence in a number of ways. Recent research suggests that negative experiences in public-initiated encounters have a disproportionately negative impact on confidence. Positive experiences in specific encounters are less likely to impact positively on general confidence (the ‘asymmetry’ theory)\(^7\).

Research also suggests that victims of crime have less confidence in the police than non-victims\(^8\).

The way that the police behave generally towards citizens may also be a factor. Studies have shown that people are more likely to express confidence if, during specific encounters, the police were perceived to have acted fairly and justly\(^9\).

**Neighbourhood type**

Some existing research suggests that levels of confidence in the police can be explained to some extent by the level of concentrated disadvantage in neighbourhoods, ie, the greater the level of deprivation, the less likely the residents are to be confident in the police\(^10\).

---

\(^7\) Skogan (2006); Bradford *et al*. (in press).
\(^9\) Maxson *et al*. (2003); Skogan, (2005); Tyler, (2005); Skogan (2006); Bradford *et al*. (in press).
There is also some evidence to suggest that collective security and social cohesion in a neighbourhood may increase public confidence\textsuperscript{11}.

**Public perceptions of neighbourhoods and quality of life**

Previous research suggests that individuals’ perceptions of their neighbourhood may be more important than the actual neighbourhood conditions, as measured by indicators such as household income or indices of deprivation\textsuperscript{12}. Quality of life perceptions can be important; for example, if people perceive an area as a good place to live, or say that they enjoy living there, they are more likely to be confident.

Studies also suggest that the public are more likely to express confidence in the police if they perceive crime and disorder to be low in their area\textsuperscript{13}.

**Socio-demographic factors**

Socio-demographic factors, especially ethnicity, are often associated with confidence in the police in simple bivariate analysis, where two variables are associated with each other.

A review of US literature concluded that two socio-demographic factors, age and ethnicity, are associated consistently with attitudes towards the police\textsuperscript{14}. Younger people and Black people tend to have more negative views of the police.

In England and Wales, White people currently have lower levels of confidence in the police than people from Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) backgrounds\textsuperscript{15}. However, these figures can be slightly misleading, as published BCS figures do not differentiate between sub-groups of ‘Black’ and ‘Asian’ respondents. Grouping survey respondents into broadbrush ethnic groups can mask subtle differences between specific ethnic subgroups.

When multivariate analysis is used, socio-demographic factors are often found not to be associated with attitudes towards the police, independent of other factors. It has been suggested that socio-demographic factors, and in particular ethnicity, can operate through other factors, especially the type and nature of contact between the police and the public\textsuperscript{16}.

\textsuperscript{11} Cao et al. (1996).
\textsuperscript{12} Cao et al. (1996); Reisig and Parks (2002); Huebner et al. (2004).
\textsuperscript{13} Cao et al. (1996); Reisig and Parks (2002); Weitzer and Tuch (2004); Allen et al. (2006).
\textsuperscript{14} Brown and Benedict (2002).
\textsuperscript{15} Patterson and Jansson (2008).
\textsuperscript{16} Skogan (2005).
METHODOLOGY

This study used 2005/06 British Crime Survey data to create multivariate statistical models based on logistic regression (see Appendix A). This type of analysis shows whether a statistical association exists between a dependent variable (eg public confidence in the local police) and a range of independent variables (eg whether the respondent perceives there to be anti-social behaviour in their neighbourhood), independent of other factors in the model. It also shows how strong that relationship is and, therefore, the extent to which certain factors increase the chances of a person being confident in the police. This does not, though, imply a direct causal relationship.

Box 1: Measures of public confidence in the police

There are two questions in the 2005/06 BCS that can be used to measure public confidence in the local police. The first – ‘Taking everything into account, how good a job do you think the police in this area are doing?’ – has been used in the PPAF to measure confidence, as Statutory Performance Indicator 2a. This measure will be referred to in this report as ‘public confidence in the local police’.

The second – ‘Taking everything into account I have confidence in the police in this area’ – is part of a battery of ‘key diagnostic indicators’ (KDIs) that appear after the SPI 2a question. This measure will be referred to in this report as the ‘alternative’ confidence measure.

In 2007/08, over half (53%) of people said they thought that the local police do a good or excellent job. A higher proportion (65%) agreed that, taking everything into account, they had confidence in the local police17. The analysis presented in this report will show whether or not different factors are associated with this alternative measure of confidence than with the SPI 2a measure.

Logistic regression models were developed for two measures of public confidence in the local police that can be derived from questions in the BCS:

‘Taking everything into account...
1. ...how good a job do you think the police in this area are doing?’
2. ...I have a lot of confidence in the police in this area.’

Regression models were also produced for specific ethnic groups – Black Caribbean, Black African, Indian, Pakistani and Bangladeshi – for both measures of confidence.

Logistic regression identifies those variables that are independently associated with the dependent variable and produces ‘odds ratios’. These indicate the category or categories within independent variables which are most associated with the dependent variable. In this case, the higher the odds ratio, the more likely the factor is to be associated with expressing confidence in the local police.

Discussion of the results focuses on how many times greater are the odds of one category of a variable, for example, having had contact with the police that the citizen perceived as satisfactory, when compared with the ‘reference category’ for that particular variable. The reference category is chosen as the most appropriate. Therefore, in relation to the above example concerning contact with the police,

17 Moley (2008).
respondents who have had no contact are set as the reference category in order to examine the influence of positive and negative contacts. Where there is no obvious reference category, or where the independent variable has only two categories, the category with the lowest odds is usually set as the reference category by default. In logistic regression, the reference category has odds of 1.00. Odds for categories within independent variables are presented as either associated with higher odds of reporting confidence compared with the reference category (odds are above 1.00) or associated with lower odds of expressing confidence compared with the reference category (odds are below 1.00).

Another way of presenting this is to talk about probability. If the odds ratio is divided by one plus the odds ratio – \( \frac{\exp(B)}{1+\exp(B)} \) – it is possible to calculate the likelihood of being confident in percentage terms. So, to use a headline finding from this research as an example, the odds ratio of +4.68 equates to people who agreed that the police are dealing with the things that matter being 82% more likely to be confident in the police than people who did not agree.

**Box 2: Neighbourhood policing, police treatment of citizens, and types of police-public contact**

In logistic regression analysis, variables that are highly correlated cannot be used in the same regression model. A decision has to be taken as to which correlated variable to include in the model. It should be noted that the correlated factors not included in the model are likely also to impact on public confidence. Data from public confidence ‘diagnostic’ questions included in the BCS were highly correlated. Responses to questions about whether the police understand the issues that affect communities, whether the police are dealing with the things that matter to people, and whether the police can be relied upon to deal with minor crimes were correlated such that only one could be used for the analysis. The variable relating to whether the police are dealing with the things that matter to people was chosen. ‘Perceptions of neighbourhood policing’ is used in this report to represent these factors.

Similarly, data from the diagnostic question on whether the public perceive that the police treat everyone fairly was correlated with data from the question on whether the public perceive the police would treat everyone ‘with respect’ during encounters. ‘Police treatment of citizens’ is used in this report to represent both these factors.

‘Public-initiated contact’ refers to any situation in which citizens approached the police for service. This includes instances of victimisation, as well as a range of other contacts: to report an accident or medical emergency, to report a ringing alarm, to report another type of disturbance, to report suspicious circumstances or persons, to report a missing person, to report lost or found property, to report a problem or difficulty, to inform the police that their house would be empty, to ask the police for any advice or information, or to give the police any other type of information.

‘Police-initiated contact’ refers to formal approaches from the police to members of the public, principally stopping people in cars or on foot. Also included are: to investigate a noise or disturbance, to ask for information in connection with a crime that has been committed, to investigate an accident or traffic offence in which the respondent was involved, to search the respondent’s house, to make an arrest, or to ask the respondent to move on. These contacts are potentially more adversarial in nature than are public-initiated contacts. Contact through community engagement and outreach work, which may be police-initiated, is not included in this category.
FINDINGS

The findings presented in this report do not show the factors that will definitely increase measures of public confidence; they give an indication of the policy action that may offer improvements. Not all factors potentially associated with public confidence could be considered in this report.

Public confidence in the local police

‘Taking everything into account, how good a job do you think the police in this area are doing?’

Several factors were found to be independently associated with public confidence in the local police (Table A.1). There were four factors for which the relative odds of being confident were over one-and-a-half times greater than those for the reference category (Box 3).

Box 3: Most important factors associated with being confident in the police

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Police factors</th>
<th>Neighbourhood factors</th>
<th>Perceptions of neighbourhood policing – agreeing that the local police are dealing with the things that matter to people</th>
<th>+4.68</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police treatment of citizens – agreeing that the local police treat everyone fairly and with respect</td>
<td>Perceptions of anti-social behaviour – perceiving that certain factors, such as noisy neighbours and litter, were not a problem in the neighbourhood</td>
<td>+2.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood factors</td>
<td>Perceptions of the local crime rate – perceiving that there was less crime in the area than two years previously</td>
<td>+1.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police factors</td>
<td>Neighbourhood factors</td>
<td>Perceptions of the local crime rate – perceiving that there was less crime in the area than two years previously</td>
<td>+1.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Together with public-initiated contact with the police, these factors explained 29% out of a total 31% of variance in the logistic regression model.

Police factors

Neighbourhood policing

The findings suggest that neighbourhood policing may influence public confidence in the local police. People who perceived that the police were ‘dealing with the things that matter’ to the community had higher odds of being confident than people who did not agree that the police were dealing with important local issues. Effective neighbourhood policing should also deal with low-level disorder in neighbourhoods; perceptions of anti-social behaviour were also associated with public confidence in the local police (see below).

Police treatment of citizens – treating people fairly and with respect

The findings suggest that the way in which policing is undertaken may also have an impact on public confidence. People who perceived that ‘the police treat everyone fairly regardless of who they are’ had odds of being confident that
were twice those of people who did not agree that the police treat everyone fairly. This finding provides further support for the procedural justice model. The finding also raises the concern that potential gains in public confidence from effective neighbourhood policing may be negated if other police activity involving interaction with the public is not undertaken in a citizen-focused way.

Specific contact between the police and the public

It is sometimes suggested that having direct contact results in people having less confidence in the police. The current analysis suggests that this is not the case. The crucial factor is whether the citizen is satisfied with the way the police handled the contact. Having contact with the police that was perceived as satisfactory was associated with higher odds of being confident, compared with people who had no contact. However, having contact with the police that was perceived as unsatisfactory was associated with lower odds of being confident, relative to respondents who had no contact. This relationship held for public-initiated contacts.

The picture is slightly different for police-initiated contacts. For specific contacts which were initiated by the police – including stopping people in their vehicles or on foot – the odds of being confident among those who reported satisfactory experiences were not statistically significantly different from those of people who had no contact. However, experiencing unsatisfactory police-initiated contact was associated with lower odds of being confident, relative to respondents who had no contact. These findings lend further support to the asymmetry theory. While it is possible that police responses when they have been approached by members of the public may have some positive impact on overall confidence, the best that can be hoped for in relation to police-initiated contacts is that existing levels of confidence are maintained. One possible explanation for this is that people have higher expectations of the police when they initiate contact.

Public perceptions of neighbourhoods and crime

Public perceptions of anti-social behaviour were found to be independently associated with confidence in the police. People who perceived low levels of anti-social behaviour in their neighbourhood had odds of being confident that were twice those of people who perceived high levels of anti-social behaviour. This finding reinforces the importance, recognised in neighbourhood policing, of providing an effective and coordinated response to visible, local problems such as litter, vandalism and graffiti, and drunken behaviour in public places. Variables included in the regression models that are not based on respondents’ perceptions – index of multiple deprivation for the local area, employment status, household income – were not associated with confidence. This supports previous research that suggests that residents’ perceptions of their area are more salient than proxy measures of economic and social disadvantage. It is possible that residents’ perceptions of anti-social behaviour are sometimes unrelated to actual disadvantage. This finding also suggests that the relative affluence of an area does not necessarily influence confidence in the police.

Perceptions of the local crime rate were also independently associated with confidence in the police. People who thought that less crime had been committed in their area than two years previously had higher odds of being confident than people who thought there was more crime. It was not possible in this analysis to

---

18 See for example Ipsos MORI (2007).
test whether it is again the perception that is more important than the reality, as there is not an objective measure of neighbourhood crime attached to the BCS dataset.

Other factors associated with public confidence in the local police

Several other factors were independently associated with confidence in the local police. These were, from a theoretical perspective, expected. Not having witnessed crime or anti-social behaviour was associated with higher odds of saying that the local police did a good job, compared with respondents who had been witnesses. Feeling safe walking alone after dark in their neighbourhood was also associated with higher odds of being confident, compared with those who said they felt unsafe.

Reading tabloid newspapers was associated with lower odds of being confident, compared with people who said that they did not read any newspaper. Level of education was also independently associated with confidence in the local police. Being educated to degree level was associated with higher odds of being confident, compared with respondents with no qualifications. Although statistically significantly different from the reference category, all these factors increased the odds of being confident by less than one-and-a-half times.

One finding was, from a theoretical perspective, unexpected. A review of literature in the US found age to be one of only two socio-demographic variables associated consistently with confidence in the police. Specifically, younger citizens tend to have more negative views of the police. In the present analysis however, being over the age of twenty-five was associated with lower odds of being confident.

Factors not independently associated with confidence in the local police

There were several factors – ethnicity, religion, employment status, socio-economic deprivation, household income, worry about crime and personal experience of victimisation – that were found not to be independently associated with public confidence in the local police. Some of these – notably ethnicity, socio-economic factors, and victimisation – were associated with lower levels of confidence using bivariate analysis.

In common with research from the US, ethnicity was not associated with confidence in the police, independent of other factors. However, US research also suggests that ethnicity can shape encounters between the police and the public. Skogan (2005) found that, in relation to police-initiated encounters, Black (and Hispanic) citizens were far less likely than White citizens to say that the police paid attention to what they had to say, or explained the reasons for their actions. Analysis of BCS data on victims’ perceptions of the service they received from the police shows that victims from BME backgrounds were less likely than White victims to say that the police showed as much interest as they should in the matter and were more likely to say they had to wait an unreasonable amount of time for a police response. Clearly, perceptual data must be treated with a degree of caution, but research does suggest that officers should consider carefully the nature of their interactions with BME citizens. This is particularly important in the light of a study of Chicago residents which found that the vicarious experiences of friends and family were

---

22 Myhill and Upson (forthcoming).
23 Rosenbaum et al. (2005).
associated with confidence in the police – especially in Black communities. A UK qualitative study on the drivers of perceptions of discrimination by public services\(^{24}\) was able to classify a proportion of respondents as ‘high [perceived] discrimination’. In the case of policing, respondents’ views were based, in part, on ‘service factors’, including the perceived disproportionate use of stop and search, a perceived lack of police accountability (for example, in relation to deaths in custody), and the perception, particularly among Black respondents, that the police were less willing to deal with crimes against minority citizens.

Bivariate analysis suggests that citizens with a low socio-economic status – the unemployed, social renters, residents from ‘moderate means’ or ‘hard pressed’ neighbourhoods – have less confidence in the local police\(^{25}\). However, the present analysis suggests socio-economic status is not associated with lower confidence, independent of other factors. This finding raises again the possibility that socio-demographic factors may be operating through factors associated with perceptions of the service and treatment people receive from the police. The police understanding and dealing with things that matter to the community was associated with higher odds of being confident; while the Police Service has generally found it more difficult to initiate and sustain community engagement in more deprived communities\(^{26}\). Bivariate analysis also suggests people with longstanding, limiting disabilities have lower confidence in the police; while community engagement has historically been less well developed with so-called ‘hard-to-reach’ groups\(^{27}\). Research from the US\(^{28}\) has shown a link between the type of neighbourhood citizens come from and whether they are treated respectfully by the police. The key point is that minority groups and people of low socio-economic status are not necessarily predisposed to have lower levels of confidence in the police. Their confidence is likely to be influenced by their perceptions of what the police do and how they behave in their neighbourhoods – especially whether they perceive them to be dealing with their concerns and whether they treat people fairly and respectfully.

Having been the victim of crime was also not associated with lower odds of being confident in the police itself, independent of other factors. However, people’s perceptions of the standard of service they receive from the police in specific encounters is associated with wider confidence – and the association between contact perceived as unsatisfactory and confidence appears particularly important.

**Other factors that may be associated with public confidence in the police**

This analysis was only able to include factors that are measured by the British Crime Survey. The fact that only around one-third of the variance is explained by the logistic regression models suggests that there are other factors associated with public confidence in the local police. Other research studies provide some indication of what additional factors may be associated with public confidence.

**Neighbourhood context and collective efficacy**

Reisig and Parks (2002), using data collected in two US cities, found ‘neighbourhood context’ – murder rates and concentrated deprivation – to be associated with confidence in the police. Although the analysis in the present report was able to

\(^{24}\) Communities and Local Government (2008).
\(^{25}\) Patterson and Jansson (2008).
\(^{26}\) See Myhill (2006).
\(^{27}\) See Myhill et al. (2003).
\(^{28}\) Mastrofski et al. (2002).
include multiple deprivation as a variable, it was not possible to consider the impact of living in neighbourhoods that varied by level of deprivation, crime rate, or racial composition, as suitable variables do not exist in the BCS dataset. It was also not possible to include the actual level of crime in the respondent’s neighbourhood as an independent variable.

Sampson et al. (1997) found a relationship between ‘collective efficacy’ – defined as social cohesion among neighbours combined with their willingness to intervene on behalf of the common good – and levels of violent crime in Chicago neighbourhoods. This relationship mediated associations between crime and both concentrated disadvantage and residential instability. Cao et al. (1996) applied this theory to confidence in the police and found collective efficacy to be independently associated with confidence. It was not possible to have collective efficacy as an independent variable in the present study as questions on social cohesion appeared in a different part of the BCS to questions on contact with the police. Initial exploratory analysis did show a weak association between confidence and factors that could have composed an independent collective efficacy variable.

Vicarious experiences

Rosenbaum et al. (2005), using survey data collected in Chicago, found that indirect – vicarious – knowledge of police contact with the public was important in shaping general attitudes towards the police. This suggests that the quality of an encounter between the police and the public may have an impact wider than the specific individual concerned. Vicarious experience was gathered in various ways, principally through the friend or family member who had the direct contact; through friends, family members and neighbours more generally; and through the media. The shared experiences of other people in their neighbourhoods were more salient for Black citizens than for citizens from other ethnic groups.

Police visibility and proactive community engagement

The evaluation of the National Reassurance Policing Programme29 showed that improved public perceptions of foot patrol in their neighbourhood and improved perceptions of police effort to find out what local people think were statistically significantly associated with public confidence. It was not possible with the 2005/06 BCS data to include either perceptions of police visibility or direct experience of community engagement in the regression models.

Feeling informed about local crime and policing

Some policy makers and practitioners feel that providing the public with objective, locally focused information about community safety is a way to counteract negative coverage in the media. Analysis of data from the Metropolitan Police Public Attitudes Survey30 suggests that how well informed people feel about policing in their local area is associated with confidence; not feeling well informed was linked to lower opinions of ‘police effectiveness’. Again, it was not possible with the present data to examine the potential impact of communications strategies on public confidence in the police.

---

29 Tuffin et al. (2006).
30 Bradford et al. (in press).
Table 1: Summary of factors independently associated with public confidence in the local police

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors associated with confidence in the local police</th>
<th>Factors not associated with confidence in the local police</th>
<th>Factors we could not include in this analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Neighbourhood policing – dealing with the things that matter</td>
<td>- Ethnicity</td>
<td>- Influence of the media other than newspaper readership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Police treatment of citizens – treating everyone fairly</td>
<td>- Religion</td>
<td>- Local information provision/feeling informed about crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Perceptions of local crime rate</td>
<td>- Employment status</td>
<td>- Vicarious experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Contact with the police – public- and police-initiated</td>
<td>- Socio-economic deprivation</td>
<td>- Police visibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Perceptions of anti-social behaviour in local area</td>
<td>- Household income</td>
<td>- Direct experience of community engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Newspaper readership</td>
<td>- Worry about crime</td>
<td>- Collective efficacy(^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Area type (rural/urban)</td>
<td>- Personal experience of victimisation</td>
<td>- Neighbourhood context(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Age</td>
<td>- Community cohesion</td>
<td>- Actual level of crime/anti-social behaviour in the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Witnessing crime</td>
<td>- Civic participation(^3)</td>
<td>- Political views/affiliations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Housing tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Feelings of safety walking alone after dark in local area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Defined as social cohesion between neighbourhood residents and willingness to intervene in neighbourhood problems.
2. There were no area variables attached to the BCS dataset that enabled consideration of the combined effect of crime rate and deprivation. There were also no variables that indicated racial composition of neighbourhoods.
3. Whether people have been members of local groups such as housing associations or held posts such as a magistrate or school governor.
Confidence among Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) groups

Published data from the 2004/05 BCS shows that confidence in the police is higher among Black and Asian respondents than it is among White respondents. However, this aggregated data masks differences in levels of confidence within these ethnic groups. Analysis of 2005/06 BCS data shows that confidence for Black Caribbean respondents was similar to that for White respondents; confidence for other ethnic groups was higher.

Table 2: Public confidence in the local police, by ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'excellent' or 'good' job</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By ethnic group¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>43,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By ethnic sub-group²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Caribbean</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black African</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani &amp; Bangladeshi</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1,134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Figure taken from Walker et al. (2006)
2. Figures for specific ethnic groups/sub-groups based on analysis of the 2005/06 BCS, undertaken by the authors.

Regression models were developed for four different non-White, minority ethnic groups: Black Caribbean, Black African, Indian, and Pakistani and Bangladeshi (Tables A.2 to A.5).

Table 3: Factors associated with higher odds of being confident in the local police, by ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Black Caribbean</th>
<th>Black African</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani &amp; Bangladeshi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood policing</td>
<td>Neighbourhood policing</td>
<td>Neighbourhood policing</td>
<td>Police treatment of citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police treatment of citizens</td>
<td>Police treatment of citizens</td>
<td>Perceiving low levels of ASB</td>
<td>Neighbourhood policing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having witnessed a crime</td>
<td>Perceiving less crime than two years ago</td>
<td>Police treatment of citizens</td>
<td>Not having witnessed a crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory public-initiated contact</td>
<td>Educated to A/AS level</td>
<td>Perceiving low levels of ASB</td>
<td>Perceiving low levels of ASB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not being a victim of crime</td>
<td>Satisfactory police-initiated contact</td>
<td>Living in rented accommodation</td>
<td>Being female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceiving low levels of ASB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Factors are listed in order of the % of variance they explain.
2. Highlighted factors have odds one-and-a-half-times greater than those of the reference category for that variable.
3. Analysis uses data from the ethnic boost component of the British Crime Survey.

Perceiving that the police were dealing with the things that matter to communities was, for minority ethnic respondents, still the factor most associated with higher odds...
of being confident in the local police. However, the analysis suggests that, for certain BME groups, police treatment of citizens may be as, or even more, salient than the police dealing with local issues. Black Caribbean respondents who perceived that the police treat everyone fairly had odds of being confident three-and-a-half-times higher than respondents who did not perceive that the police treated everyone fairly. For Pakistani and Bangladeshi respondents, those who perceived that the police treat everyone fairly had odds of being confident four times higher than those who did not perceive that the police treat everyone fairly.

This finding is important. The strained relationship between Black Caribbean communities and the police is well documented and can be exacerbated by the use of operational policing tactics like stop and search. Counter-terrorism has become increasingly prominent in policing since the attacks of September 11, 2001. Research published in 2007 suggests that there has been an increase in the proportion of Pakistani and Bangladeshi citizens subject to stops since police powers were increased by the Criminal Justice Act, 2003. This increase was observed before the London bombings of July 7, 2005. Muslim organisations have voiced concerns about the targeting of Muslims for stop and search in the wake of both 9/11 and 7/7. The analysis for this report used 2005/06 data, much of which was collected in the eight months following the London bombings.

Having contact with the police was associated with confidence for all ethnic groups with the exception of Black African. However, the association differed slightly by ethnic group. For Black Caribbean respondents, the association was the same as for all respondents, ie, having contact with the police that was initiated by the respondent and was perceived as satisfactory was associated with higher odds of being confident, compared with people who had no contact; unsatisfactory self-initiated contact was associated with lower odds of being confident. For Indian respondents, it was satisfactory police-initiated contact that was associated with higher odds of being confident. The odds for satisfactory public-initiated contact were not statistically significantly different from those for Indian respondents who had no contact with the police. For Pakistani and Bangladeshi respondents, only public-initiated contact was independently associated with confidence. The odds for satisfactory public-initiated contact for Pakistani and Bangladeshi respondents were not statistically significantly different from those for respondents who had no contact. As with other ethnic groups, unsatisfactory contact was associated with lower odds of being confident.

---

33 Qureshi (2007). This research was based on a limited time period in a single town; further analysis would be required before the results observed could be taken as representative of a wider trend.
An alternative measure of confidence

‘Taking everything into account I have confidence in the police in this area.’

There were three factors which were associated with relative odds of more than one-and-a-half times the reference category in relation to the alternative measure of confidence in the local police (Table A.6). These were identical to the three most important factors independently associated with confidence in the local police, based on the SPI 2a ‘how good a job...’ question.

Box 4: Most important factors associated with being confident in the police (alternative measure)

| Police factors | Perceptions of neighbourhood policing – agreeing that the local police are dealing with the things that matter to people | +10.24 |
| Police treatment of citizens – agreeing that the local police treat everyone fairly and with respect | +3.42 |
| Neighbourhood factors | Perceptions of anti-social behaviour – perceiving that certain factors, such as noisy neighbours and litter, were not a problem in the neighbourhood | +2.00 |

Only two factors that were independently associated with public confidence in the local police, using the SPI 2a measure, were not associated with the alternative measure: education and rural/urban area type.

The pattern in relation to public perceptions of their direct contacts with the police was also very similar between the models. While satisfactory public-initiated contact was associated with higher odds of being confident, relative to people who had no contact, the odds for satisfactory police-initiated contact were not statistically significantly different from those who had no contact. However, contact that was perceived as unsatisfactory, both public- and police-initiated, was associated with lower odds of being confident, relative to people who had no contact with the police.

These findings suggest that, in a broad sense, the two measures are not that different empirically and that the alternative question is not suitable for measuring prospective confidence in the police. This may be partially explained by how the alternative question is framed. It follows a set of similar attitude statements on the performance of the local police and is prefaced with ‘Taking everything into account...’. It is possible that respondents may still be using the past performance of their local police as a referent when answering the alternative question.

Alternative confidence measure – variations by ethnic group

For the alternative measure of confidence, the proportion of Black Caribbean respondents agreeing that they had confidence in the local police (58%) was five percentage points lower than the proportion for White respondents (63%). This difference was statistically significant. Respondents from other ethnic groups were all more likely to agree that they had confidence in the local police than White respondents.
Table 4: Public confidence in the local police (alternative measure), by ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'excellent' or 'good' job¹</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>47,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By ethnic group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>44,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By ethnic sub-group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Caribbean</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black African</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani &amp; Bangladeshi</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1,139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Figures based on analysis of 2005/06 BCS data, undertaken by the authors.

Neighbourhood policing and police treatment of citizens were still the factors most associated with highest relative odds of being confident, for BME groups, although, for this alternative measure, police treatment of citizens was the most important factor for Black African, Pakistani and Bangladeshi respondents.

Public-initiated contact was associated with this measure of confidence for all ethnic groups. However, in contrast to the SPI 2a measure, the odds for satisfactory contact were not statistically significantly different from the reference category (those who had not initiated contact) for any ethnic group. Unsatisfactory contact was associated with lower odds of being confident for all groups, relative to people who had no contact with the police.

Perhaps the most interesting finding, though, concerned police-initiated contact. For Pakistani and Bangladeshi respondents, those who perceived their police-initiated encounter as satisfactory had lower odds of being confident, when compared with people who reported no contact (the reference group). Police-initiated contact was not associated with this measure of confidence for any other ethnic group.
Figure 1: Factors that are associated with higher relative odds of being confident in the local police, by ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Black Caribbean</th>
<th>Black African</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani or Bangladeshi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police deal with the things that matter</td>
<td>Police deal with the things that matter</td>
<td>Police deal with the things that matter</td>
<td>Police deal with the things that matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police treat everybody fairly and with respect</td>
<td>Police treat everybody fairly and with respect</td>
<td>Police treat everybody fairly and with respect</td>
<td>Police treat everybody fairly and with respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceive low levels of anti-social behaviour</td>
<td>Perceive low levels of anti-social behaviour</td>
<td>Perceive low levels of anti-social behaviour</td>
<td>Perceive low levels of anti-social behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having witnessed a crime</td>
<td>Not having witnessed a crime</td>
<td>Not having witnessed a crime</td>
<td>Not having witnessed a crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory public-initiated police contact</td>
<td>Satisfactory public-initiated police contact</td>
<td>Satisfactory public-initiated police contact</td>
<td>Satisfactory public-initiated police contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having been the victim of crime</td>
<td>Not having been the victim of crime</td>
<td>Not having been the victim of crime</td>
<td>Not having been the victim of crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceive low levels of anti-social behaviour</td>
<td>Perceive low levels of anti-social behaviour</td>
<td>Perceive low levels of anti-social behaviour</td>
<td>Perceive low levels of anti-social behaviour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All respondents
Perceptions of neighbourhood policing
Police fairness/respect
Perceptions of anti-social behaviour
Perceptions of the local crime rate

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

Taking everything into account I have confidence in the police in this area.
CONCLUSIONS

Several factors were most consistently associated with public confidence in the local police. For certain key factors, this association held across ethnic groups and for two different measures of confidence.

Neighbourhood policing and residents’ perceptions of their neighbourhood

Perceiving that the police understood and were dealing with the things that mattered to the local community was the most important factor associated with being confident in the local police. Residents’ perceptions of their neighbourhoods – low levels of anti-social behaviour and less crime than previously – were also associated with higher odds of being confident. It, therefore, follows that effective implementation of neighbourhood policing may impact positively on measures of confidence. Future iterations of the work presented here, based on more recent BCS data, will be able to assess the potential impact on this measure of confidence of two key mechanisms for delivering neighbourhood policing – visible foot patrol and participation in community engagement activity.

Although it could not be considered in this study, research by the Metropolitan Police suggests that residents who feel informed about what the police are doing in their area are more confident. It seems plausible that receiving appropriate information could improve perceptions that the police are dealing with local issues. Providing residents with an accurate picture of local trends in crime may also be important, though there is currently only limited evidence to support this theory. More work needs to be undertaken in this area, in particular to determine the type of information that various different people would like, how regularly, and in what format.

Treating people fairly

Perceiving that the police treated everyone fairly and with respect was also associated with higher odds of being confident. This suggests that, in order for gains in confidence to be realised, officers must be seen to conduct any police work that involves interaction with the public, including response policing and investigation activity, in a fair and equitable way.

This finding reinforces even more the need for a targeted neighbourhood policing model. It might be suggested that zero-tolerance policing, with its emphasis on enforcement for minor offences, may impact on people’s perceptions of anti-social behaviour in their neighbourhood. However, when implemented in New York, this more aggressive, results driven style of policing was associated with reduced levels of confidence, particularly among minority communities. Officers should, therefore, ensure that they are seen to treat members of all neighbourhoods and communities fairly and with respect whenever they come into contact with them.

Is the quality of specific police-public contact important?

Satisfaction with specific encounters with the police appears to be important in relation to general public confidence. People who approached the police for help and received a satisfactory response had higher odds of being confident than people who had not contacted the police. This finding suggests, in contrast to some previous research findings, that there is some scope for good quality service to impact on overall confidence in the police.
However, less than half of people surveyed actually had specific contact with the police in the previous year and not all of this contact was public-initiated. Satisfactory police-initiated contact was not associated with higher odds of being confident. Contact which a member of the public perceived as unsatisfactory was associated with lower odds of being confident, whether this contact was public or police-initiated.

In this sense, then, providing a satisfactory service to the public in specific encounters may be seen as less important in respect of improving general confidence than dealing with neighbourhood priorities and being seen more generally to treat people fairly and with respect. However, providing a quality service in specific encounters is important, as unsatisfactory contact, in any situation, may have a negative impact on general confidence. Although not a consideration in this study, other research has suggested that negative contacts may accumulate as a pool of vicarious experiences that may be as damaging to general confidence as the original, poorly handled encounter.

Further to this, it appears that any police-initiated contact – whether satisfactory or otherwise – has the potential to reduce confidence among Pakistani and Bangladeshi citizens. Police-initiated in this context refers only to formal contacts such as stops. Proactive community engagement with such communities is likely to have a more positive impact, though this could not be explored specifically in this study.

Ethnicity and confidence

Ethnicity was found not to be associated with public confidence, independent of other factors. This finding suggests that the differences in levels of confidence between ethnic groups stem from interactions of other factors – most likely perceptions of police activity and perceptions of local neighbourhoods.

For the alternative measure, Black Caribbean respondents’ confidence in the police was statistically significantly lower than that for any other ethnic group. This difference suggests that policy makers and practitioners should examine carefully factors such as perceptions of fairness and their potential impact on confidence for this specific ethnic group.

Citizen focused policing

The principles of citizen focus emphasise organisational and cultural change, focusing on the needs of individuals and communities, and improving the experience of those who have contact with the police. The potential positive impact of effective operational programmes, such as neighbourhood policing, may not be fully realised without this wider framework.

Community engagement – sharing information, consulting and acting in partnership with the public – is a key delivery mechanism for citizen focus, and indeed neighbourhood policing. Engaging with communities in order to deliver policing in a more citizen focused way may be key to improving public confidence.

How should we measure public confidence in the police?

The question favoured until recently by the Home Office to measure public confidence in the police asks people ‘how good a job’ they think the police in their local area are doing. Key factors associated with confidence by this measure related to police
effectiveness in dealing with issues that matter to the community and satisfaction with previous encounters with the police. However, aspects of procedural justice – fair and respectful treatment – were also found to be associated with this measure, suggesting there may be some scope for the SPI 2a question to act as a proxy measure of trust in the police. This should be further investigated. US researchers have tended to combine questions on effectiveness with more explicit questions on prospective confidence when conceptualising trust in the police.

It was hypothesised that an alternative measure of confidence included in the BCS, asking respondents to ‘agree’ or ‘disagree’ with the statement ‘I have confidence in the police in this area’, could be used as a more prospective measure. However, the fact that an almost identical set of factors was associated with this alternative measure suggests that it is similar empirically to the existing SPI 2a question.

PSA 23, introduced in April 2008, focused on the public’s perceptions of how effectively the police and local council were tackling crime and anti-social behaviour issues of greatest priority locally. Work is being undertaken to see whether the factors associated with confidence presented in this report are also associated with the new PSA. As the new PSA is concerned with increasing public confidence in the police and their partners in tackling crime and anti-social behaviour, it will be important for ongoing theoretical and empirical research to explore how wider aspects of public confidence in the police might be assessed in the future. Measurement of these broader issues – specifically trust in how the police will be able to perform their role in the future – are likely to be critical if the potential benefits of the procedural justice model, such as greater cooperation with the police and compliance with the law, are to be fully realised.

Box 5: Implications of this research

- Neighbourhood policing should continue to be embedded within a wider framework of citizen focus.
  - Neighbourhood policing teams should concentrate on improving residents’ perceptions of their neighbourhood, by understanding and dealing with things that matter to local people.

- All police officers and staff, including those involved in response policing and investigations, should be aware of the importance of providing a service that is satisfactory to members of the public.

- The Police Service should attempt to engage positively with residents of low socio-economic status neighbourhoods and with ‘hard-to-reach’ and minority groups.

- Work should be undertaken to define precisely what is meant by public confidence in the police and to explore more thoroughly measures for aspects of confidence that are associated with trust and legitimacy, as well as confidence in how the police are dealing with existing problems.
  - Developing robust measures of trust in and cooperation with the police, and compliance with the law, will allow testing of the ‘procedural justice’ model (fair and respectful treatment fosters trust and legitimacy, which in turn leads to cooperation and compliance) in a UK context.
APPENDIX A – METHODOLOGY

British Crime Survey data on public confidence in the local police from 2005/06 was used for this study.

**Bivariate analysis**

Bivariate data analysis gives an idea of whether a specific independent variable (such as ethnicity) is associated with a dependent variable (such as confidence in the police). However, independent variables may be correlated with each other and looking at this simple relationship alone will not give an indication of which are the most important associations.

Bivariate analysis was undertaken to help choose independent variables to include in multivariate statistical models.

**Multivariate analysis – logistic regression**

The purpose of multivariate analysis is to identify the factors (independent variables) that are associated with an outcome (or dependent) variable. As public confidence in the local police is generally used as a binary variable – whether the police do a good or excellent job, or a fair or poor job – logistic regression was the technique used in order to determine the key factors associated with public confidence.

Logistic regression analysis produces ‘odds ratios’ that indicate which category within the independent variable is most likely to be associated with the dependent variable. Each independent variable was a question that had two or more possible response options. One response option is chosen as the ‘reference category’ – the category to which the odds for other categories in the variable are compared with. In this study, reference categories were chosen as, theoretically, the most appropriate (e.g., having had no contact with the police, which allows comparison with positive and negative contacts). If there was no appropriate reference category, the category with the lowest odds ratio became the reference by default.

Independent variables can also be ordered by the amount of variance in the dependent variable that the independent variable explains – the greater the amount of variance explained, the greater the strength of association. However, in social science research, the amount of variance explained by multivariate models is reasonably low, and in this study was approximately one-third. This study concentrates mainly on reporting the odds ratios.

**Structure of the analysis**

The dependent variables were derived from the following:

- ‘Taking everything into account, how good a job do you think the police in this area are doing?’
- ‘Taking everything into account I have confidence in the police in this area.’

Three logistic regression models were run for both dependent variables. This was necessary because of the structure of the BCS, whereby the sample is split at certain points during the interview. Questions relating to contact with the police and detailed questions relating to anti-social behaviour and social cohesion appear in different
modules, and so are asked of different people. It is not possible to include these variables in the same regression model. By running three models, it was possible to examine whether variables associated with anti-social behaviour and community cohesion, and type of police force area, were associated with confidence, independently of variables it was possible to include in all models.

Model 1 included only variables derived from questions asked to the full BCS sample, so it was possible to include police force area.

Model 3 contained variables relating to community cohesion, civic participation, and the frequency of experience of anti-social behaviour and its perceived impact on quality of life.

As police force area, community cohesion and civic participation, and more detailed anti-social behaviour factors were either not associated, or did not increase greatly the odds of being confident, it was decided to use Model 2 – which included variables associated with police contact – as the basis for the final regression models.

The independent variables common to all models were:

- Feelings of safety
- Worry about crime
- Perception of the crime rate
- Perceived impact of crime on quality of life
- Perceived anti-social behaviour
- Personal experience of victimisation
- Whether the respondent had witnessed crime
- Neighbourhood policing – whether the police deal with the things that matter
- Police treatment of citizens – whether the police treat everyone fairly
- Sex
- Age
- Ethnicity
- Religion
- Employment status
- Newspaper readership
- Index of multiple deprivation
- Household income
- Housing tenure
- Education
- Whether respondent lives in a rural or urban area.

Independent variables included in specific models were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police force area</td>
<td>Police-initiated contact with the police</td>
<td>Witnessing ASB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public-initiated contact with the police</td>
<td>Impact of ASB on quality of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community cohesion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Civic participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Respondent rating of their neighbourhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>as a place to live</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX B – LOGISTIC REGRESSION TABLES

#### Table A.1: Logistic regression model for public confidence in the local police

‘Taking everything into account, how good a job do you think the police in this area are doing?’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005/06 BCS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Odds ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The police in this area are dealing with the things that matter to people in this community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The police in this area treat everyone fairly regardless of who they are</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of the local crime rate in the previous two years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with the police (public initiated)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of anti-social behaviour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper readership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural/urban classification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with the police (police initiated)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witnessing crime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing tenure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Odds ratio Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Odds ratio</th>
<th>Sig²</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More crime</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same amount of crime</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less crime</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More crime</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No contact</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No ASB</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some ASB</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High ASB</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabloid</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadsheet</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/ several</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45+</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No contact</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witness</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a witness</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O level/GCSE</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprentice; A/AS level</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree or Diploma</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owners</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social renters</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private renters</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Reference category</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.15 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings of safety walking alone after the dark</td>
<td>Safe</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.14 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsafe</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline odds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0.12</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unweighted base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11,048</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. All variables included in the table were significantly associated with being confident in the police (the dependent/outcome variable) after controlling for other variables. The highlighted variables contributed 1% or more to the variance explained by the model. The remaining variables contributed less than 1% to the variance explained by the model.

2. Odds ratios of greater than one indicate higher odds of being confident in the local police compared with the reference category in that variable; less than one indicates lower odds. The baseline odds are the odds ratios for a model with only a constant term.

3. Statistical significance at the 5% level is indicated by **; significance at the 10% level is indicated by *.

4. Variables included in the analysis but not found to be statistically significantly associated with the dependent variable were: ethnicity, religion, respondent employment status, index of multiple deprivation, household income, worry about personal crime, victimisation.

5. The Nagelkerke R square statistic indicates the extent to which the variation in the dependent variable is explained by the model. In this case the measure was 0.31, indicating that 31 per cent of the variation was explained by the variables included in the model.

6. The type of logistic regression carried out was forward stepwise. This was carried out using SPSS.

7. Data for England only.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'Taking everything into account, how good a job do you think the police in this area are doing?'</th>
<th>2005/06 BCS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Odds ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The police in this area are dealing with the things that matter to people in this community</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The police in this area treat everyone fairly regardless of who they are</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witnessing a crime</td>
<td>Witness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not a witness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with the police (public initiated)</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victimisation</td>
<td>Non-victim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of anti-social behaviour</td>
<td>No ASB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some ASB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High ASB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline odds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unweighted base 427

1. All variables included in the table were significantly associated with being confident in the police (the dependent/outcome variable) after controlling for other variables. The **highlighted** variables contributed 1% or more to the variance explained by the model. The remaining variables contributed less than 1% to the variance explained by the model.
2. Odds ratios of greater than one indicate higher odds of being confident in the local police compared with the reference category in that variable; less than one indicates lower odds. The baseline odds are the odds ratios for a model with only a constant term.
3. Significance at the 5% level is indicated by **; significance at the 10% level is indicated by *.
4. Variables included in the analysis but not found to be statistically significantly associated with the dependent variable were: age, religion, newspaper readership, household income, housing tenure, education, perception of local crime rate in the previous two years, contact with the police (police-initiated).
5. The Nagelkerke R square statistic indicates the extent to which the variation in the dependent variable is explained by the model. In this case the measure was 0.36, indicating that 36% of the variation was explained by the variables included in the model.
6. The type of logistic regression carried out was forward stepwise. This was carried out using SPSS.
7. Data for England only.
Table A.3: Logistic regression model for public confidence in the local police: Black African respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Taking everything into account, how good a job do you think the police in this area are doing?’</th>
<th>2005/06 BCS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Odds ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The police in this area are dealing with the things that matter to people in this community</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>6.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The police in this area treat everyone fairly regardless of who they are</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceptions of the local crime rate in the previous two years</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More crime</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The same</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less crime</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline odds</strong></td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. All variables included in the table were significantly associated with being confident in the police (the dependent/outcome variable) after controlling for other variables. The highlighted variables contributed 1% or more to the variance explained by the model. The remaining variables contributed less than 1% to the variance explained by the model.
2. Odds ratios of greater than one indicate higher odds of being confident in the local police compared with the reference category in that variable; less than one indicates lower odds. The baseline odds are the odds ratios for a model with only a constant term.
3. Significance at the 5% level is indicated by **; significance at the 10% level is indicated by *.
4. Variables included in the analysis but not found to be statistically significantly associated with the dependent variable were: age, newspaper readership, household income, perceptions of anti-social behaviour, victimisation, witnessing crime, contact with the police (both public and police-initiated).
5. The Nagelkerke R square statistic indicates the extent to which the variation in the dependent variable is explained by the model. In this case the measure was 0.35, indicating that 35% of the variation was explained by the variables included in the model.
6. The type of logistic regression carried out was forward stepwise. This was carried out using SPSS.
7. Data for England only.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'Taking everything into account, how good a job do you think the police in this area are doing?'</th>
<th>2005/06 BCS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The police in this area are dealing with the things that matter to people in this community</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceptions of anti-social behaviour</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No ASB</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some ASB</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High ASB</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact with the police (public initiated)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No contact</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The police in this area treat everyone fairly regardless of who they are</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O level/GCSE</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprentice; A/AS level</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree or Diploma</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact with the police (police initiated)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No contact</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline odds</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline odds</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unweighted base: 635

1. All variables included in the table were significantly associated with being confident in the police (the dependent/outcome variable) after controlling for other variables. The highlighted variables contributed 1% or more to the variance explained by the model. The remaining variables contributed less than 1% to the variance explained by the model.
2. Odds ratios of greater than one indicate higher odds of being confident in the local police compared with the reference category in that variable; less than one indicates lower odds. The baseline odds are the odds ratios for a model with only a constant term.
3. Significance at the 5% level is indicated by **; significance at the 10% level is indicated by *.
4. Variables included in the analysis but not found to be statistically significantly associated with the dependent variable were: sex, age, religion, employment status, newspaper readership, index of multiple deprivation, household income, housing tenure, feelings of safety walking alone after dark, worry about being the victim of crime, perceptions of the local crime rate in the previous two years, victimisation, witnessing a crime.
5. The Nagelkerke R square statistic indicates the extent to which the variation in the dependent variable is explained by the model. In this case the measure was 0.36, indicating that 36% of the variation was explained by the variables included in the model.
6. The type of logistic regression carried out was forward stepwise. This was carried out using SPSS.
7. Data for England only.
Table A.5: Logistic regression model for public confidence in the local police: Pakistani and Bangladeshi respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Taking everything into account, how good a job do you think the police in this area are doing?’</th>
<th>2005/06 BCS</th>
<th>Odds ratio</th>
<th>Sig(^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The police in this area treat everyone fairly regardless of who they are</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Reference category</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The police in this area are dealing with the things that matter to people in this community</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Reference category</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witnessing crime</td>
<td>Seen</td>
<td>Reference category</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not seen</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of anti-social behaviour</td>
<td>No ASB</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some ASB</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High ASB</td>
<td>Reference category</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing tenure</td>
<td>Owners</td>
<td>Reference category</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social renters</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private renters</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Reference category</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O level/GCSE</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apprentice; A/AS level</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree or Diploma</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with the police (public initiated)</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No contact</td>
<td>Reference category</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline odds</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unweighted base 556

1. All variables included in the table were significantly associated with being confident in the police (the dependent/outcome variable) after controlling for other variables. The highlighted variables contributed 1% or more to the variance explained by the model. The remaining variables contributed less than 1% to the variance explained by the model.
2. Odds ratios of greater than one indicate higher odds of being confident in the local police compared with the reference category in that variable; less than one indicates lower odds. The baseline odds are the odds ratios for a model with only a constant term.
3. Significance at the 5% level is indicated by **; significance at the 10% level is indicated by *.
4. Variables included in the analysis but not found to be statistically significantly associated with the dependent variable were: age, religion, employment status, newspaper readership, index of multiple deprivation, household income, feelings of safety walking alone after dark, worry about personal crime, perceptions of the local crime in the previous two years, victimisation, contact with the police (police-initiated).
5. The Nagelkerke R square statistic indicates the extent to which the variation in the dependent variable is explained by the model. In this case the measure was 0.38, indicating that 38% of the variation was explained by the variables included in the model.
6. The type of logistic regression carried out was forward stepwise. This was carried out using SPSS.
7. Data for England only.
Table A.6: Logistic regression model for alternative measure of public confidence in the local police

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'Taking everything into account I have confidence in the police in this area'</th>
<th>2005/06 BCS</th>
<th>Odds ratio</th>
<th>Sig*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The police in this area are dealing with the things that matter to people in this community</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>10.24</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Reference category</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The police in this area treat everyone fairly regardless of who they are</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Reference category</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of anti-social behaviour</td>
<td>No ASB</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some ASB</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High ASB</td>
<td>Reference category</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with the police (public initiated)</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No contact</td>
<td>Reference category</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper readership</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Reference category</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabloid</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadsheet</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/several</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of the local crime rate in the previous two years</td>
<td>More crime</td>
<td>Reference category</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same amount of crime</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less crime</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with the police (police initiated)</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No contact</td>
<td>Reference category</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings of safety walking alone after dark</td>
<td>Safe</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe</td>
<td>Reference category</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Reference category</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing tenure</td>
<td>Owners</td>
<td>Reference category</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social renters</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private renters</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witnessing crime</td>
<td>Witness</td>
<td>Reference category</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a witness</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>Reference category</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45+</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline odds</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. All variables included in the table were significantly associated with being confident in the police (the dependent/outcome variable) after controlling for other variables. The highlighted variables contributed 1% or more to the variance explained by the model. The remaining variables contributed less than 1% to the variance explained by the model.
2. Odds ratios of greater than one indicate higher odds of being confident in the local police compared with the reference category in that variable; less than one indicates lower odds. The baseline odds are the odds ratios for a model with only a constant term.

3. Significance at the 5% level is indicated by **; significance at the 10% level is indicated by *.

4. Variables included in the analysis but not found to be statistically significantly associated with the dependent variable were: ethnicity, religion, employment status, index of multiple deprivation, household income, education, rural or urban, worry about personal crime, victimisation.

5. The Nagelkerke R square statistic indicates the extent to which the variation in the dependent variable is explained by the model. In this case the measure was 0.47, indicating that 47% of the variation was explained by the variables included in the model.

6. The type of logistic regression carried out was forward stepwise. This was carried out using SPSS.

7. Data for England only.
Table A.7: Logistic regression model for alternative measure of public confidence in the local police: Black Caribbean respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'Taking everything into account I have confidence in the police in this area'</th>
<th>2005/06 BCS</th>
<th>Odds ratio</th>
<th>Sig(^3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The police in this area are dealing with the things that matter to people in this community</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.03 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Reference category</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The police in this area treat everyone fairly regardless of who they are</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.52 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Reference category</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with the police (public initiated)</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td>.11 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No contact</td>
<td>Reference category</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline odds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. All variables included in the table were significantly associated with being confident in the police (the dependent/outcome variable) after controlling for other variables. The highlighted variables contributed 1% or more to the variance explained by the model. The remaining variables contributed less than 1% to the variance explained by the model.
2. Odds ratios of greater than one indicate higher odds of being confident in the local police compared with the reference category in that variable; less than one indicates lower odds. The baseline odds are the odds ratios for a model with only a constant term.
3. Significance at the 5% level is indicated by **; significance at the 10% level is indicated by *.
4. Variables included in the analysis but not found to be statistically significantly associated with the dependent variable were: age, religion, newspaper readership, household income, housing tenure, education, perception of local crime rate in the previous two years, perceptions of anti-social behaviour, victimisation, witnessing a crime, contact with the police (police-initiated).
5. The Nagelkerke R square statistic indicates the extent to which the variation in the dependent variable is explained by the model. In this case the measure was 0.60, indicating that 60% of the variation was explained by the variables included in the model.
6. The type of logistic regression carried out was forward stepwise. This was carried out using SPSS.
7. Data for England only.
Table A.8: Logistic regression model for alternative measure of public confidence in the local police: Black African respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'Taking everything into account I have confidence in the police in this area'</th>
<th>2005/06 BCS</th>
<th>Odds ratio</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The police in this area treat everyone fairly regardless of who they are</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>10.54</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Reference category</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Reference category</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The police in this area are dealing with the things that matter to people in this community</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Reference category</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of anti-social behaviour</td>
<td>No ASB</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some ASB</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High ASB</td>
<td>Reference category</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with the police (public initiated)</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No contact</td>
<td>Reference category</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>Reference category</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45+</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline odds</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unweighted base 365

1. All variables included in the table were significantly associated with being confident in the police (the dependent/outcome variable) after controlling for other variables. The highlighted variables contributed 1% or more to the variance explained by the model. The remaining variables contributed less than 1% to the variance explained by the model.
2. Odds ratios of greater than one indicate higher odds of being confident in the local police compared with the reference category in that variable; less than one indicates lower odds. The baseline odds are the odds ratios for a model with only a constant term.
3. Significance at the 5% level is indicated by **; significance at the 10% level is indicated by *.
4. Variables included in the analysis but not found to be statistically significantly associated with the dependent variable were: newspaper readership, household income, perceptions of the local crime rate in the previous two years, victimisation, witnessing crime, contact with the police (police-initiated).
5. The Nagelkerke R square statistic indicates the extent to which the variation in the dependent variable is explained by the model. In this case the measure was 0.51, indicating that 51% of the variation was explained by the variables included in the model.
6. The type of logistic regression carried out was forward stepwise. This was carried out using SPSS.
7. Data for England only.
Table A.9: Logistic regression model for alternative measure of public confidence in the local police: Indian respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'Taking everything into account I have confidence in the police in this area'</th>
<th>2005/06 BCS</th>
<th>Odds ratio</th>
<th>Sig*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The police in this area are dealing with the things that matter to people in this community</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Reference category</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The police in this area treat everyone fairly regardless of who they are</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Reference category</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worry about being the victim of crime</td>
<td>Not worried</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some worry</td>
<td>Reference category</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High worry</td>
<td>Reference category</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with the police (public initiated)</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>Reference category</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No contact</td>
<td>Reference category</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline odds</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unweighted base 646

1. All variables included in the table were significantly associated with being confident in the police (the dependent/outcome variable) after controlling for other variables. The highlighted variables contributed 1% or more to the variance explained by the model. The remaining variables contributed less than 1% to the variance explained by the model.
2. Odds ratios of greater than one indicate higher odds of being confident in the local police compared with the reference category in that variable; less than one indicates lower odds. The baseline odds are the odds ratios for a model with only a constant term.
3. Significance at the 5% level is indicated by **; significance at the 10% level is indicated by *.
4. Variables included in the analysis but not found to be statistically significantly associated with the dependent variable were: sex, age, religion, employment status, newspaper readership, index of multiple deprivation, household income, housing tenure, education, feelings of safety walking alone after dark, perceptions of the local crime rate in the previous two years, perceptions of anti-social behaviour, victimisation, witnessing a crime, contact with the police (police-initiated).
5. The Nagelkerke R square statistic indicates the extent to which the variation in the dependent variable is explained by the model. In this case the measure was 0.49, indicating that 49% of the variation was explained by the variables included in the model.
6. The type of logistic regression carried out was forward stepwise. This was carried out using SPSS.
7. Data for England only.
Table A.10: Logistic regression model for alternative measure of public confidence in the local police: Pakistani and Bangladeshi respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005/06 BCS</th>
<th>Odds ratio</th>
<th>Sig³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>‘Taking everything into account I have confidence in the police in this area’</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The police in this area treat everyone fairly regardless of who they are</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The police in this area are dealing with the things that matter to people in this community</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with the police (public initiated)</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No contact</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of the local crime rate in the previous two years</td>
<td>More crime</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less crime</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with the police (police initiated)</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No contact</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline odds</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. All variables included in the table were significantly associated with being confident in the police (the dependent/outcome variable) after controlling for other variables. The highlighted variables contributed 1% or more to the variance explained by the model. The remaining variables contributed less than 1% to the variance explained by the model.

2. Odds ratios of greater than one indicate higher odds of being confident in the local police compared with the reference category in that variable; less than one indicates lower odds. The baseline odds are the odds ratios for a model with only a constant term.

3. Significance at the 5% level is indicated by **; significance at the 10% level is indicated by *.

4. Variables included in the analysis but not found to be statistically significantly associated with the dependent variable were: sex, age, religion, newspaper readership, index of multiple deprivation, household income, housing tenure, education, feelings of safety walking alone after dark, worry about personal crime, perceptions of anti-social behaviour, victimisation, witnessing a crime.

5. The Nagelkerke R square statistic indicates the extent to which the variation in the dependent variable is explained by the model. In this case the measure was 0.51, indicating that 51% of the variation was explained by the variables included in the model.

6. The type of logistic regression carried out was forward stepwise. This was carried out using SPSS.

7. Data for England only.
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