

Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Summary	3
3. Measuring Anti-Social Behaviour	5
Why bother measuring perceptions?	5
Perceptions = reality	7
A uniform measure for ASB: the 7-Strand Index	8
4. Trends in Perceptions	10
National trends from the British Crime Survey (1992-2006)	10
Trends from the BVPIs (2003-6)	10
Other Trends – Regeneration areas	13
5. The Importance of Place: Developing a Predictive Model	13
ASB and deprivation	14
Population density	14
Population profiles	15
Constructing a predictive model	16
6. Frontiers Analysis: How do Areas Compare?	18
Areas with less/more ASB than expected	19
Trends by region, authority type and Respect Area	20
London Boroughs	21
Mets and Unitaries	21
Districts	22
Counties	23
7. Next Steps: Explaining Variations	24
The impact of ASBOs?	24
The role of communications	25
Next steps	26
8. Full Area Results	27

1. Introduction

Background

Welcome to *Anti-Sacial Behaviour: People, Place and Perceptions*. This report is the first to map how anti-social behaviour is perceived at a local level across all parts of England and how these views are changing over time. Tailored analysis enables us to identify where perceptions are not as we might expect; in some areas perceptions of anti-social behaviour are better than we would predict, in others they are worse.

This report comes at a critical point. The appraisals of Tony Blair's 10 years of power have been quick to label his term as a success or failure across different key areas of policy. However, when it comes to one of his personal priorities, the tackling of anti-social behaviour and instilling of a "proper sense of respect" in our communities, the commentators have been notably non-committal.

So, do we believe that the neighbourhoods of Britain in 2007 are more respectful and more law-abiding than those 10 years ago? Has the outgoing Prime Minister fulfilled his ambition to "bring back a proper sense of respect in our schools, in our communities, in our towns and our villages?" or has it, in the words of David Cameron, merely been a case of "New Labour nannying".

Well, anxieties and fears around anti-social behaviour have certainly not disappeared but at the same time there are indications that we are now less concerned than we were. Is it simply too complex an issue to fully comprehend, let alone resolve, or is it something that we don't like to admit is actually getting better?

Whatever the answers, whilst it continues to top local issues of concern – and it does – how best to deal with anti-social behaviour remains a key battle ground for the main political parties.

This report

Previous Ipsos MORI analysis has shown the importance of place on people's perceptions of local public services. For example, our series of "Frontiers of Performance in Local Government" reports have consistently shown how some authorities face greater challenges than others in providing services to a diverse and changing population and in terms of the prevailing local social and economic climate in which they operate. Accordingly, those facing more challenging local conditions tend to obtain lower satisfaction ratings from residents at an absolute level. It is only by taking these relevant local factors into account that we can start to level the playing field and assess performance on a like-for-like basis.

We have also measured and modelled the impact of local area characteristics on ratings of housing, health services and local transport. These reports have represented a step change in the way local areas assess their own performance, moving us beyond the limited-value league tables format.

For the first time, we have used similar techniques to determine what local area characteristics play a role in determining perceived levels of anti-social behaviour and to what extent. Taking this forward, we have identified how different areas fare in terms of how local residents feel about anti-social behaviour compared to how we would *predict* them to feel, given the type of area they live in.

We have analysed data from the 2006/07 BVPI General User Surveys¹. These mandatory self-completion surveys are undertaken triennially by all English local authorities and results are collated by the Department for Communities and Local Government (CLG) and the Audit Commission. The 2006 survey includes a set of questions on anti-social behaviour (as it did previously in 2003/04, but not in 2000) and represents the only survey with enough responses to enable robust analysis at a local authority level.²

It is the responses to these questions that have been used within our Frontiers analysis. This analysis is based on the consideration of a number of exogenous factors, such as deprivation and population density, which initial regression-based analysis shows to have strong relationships with, and impacts upon, residents' views. This data is then linked to perceptions of anti-social behaviour in order to present an accurate assessment of how perceptions compare across areas, taking into account local circumstance.

Fundamentally, this report brings the role of *place* into our assessment of how anti-social behaviour is perceived. Of course, many of the aspects identified as being important in determining how people feel about anti-social behaviour will be intuitive (indeed, previous studies have already identified the correlation with levels of local deprivation, for example). However, by quantifying the impact of different factors we can begin to reveal how much scope there might be to change perceptions, but also identify areas where residents – for whatever reason – are more/less concerned about anti-social behaviour than they should be given the characteristics of the local area.

This report is not about identifying "good" or "poor" performers. By its nature, anti-social behaviour covers a multitude of issues requiring action from a range of local agencies. No single agency can therefore be accountable for any relative local findings contained within this analysis. Moreover, our key objective in producing this analysis is to progress discussion around the reasons for variations in perceptions across the country, and in doing so, reinforce the benefits for future policy to carefully consider the impact of *place*.

¹ Also referred to as Local Government User Satisfaction Survey (LGUSS)

² Further details at www.audit-commission.gov.uk/performance/dataprovision.asp

The importance of perceptual measures

By definition, the scale and impact of anti-social behaviour can only be measured by gauging the perceptions of those whose lives are affected by such behaviour. These survey measures continually show anti-social behaviour issues to be at the forefront of local concerns, surpassing the more traditional responsibilities attached to relevant local public service providers.

The 7-strand anti-social behaviour index aggregates the extent to which residents classify different local issues as being problematic in their local areas. These range from environmental-related concerns of *rubbish and litter lying around* and *abandoned or burnt out cars*, through to *vandalism, graffiti and other deliberate damage, people being drunk or rowdy, people using or dealing drugs, teenagers hanging around on the streets* and *noisy neighbours or loud parties*. It is this 7-strand index measure that we use as the key perceptual indicator in our analysis.

Perceptions of anti-social behaviour have improved – but to what extent?

Trends in perceptions from the British Crime Survey indicate an increase in perceptions of anti-social behaviour from the early 1990s through to 2002/03, when concerns tended to peak. They then reversed sharply in a positive direction before generally levelling out in recent years.

As cited in the National Audit Office's 'Tackling anti-social behaviour' report (2006), since 2003, the overall trend in the 7-strand index measure has been positive, with a decline of four percentage points in the proportion of the British public rating anti-social behaviour as "high" in their areas (down from 21% in 2003 to 17% at the end of 2006) The Best Value Performance Indicator (BVPI) surveys indicate a sharper improvement in perceptions, with a 15 percentage point decrease in perceptions of anti-social behaviour over the same period.

This positive shift recorded in the BVPI surveys has been largely driven by declining numbers of residents perceiving drunkenness, abandoned cars, vandalism and graffiti and people using or dealing drugs as big problems in their area. In contrast, the proportion who report teenagers hanging around on the streets as a big problem has remained static over the same period.

Place matters

The variations in perceptions of anti-social behaviour across England are vast; 5% in City of London, up to 53% in Newham. But any absolute comparisons are meaningless. Those areas appearing at the "top" of a list of perceptions of anti-social behaviour bear no relation to those at the "bottom" in terms of demographic make-up, levels of local deprivation, size, local infrastructure, etc.

Our Frontiers analysis enables us to predict the levels of perceived anti-social behaviour we might expect to see in an area, given the local prevailing conditions. By knowing the level of deprivation, population density, population inflow, recorded level of violent crime and proportion of residents aged 25 years and under in a local authority area we can predict the likely level of perceived anti-social behaviour in that area to within relatively small ranges.

Applying this model allows us to compare *predicted* perceptions with *actual* perceptions and identify areas where perceptions are better, worse, or as predicted. The patterns of relative "performance" illustrate no clear-cut patterns by geography or authority type, although on the whole, areas in the West Midlands and North West tend to fare better than those in London and the South East. This reflects the finding that Metropolitan areas perform particularly well in terms of higher perceptions of anti-social behaviour, below what we would predict. Notably the Government's 40 Respect Areas are significantly more likely to record lower than predicted anti-social behaviour ratings. There are significant variations in performance within authority types, with some areas performing well above or below their neighbours.

Next steps

This analysis ensures we are now in a better position to identify where perceptions of anti-social behaviour are exceeding or falling short of realistic expectations. The next step will be to explore *why* different areas fall into these categories.

An initial glance at those areas at the top and bottom of the lists would not immediately suggest a host of common themes around localised issues or types of areas. Further exploration may reveal the relative impact of factors such as communications, use of relevant tools and powers, preventative measures, displacement activities, and other factors over which local agencies may have varying degrees of control.

Identifying the reasons behind the variances across local areas will be a major challenge, but an important one if we are to ensure that efforts to tackle antisocial behaviour are most effectively targeted.

> Ashley Ames Helen Powell Joanne Crouch Dan Tse

> > June 2007

3. Measuring Anti-Social Behaviour

This chapter observes the relative priority that the general public place on antisocial behaviour issues, as well as the importance of perceptual data given the personal impact of such behaviour and the absence of 'hard' measures. We also outline the widely-used tools for measuring perceptions of anti-social behaviour.

Why bother measuring perceptions?

The Ipsos MORI Political Tracker continually highlights the prominence of law and order issues amongst public concerns; indeed, it tops the list of concerns in our April 2007 measure.



In the absence of particularly high-profile domestic crime cases in recent months, we can assume that the scale of importance attached to law and order reflects ongoing concerns around violent crime, drugs, leniency of sentences and antisocial behaviour (highlighted as the most frequent concerns in separate regular polling we conduct specifically on law and order issues).

Further evidence of the salience of anti-social behaviour concerns in local communities can be drawn from responses to quality of life questions in the recent BVPI surveys. The two issues most likely to be cited as being in need of improvement across the country are *activities for teenagers* and *level of crime*, both of which we know from our wide-ranging local area-based work reflect concerns



around anti-social behaviour (respondents were not provided with an option relating specifically to "anti-social behaviour" in the survey).

Ipsos MORI

Public priorities for improvement

Q. Thinking about this local area, which of the things below, if any, do you think most need improving?



There is a correlation between satisfaction with the council and perception of anti-social behaviour. Where satisfaction levels with the council are high, residents are less likely to perceive anti-social behaviour as a problem. There are of course links to deprivation - councils operating in deprived areas often are not rated well by their residents and are also the areas most closely linked to high perceived levels of anti-social behaviour.



Perceptions = reality

Much is written about the Perception Gap in relation to crime; i.e. the perception of crime (as measured by surveys) is much greater than the reality (as measured via official police records³). However, when it comes to many of the issues which make up anti-social behaviour, then in the absence of "official" records⁴, perceptions are the only measure of reality. Indeed, by definition, this should be the case. If we are defining ASB as "behaviour which causes or is likely to cause harassment, alarm or distress to one or more persons not in the same household"⁵, then the critical measure is that of the negative impact on others.

Survey measures are therefore critical when measuring anti-social behaviour. They are the only robust and meaningful way of assessing changes in perceptions and hence play a vital role in determining the degree to which activity designed to tackle anti-social behaviour has been successful. Indeed, the Criminal Justice System's PSA 2 target relates specifically to perceptual measures: *"the penentage of people who feel anti-social behaviour to be a very or fairly big problem is lower than in the baseline year"*.

³ Although we must acknowledge that the 'true' figure of crime is somewhat difficult to come by, and estimates vary enormously - Lord Birt estimated that in 1999-2000 130 million crimes were committed, which was around nine times the British Crime Survey estimate and nearly 26 times the police recorded crime figure. See Garside R, *Right for the wrong reasons: Making sense of criminal justice failure*; Crime and Society Foundation 2006

⁴ To date there remains only one offical count of reported ASB activity– when around 66,000 reports of ASB were made to authorities during the "One day count of anti-social behaviour" on September 10th 2003

⁵ Crime and Disorder Act 1998, Home Office

Like all perceptual measures, the data obtained may be influenced by various factors. As well as the data collection process itself (type of survey, how a question is asked, types of respondents, etc), there are the complexities of how a respondent forms their opinions about ASB. Here, actual experience will mingle with what they have heard direct from others, what they have seen, heard or read via the media, how they like to come across in surveys, as well as their more general outlook on life when formulating their stated opinion.

However, given the focus within this report on trends over time and comparisons across areas (as opposed to individual ratings), then these factors become less pertinent.

A uniform measure for ASB: the 7-Strand Index

The Home Office uses a 7-strand index score as an overall measure of anti-social behaviour. This combines respondents' ratings on seven key issues:



Respondents rate each of the above issues on a four-point scale; "Not a problem at all", "Not a very big problem", "A fairly big problem" or "A very big problem". The question is worded to focus attention on the respondent's *local area*.

A single 7-strand index score is obtained by firstly assigning each survey respondent a numerical score based on their responses to the seven key questions

and then determining the proportion who have scored above ("High ASB") or below ("Low ASB") a specific value⁶.

Collecting perceptions: British Crime Survey and BVPIs

The Home Office measures perceptions of anti-social behaviour on an ongoing basis via the **British Crime Survey (BCS)**. The BCS is a nationally representative survey of British adults, with over 50,000 face-to-face interviews conducted each year. The questionnaire includes perceptions of anti-social behaviour (via the seven strand index questions – see above), amongst a range of other measures relating to experience of crime, risk factors, attitudes towards crime and attitudes towards the Criminal Justice System. The size and structure of the survey ensures that the quarterly national trends in perceptions of anti-social behaviour are highly robust and reliable.

The constituent questions which make up the 7-strand index were also included in the 2003 and 2006 **BVPI General User Surveys**.⁷ These mandatory selfcompletion surveys are undertaken triennially by all English local authorities and results are collated by the Department for Communities and Local Government (CLG) and the Audit Commission. Whilst the survey methodology cannot be claimed to obtain perceptions as representative as those from the BCS, it does have the advantage of being large enough to provide robust findings at a local authority level (the survey requirements stipulate a minimum of 1,100 responses for each local authority).

⁷ The 7-Strand Index was calculated for each local authority from the constituent questions by BVPI survey data processors (Cobalt Sky Ltd) who were commissioned to do so by the Respect Task Force. Each Local Authority was subsequently issues with its 7-strand index score alongside its results for the individual anti-social behaviour and respect questions. The Respect Task Force made the 7-strand index scores available to Ipsos MORI, for the purpose of the Frontiers analysis.



⁶ An individual's responses on each question are scored as follows: "Not a problem at all" = 0, "Not a very big problem" = 1, "A fairly big problem" = 2, "A very big problem" = 3. Each respondent therefore has a total score of between 0 and 21 once the responses from the seven questions are added. The proportion scoring between 0 and 10 overall are dassified as "Low ASB", whilst those scoring 11-21 are dassified as "High ASB".

4. Trends in Perceptions

This chapter explores how perceptions of anti-social behaviour have changed in recent years, comparing time series trends across different data sources, notably the British Crime Survey and the BVPI surveys.

National trends from the British Crime Survey (1992-2006)

The chart below shows how perceptions of the anti-social behaviour issues which make-up the 7-strand index have varied over the past 15 years. It also includes the 7-strand index score since 2001/2 (i.e. the proportion of residents classified as scoring "High ASB"), when the most recent version of the index was introduced.

From 1992 through to 2002/03 the general pattern was an increase in perceptions of anti-social behaviour. Perceptions of almost all seven issues peaked in 2002/03 before reversing sharply and since levelling out in most cases.



Trends from the BVPIs (2003-6)

As noted previously, the Best Value Performance Indicator (BVPI) surveys cannot be claimed to be as representative as the British Crime Survey. However, the sheer numbers of people completing these surveys (around half a million households each sweep) means that they provide a robust indictor of shifts in



public opinion over time, as well as having the benefit of providing scope for local authority-level analysis.

Like the BCS over the same period, trends in perceptions of anti-social behaviour from the BVPI surveys are positive; fewer people perceive high levels of antisocial behaviour at the end of 2006 than did at the back end of 2003. However, trends are notably more positive in the BVPI surveys, with a significantly sharper improvement in perceptions. This shift in perceptions is consistent across different types of authority, suggesting localised factors are not significantly affecting the trends.



When we separate the 7-strand index we see varying trends in perceptions of the different behaviours across the two BVPI surveys (2003-2006). The overall improvement in perceptions is being driven largely by significant decreases in the numbers of respondents rating the following four issues as big problems in their local areas:

- People being drunk or rowdy in public spaces
- Abandoned or burnt out cars
- Vandalism, graffiti and other deliberate damage to property or vehicles
- People using or dealing drugs

In contrast, the proportion of people who note teenagers hanging around on the streets as a big problem has remained static, meaning that it is now, by some margin, the issue most likely to be noted as problematic by residents.



Perceptions of both noisy neighbours or loud parties and rubbish and litter lying around are moving in the right direction, although not to the same extent as other factors.



When interpreting these apparent improvements in perceptions, we must be mindful of some caveats in the BVPI dataset. One change between 2003 and 2006 was the positioning of the anti-social behaviour questions within the questionnaire. In 2003 these questions were towards the end of the questionnaire and followed a range of service satisfaction questions relating to local authority performance. In 2006, the questions appeared towards the beginning of the questionnaire and preceded all questions about local authority performance. However, the variations in trends across the seven issues suggest that there is no major systematic effect of this change in positioning.

It is also worth noting that a relatively small number of authorities (16 of the total 387[®]) conducted the BVPI survey via face-to-face interviewing in 2003. This was not permitted in 2006, so all had to switch to self-completion questionnaires distributed by post. However, the effect of this switch has typically been negative in terms of perceptions of anti-social behaviour since a self-completion methodology tends to elicit higher recorded levels of problematic behaviour than a face-to-face survey (hence higher 7-strand scores in the BVPIs than in the BCS). Therefore, if we were to exclude these authorities from the analysis, then the trends would actually be <u>more</u> positive. However, these changes in data collection methods do mean that trends in perceptions at an individual authority level can be misleading in some instances.

⁸ This figure includes counties

5. The Importance of Place: Developing a Predictive Model

In this chapter we examine how local circumstances beyond the control of any local agency can impact significantly on perceptions of anti-social behaviour. We have developed a model which enables us to predict the levels of perceived antisocial behaviour we might expect to see in an area, given the prevailing conditions locally.

The variations in perceptions of anti-social behaviour across England are vast. BVPI findings at a local authority level show the proportions of residents perceiving high levels of anti-social behaviour ranges from 5% in the City of London to 53% in Newham. Similar findings were also reported in the National Audit Office's report 'Tackling Anti-Social Behaviour' (2006)⁹. And this of course masks further variation at a sub-authority level.



However, the usefulness of such comparisons is limited. In most ways, those areas appearing at the "top" of the list bear no relation to those at the "bottom" in terms of demographic make-up, levels of local deprivation, size, local infrastructure, etc. To begin to explore <u>real</u> differences in perceptions of antisocial behaviour, we must first recognise the types of local factors which play a key role in shaping perceptions.

⁹ NAO reported also reported significant area variations, with 29% of people in London perceiving anti-social behaviour to be a problem compared to 7% in Lincolnshire and Essex.



ASB and deprivation

Previous work (e.g. *Perceptions and Experience of ASB: findings from the BCS 2003/04)* has highlighted the strong link between perceptions of anti-social behaviour and local levels of deprivation.

Analysis of the 2006 BVPI dataset confirms this correlation and shows that it holds true for all types of authority area; the more deprived the area, the more problematic anti-social behaviour is likely to be perceived. The strength of the correlation cannot be ignored; it emphasises the importance of factoring local deprivation into relevant policy-oriented discussions, whilst dispelling any myth that anti-social behaviour affects people across the social spectrum to the same extent.



Again, it must be remembered that this analysis is at a local authority level where variations in local deprivation will be filtered down to some extent. We might expect even stronger correlations if analysis was undertaken at, for example, a ward or postcode sector level.

Population density

Another factor which has emerged as impacting upon perceptions of anti-social behaviour is the concentration of local populations. Previous analysis we have conducted has shown variations by rurality (with urban areas recording higher levels of anti-social behaviour than smaller towns and villages). Within the analysis of the 2006 BVPI data, population density emerges as a key correlator with perceptions of anti-social behaviour. The more densely populated an area, then the higher the perception of anti-social behaviour. In some ways this may,

in part, be a proxy measure for any urban/rural differences, whilst also reflecting different types of neighbourhoods and the nature of local housing stock (amongst other factors).



Population profiles

Socio-economic and population density variables clearly have an important bearing on perceptions of anti-social behaviour. So also does the population profile.

Analysis of the British Crime Survey¹⁰ has shown notable variations in perceptions across different age groups, with the proportions noting anti-social behaviour as a big problem tending to decrease with age. Both men and women aged 16 to 24 years are considerably more likely to perceive high levels of anti-social behaviour than any other age group. In contrast, those aged 75 or over are least likely to perceive high levels.

These findings contrast with the populist stereotyping of the types of residents most likely to cite concerns around anti-social behaviour, but are consistent with our analysis which shows that perceptions of anti-social behaviour are more likely to be high in areas with greater proportions of younger residents. Just as variables such as deprivation should be taken into account when comparing perceptions across different areas, incorporating relevant population profiles is also key in helping to level the playing field and ensure the most accurate and useful assessments.

¹⁰ Perceptions and experiences of anti-social behaviour. findings from 2003/2004 BCS. Wood. Home Office online report 49/04

Another factor which emerges from our analysis is the change in population levels within areas. The key variable is **net inflow**, which is calculated using Office for National Statistics data tables. The figure for each area is derived by subtracting the outflow variable (i.e. number of people leaving an area) from the inflow value (the number of people moving into the area) and expressing the difference as a percentage of the current population. The higher the value, then the larger the net inflow (i.e. more people entering than leaving). In our model, this variable has a negative relationship with the seven-strand index score. This denotes that the areas which have higher numbers of people leaving than entering are more likely to suffer from high levels of perceived anti-social behaviour.

Constructing a predictive model

Taking this approach a step further, we have developed a model which enables us to predict the levels of perceived anti-social behaviour we might expect to see in an area, given the local prevailing conditions.

The dataset for analysis included the 7-strand anti-social behaviour index figures for all local authority areas in England as the dependent variable (using 2006 BVPI data). Within this dataset we included a multitude of local area-based statistics covering demographic information, socio-economic indicators, health factors, recorded crime data, local skills and qualifications, income indicators, and other factors relating to deprivation and the social make-up of local areas. The majority of data is sourced directly from ONS published information.

The first step in creating a predictive model is to ensure we are including all factors that might be expected to have an impact on levels of perceived antisocial behaviour. This is done by looking at the relationship between the 7-strand anti-social behaviour scores across all authority areas and the key demographic and socio-economic factors. The strength of the relationship with each factor was measured using correlational analysis¹¹. The charts on the previous pages show the correlations between perceptions of anti-social behaviour and deprivation/population density.

Our model is constructed using a further stage of "stepwise" multiple regression¹². This process systematically identifies the aspects that explain the

¹² Ordinary Least Squares Linear Regression is used to build the model. Specifically, a stepwise procedure is employed which takes alternate 'enter' and 'remove' steps to select the optimal set of predictor variables. The enter step evaluates the influence of each predictor variables that is not within the model, and enters the most influential variable into the model (conditional on a significance criterion). The remove step evaluates each predictor variable that is within the model, and deletes the least influential variable. These steps are repeated until the significance criteria are not met for a consecutive enter and remove step. The computation was carried out using SPSS, and the criteria selected are the default criteria which use F-tests on significance levels 0.05 (enter) and 0.1 (remove).



¹¹ Correlation is a bivariate measure of association (strength) of the relationship between two variables. It ranges from 0 (random relationship) to 1 (perfect positive linear relationship) or -1 (perfect negative linear relationship). It is usually reported in terms of its square (r^{2} , interpreted as percent of variance explained. For instance, if r^2 is 0.25, then the independent variable is said to explain 25% of the variance in the dependent variable.

highest amount of variation in perceptions of anti-social behaviour across all authority areas.

The following chart illustrates the model identified as the strongest predictor of variation in perceptions of anti-social behaviour across areas. The five factors identified on the right-hand side account for 58% of the variance in perceptions of anti-social behaviour across the 387 local authority areas¹³.

Therefore, by knowing the level of deprivation, population density, population inflow, recorded level of violent crime, and proportion of residents aged 25 years and under in a local authority area we can predict the likely level of perceived antisocial behaviour in that area to within relatively small ranges.

The percentage figures alongside each factor indicate the relative weight of each within the model, and here show that the amalgamated index of multiple deprivation score¹⁴ is the biggest single predictor.

This model forms the basis of the next stage of Frontiers analysis in which we have predicted levels of perceived Anti-Social Behaviour at a local authority level and compared these with actual perceptions (see next chapter).



¹³ This figure includes counties

¹⁴ We have also explored the impact of the separate components of the IMD score and found indices relating to Education Skills and Training, Income and Crime emerge as the three strongest predictors.

6. Frontiers Analysis: How do Areas Compare?

The previous chapter outlined the development of a model for predicting perceptions of anti-social behaviour at a local authority area level. In this chapter we apply this model to all 387 English local authority areas to predict perceptions of anti-social behaviour across the country. We then highlight how actual perceptions compare and where the differences between predictions and reality are most stark. As well as showing results at an overall level, we break down analysis into different authority types in order to explore further differences between similar types of administrative area.

The tables in this chapter concentrate on the extremities of our analysis; that is, those areas which exceed or fall short of the predicted levels of anti-social behaviour to the greatest extent. Each table shows:

- The **actual** 7-strand index score, as recorded via the seven constituent questions in the 2006 BVPI General Survey
- The **predicted** 7-strand index score using the model discussed in the previous chapter
- The **gap** between actual and predicted levels of anti-social behaviour (using the percentage point difference)

The broad picture is fairly balanced; of the 387 authority areas, 193 (50% of the total) have an actual perception score which is lower than the predicted level (by half a percentage point or more). This is denoted by a minus sign but is a positive result, i.e. perceptions are better than predicted. In contrast, 155 (40%) record perceptions which are higher than their predicted levels. One in ten areas (39) record a gap between actual and predicted levels of less than half of one percentage point and are rounded down to "zero difference" in our analysis.

It must be remembered that our key measure, the 7-strand index, is an amalgamated variable. Therefore, it is possible that the gaps between actual and predicted scores in some areas will be significantly affected by responses relating to a minority of the seven types of anti-social behaviour within the index. For example, it may not be the case that an authority area which exceeds its predicted 7-strand index score would exceed predicted perceptions on all seven types of anti-social behaviour (and vice versa).

A table containing full results of our Frontiers analysis for all authority areas is included in the final chapter of this report.

Areas with less/more ASB than expected

The table below shows the areas where perceptions of anti-social behaviour do not appear as high as one would expect given the local conditions. So, for example, we would expect 34% of residents to rate anti-social behaviour as high in Wolverhampton given the area's local characteristics. However, only 22% scored high on the 7-strand index within the BVPI survey, meaning the actual score is 12 percentage points lower than we would predict. The ten areas where perceptions are most positive against predicted levels of anti-social behaviour include large conurbations and more rural areas from different areas of the country, with varying levels of deprivation.

Local Authority Area	Actual 7- Strand Score (%)	Predicted 7- Strand Score (%)	GAP (percentage points)
Wolverhampton	22	34	-12
City of London	5	16	-11
Manchester	29	40	-11
Coventry	22	32	-10
Wandsw orth	16	25	-9
Redditch	20	29	-9
New castle upon Tyne	24	32	-8
Shrew sbury and Atcham	13	21	-8
Broadland	7	15	-8
Hambleton	9	17	-8

Areas with less ASB than expected

In contrast, the following areas are those where perceptions of anti-social behaviour are worse than we would predict them to be once local factors are taken into consideration. Again, there is some mix, although on the whole they tend to more likely to be more district-oriented than the best performing areas.

Local Authority Area	Actual 7- Strand Score (%)	Predicted 7- Strand Score (%)	GAP (percentage points)
Wakefield	41	29	12
Wellingborough	36	24	12
Ealing	42	30	12
Torbay	36	24	12
Craw ley	38	25	13
Arun	31	18	13
Fenland	36	21	15
Cannock Chase	43	27	16
Pendle	46	29	17
Blyth Valley	47	28	19

Areas with more ASB than expected

Trends by region, authority type and Respect Area

The following table shows the proportion of areas which record more or less perceived anti-social behaviour than predicted at a **regional** level. The figures for each region do not add up to 100% because some areas in each region neither exceed nor fall short of their predicted ratings by more than half a percentage point (i.e. their actual perceived score matches the predicted measure). Relative perceptions are most positive in the West Midlands and North West, where areas are most likely to record lower levels of anti-social behaviour than we would predict. In contrast, areas in London and the South East fare worst at an aggregate level.

Region	% of areas with lower perceptions of ASB than predicted	% of areas with higher perceptions of ASB than predicted
West Midlands (38)	66	29
North West (46)	61	28
Yorkshire and Humberside (22)	59	41
South West (50)	52	36
North East (25)	52	36
East Midlands (44)	51	44
East of England (54)	50	43
London (33)	42	45
South East (74)	32	50

Splitting the profile by **authority type** reveals that Metropolitan areas are particularly likely to perform well with regards recording ratings of anti-social behaviour below predicted levels. This will reflect in the above table where the North West and West Midlands contain comparatively high proportions of Metropolitan authority areas.

Authority type	% of areas with lower perceptions of ASB than predicted	% of areas with higher perceptions of ASB than predicted
Metropolitan (36)	75	19
Counties (35)	50	32
District (238)	48	43
Unitary (46)	46	43
London Boroughs (33)	42	45

We can also breakdown the data to observe how the Government's 40 Respect Areas, charged with leading the Respect Programme, compare with others. As the table shows, these 40 areas are significantly more likely to record lower-thanpredicted anti-social behaviour ratings.

	% of areas with lower perceptions of ASB than predicted	% of areas with higher perceptions of ASB than predicted
Respect areas (40)	75	20
Non-respect areas (347)	47	42

London Boroughs

The table below shows the London Boroughs most likely to either 'overperform' or 'under-perform' in terms of perceptions of anti-social behaviour. Whilst Newham records the highest levels of anti-social behaviour anywhere in the country within the BVPI surveys (at an absolute level), it is the comparatively less deprived borough of Ealing where perceptions are most likely to exceed predicted levels.

Local Authority Area	Actual 7- Strand Score (%)	Predicted 7- Strand Score (%)	GAP (percentage points)
Less ASB than predicted			
City of London	5	16	-11
Wandsw orth	16	25	-9
Richmond upon Thames	12	19	-7
Westminster	19	25	-6
Islington	31	37	-6
More ASB than predicted			
Hillingdon	30	26	4
Havering	31	24	7
Barking & Dagenham	42	34	8
New ham	53	42	11
Ealing	42	30	12

Mets and Unitaries

The metropolitan and unitary areas of Wolverhampton, Manchester, Coventry and Newcastle all have lower then predicted perceived levels of anti-social behaviour, and all make the overall top ten list. In contrast, the unitary areas with highest relative levels of perceived anti-social behaviour are from the south (with the exception of Wakefield).

Local Authority Area	Actual 7- Strand Score (%)	Predicted 7- Strand Score (%)	GAP (percentage points)
Less ASB than predicted			
Wolverhampton	22	34	-12
Manchester	29	40	-11
Coventry	22	32	-10
New castle upon Tyne	24	32	-8
Derby	23	31	-8
More ASB than predicted			
Thurrock	35	27	8
Slough	38	30	8
Brighton & Hove	36	25	11
Wakefield	41	29	12
Torbay	36	24	12

Districts

The following table shows the districts at each extreme. Blyth Valley (Northumberland), Pendle (Lancashire) and Cannock Chase (Staffordshire) have the largest gaps between actual and predicted perceptions of all areas in the country, as well as recording some of the highest perceived levels of anti-social behaviour overall.

Local Authority Area	Actual 7- Strand Score (%)	Predicted 7- Strand Score (%)	GAP (percentage points)
Less ASB than predicted			
Redditch	20	29	-9
Shrew sbury and Atcham	13	21	-8
Broadland	7	15	-8
Hambleton	9	17	-8
Berw ick upon Tw eed	13	21	-8
More ASB than predicted			
Arun	31	18	13
Fenland	36	21	15
Cannock Chase	43	27	16
Pendle	46	29	17
Blyth Valley	47	28	19

Counties

There is less variation in County scores, reflecting the larger geographic areas covered. No counties appear at either the upper or lower ends of the overall ranked tables, although the table below shows there is some degree of variation in perception gaps.

Local Authority Area	Actual 7- Strand Score (%)	Predicted 7- Strand Score (%)	GAP (percentage points)
Less ASB than predicted			
North Yorkshire	14	22	-8
Worcestershire	15	22	-7
Lancashire	20	25	-5
Suffolk	15	19	-4
Staffordshire	20	23	-3
More ASB than predicted			
Warw ickshire	23	20	3
Northamptonshire	25	22	3
Surrey	22	17	5
West Sussex	25	18	7
Somerset	27	20	7

7. Next Steps: Explaining Variations

As noted at the start of this report, the main purpose of this analysis is to further the discussion and debate on anti-social behaviour, with particular emphasis on the importance of place on perceptions. The previous chapters have highlighted the wide range of perceptions across the country and shown the influence of local factors on some of this variance. We are now in a much better position to identify where perceptions of anti-social behaviour are exceeding or falling short of realistic expectations.

The next step will be to explore *why* different areas fall into these categories. An initial glance at those areas at the top and bottom of the lists would not immediately suggest a host of common themes around localised issues or types of areas. However, there are some hypotheses that we can begin to explore:

- The potential impact of **communications**. Are local agencies in some areas more effective in telling residents what is being done to tackle anti-social behaviour, and in turn, reducing the number of people who perceive it as a problem?
- Are local agencies in some areas dealing with anti-social behaviour significantly better than others, whether it be via the use of specific tools and powers, or the effective deployment of visible reassurance?
- Are **preventative measures** and **displacement activities** more effective in some areas than others? For example, the provision of leisure facilities, etc
- Are some areas more prone to negative perceptions because of their layout, infrastructure or positioning relative to other towns/cities?

We do not set out to provide comprehensive answers but can begin to explore the possible impact of some of these types of factors.

The impact of ASBOs?

As the highest profile measure available to local authorities in directly tackling anti-social behaviour, the use of anti-social behaviour orders (ASBOs) may impact upon public perceptions either via a direct observable impact in reducing levels of anti-social behaviour, or as a symbol of action. This latter route will depend upon the effective communication of the issuing of the Order to the wider community, but either channel may, in theory, lead to a reduction in the likelihood of rating anti-social behaviour as problematic. When we plot the number of ASBOs issued by local authorities¹⁵ against the gap between actual and predicted levels of perceived anti-social behaviour, we find some correlation, but only a fairly weak one. Those areas which have issued more ASBOs are more likely to obtain lower than predicted levels of anti-social behaviour, but the correlation cannot be claimed to be conclusive.



Whilst further analysis using more up-to-date figures on numbers of ASBOs may be helpful, this still does not get around the fact that we are working with purely quantitative data. We are not factoring in the reasons for the ASBOs, the types of Orders issued, their geographical dispersal, the amount (and slant) of press coverage, etc. Such information would allow for a more instructive analysis of the impact of ASBOs, as well as other tools and powers at the disposal of local agencies.

The role of communications

Previous Ipsos MORI research in the *Together* Trailblazer areas¹⁶ has highlighted the positive correlations between information provision and confidence in the ability of local agencies to tackle anti-social behaviour. Residents who feel better informed about how anti-social behaviour is being tackled in their areas are more likely to express confidence than those who do not.

¹⁶ Evaluation of *Together* research 2004-6, Ipsos MORI/Home Office Anti-Social Behaviour Unit.



¹⁵ Information supplied by local CDRPs to the Home Office, 2005. In some cases data from 1999 is used.



This is consistent with other work across the criminal justice system and suggests that communications may play a role in explaining the variances in perceptions of anti-social behaviour. However, when we plot the gap between actual and predicted levels of perceived anti-social behaviour against the proportion of residents who feel well informed about what their local council is doing to tackle anti-social behaviour.

These findings suggest that whilst communications can have a significant beneficial impact on public levels of confidence and attitudes towards the tackling of anti-social behaviour in the short-term, it may not have such a major immediate impact on perceived levels of anti-social activity per se. Affecting change in people's perceptions of local activity is likely to need sustained communications, backed up by action (to counter any potential accusations of spin over substance).

Next steps

Identifying the reasons behind the variances across local areas will be a major challenge, but an important one if we are to ensure that efforts to tackle antisocial behaviour are most effectively targeted. We believe our analysis contained within this report represents a major step forward in how we assess perceptions of anti-social behaviour. Whilst we have only begun to make initial suggestions as to the types of factors which may help to explain variations in performance, we would welcome further discussion and debate.

8. Full Area Results

London Boroughs

			GAP
LA Name	Actual ASB (%)	Predicted ASB (%)	(percentage points)
Barking & Dagenham	42	34	8
Barnet	20	25	-5
Bexley	29	26	3
Brent	30	31	-1
Bromley	25	23	2
Camden	30	30	0
City of London	5	16	-11
Croydon	30	29	1
Ealing	42	30	12
Enfield	29	29	0
Greenwich	33	34	-1
Hackney	44	41	3
Hammersmith & Fulham	31	28	3
Haringey	33	36	-3
Harrow	26	25	1
Havering	31	24	7
Hillingdon	30	26	4
Hounslow	32	31	1
Islington	31	37	-6
Kensington & Chelsea	16	19	-3
Kingston upon Thames	21	22	-1
Lambeth	33	33	0
Lewisham	28	32	-4
Merton	24	24	0
Newham	53	42	11
Redbridge	29	27	2
Richmond upon Thames	12	19	-7
Southwark	29	34	-5
Sutton	23	24	-1
Tower Hamlets	44	41	3
Waltham Forest	35	34	1
Wandsworth	16	25	-9
Westminster	19	25	-6

Counties

			GAP
LA Name	Actual ASB (%)	Predicted ASB (%)	(percentage points)
Bedfordshire	20	21	-1
Buckinghamshire	21	19	2
Cambridgeshire	20	18	2
Cheshire	21	21	0
Cornwall	21	21	0
Cumbria	19	22	-3
Derbyshire	21	23	-2
Devon	16	18	-2
Dorset	15	16	-1
Durham County	28	25	3
East Sussex	20	20	0
Essex	21	21	0
Gloucestershire	18	20	-2
Hampshire	19	20	-1
Hertfordshire	22	21	1
Kent	22	21	1
Lancashire	20	25	-5
Leicestershire	17	19	-2
Lincolnshire	18	20	-2
Norfolk	18	19	-1
North Yorkshire	14	22	-8
Northamptonshire	25	22	3
Northumberland	17	17	0
Nottinghamshire	24	23	1
Oxfordshire	18	18	0
Shropshire	18	19	-1
Somerset	27	20	7
Staffordshire	20	23	-3
Suffolk	15	19	-4
Surrey	22	17	5
Warwickshire	23	20	3
West Sussex	25	18	7
Wiltshire	15	17	-2
Worcestershire	15	22	-7

Districts

			GAP
LA Name	Actual ASB (%)	Predicted ASB (%)	(percentage points)
Adur	28	21	7
Allerdale	20	22	-2
Alnwick	15	17	-2
Amber Valley	23	22	1
Arun	31	18	13
Ashfield	36	26	10
Ashford	19	18	1
Aylesbury Vale	16	18	-2
Babergh	17	17	0
Barrow-in-Furness	28	30	-2
Basildon	33	27	6
Basingstoke and Deane	21	21	0
Bassetlaw	35	24	11
Bedford	21	23	-2
Berwick-upon-Tweed	13	21	-8
Blaby	12	19	-7
Blyth Valley	47	28	19
Bolsover	32	27	5
Boston	31	21	10
Braintree	20	19	1
Breckland	20	16	4
Brentwood	17	18	-1
Bridanorth	15	17	-2
Broadland	7	15	-8
Bromsgrove	14	18	-4
Broxbourne	22	23	-1
Broxtowe	19	22	-3
Burnley	41	33	8
Cambridge	22	23	-1
Cannock Chase	43	20	16
Canterbury	20	20	
Caradon	19	20	-1
Carlisle	18	20	-5
Carrick	15	19	-5 -4
Castle Morpeth	15	18	
Castle Point	- 21	22	
Charpwood	21	22	-1
Chelmsford	15	21	-1
Cheltenham	24	20	1
Chonwoll	24	23	- 2
Cherter	22	19	3
Chaster la Street	21	22	-1
Chester-le-Sileei	22	24	-2
Chishastar	21	20	-1
	16	16	0
Charley	17	18	-1
Choney	22	22	0
Christenuren	15	16	-1
Colchester	19	22	-3
	20	18	2
Copeland	25	25	0
Corby	39	31	8

Cotswold	20	14	6
Craven	14	15	-1
Crawley	38	25	13
Crewe and Nantwich	23	21	2
Dacorum	23	21	2
Dartford	31	25	6
Daventry	22	17	5
Derbyshire Dales	9	17	-8
Derwentside	33	25	8
Dover	24	22	2
Durham City	16	21	-5
Easington	37	32	5
East Cambridgeshire	21	15	6
East Devon	11	14	-3
East Dorset	8	12	-4
East Hampshire	18	17	1
East Hertfordshire	20	17	3
East Lindsey	18	20	-2
East Northamptonshire	27	17	10
East Staffordshire	18	24	-6
Eastbourne	21	22	-1
Eastleigh	19	22	-3
Eden	13	15	-2
Ellesmere Port & Neston	31	25	6
Elmbridge	13	15	-2
Epping Forest	21	20	1
Epsom and Ewell	21	18	3
Erewash	30	24	6
Exeter	21	25	-4
Fareham	16	20	-4
Fenland	36	21	15
Forest Heath	21	11	10
Forest of Dean	23	20	3
	- 17	10	1
Gealing	21	23	-2
Gloucester	24	29	-5 -
Gosport	31	26	5
	32	20	- <i>1</i> -
Great Yarmourn	32	21	D
	17	17	0
Hampleton	9	17	-8
Harborough	13	14	-1
	27	29	-2
	12	10	-4 0
Hadings	10	30	-2
Havant	24	27	-3
Hartsmara	24	21	-5
High Peak	21	21	0
Hinckley and Rosworth	21	21	0
Horsham	10	15	1
Huntingdonshire	19	10	4
Hyndhurn	20	10	2
lpswich	21	29	-8
1 T T		_*	Ŭ.

Kennet	13	16	-3
Kerrier	19	23	-4
Kettering	23	21	2
King's Lynn and West			
Norfolk	19	18	1
Lancaster	19	23	-4
Lewes	22	19	3
Lichfield	19	20	-1
Lincoln	33	31	2
Macdesfield	19	19	0
Maidstone	16	20	-4
Maldon	24	18	6
Malvern Hills	21	18	3
Mansfield	37	32	5
Melton	18	18	0
Mendin	29	20	q
Mid Bedfordshire	17	17	0
Mid Dovon	17	10	5
Mid Suffolk	8	19	-0
Mid Suppoy	20	10	-0
	20	17	3
	12	16	-4
New Forest	15	17	-2
Newark and Sherwood	18	21	-3
Newcastle-under-Lyme	24	25	-1
North Cornwall	18	20	-2
North Devon	24	21	3
North Dorset	14	14	0
North East Derbyshire	16	22	-6
North Hertfordshire	19	18	1
North Kesteven	12	13	-1
North Norfolk	13	16	-3
North Shropshire	17	18	-1
North Warwickshire	16	23	-7
North West Leicestershire	18	21	-3
North Wiltshire	17	17	0
Northampton	29	28	1
Norwich	23	29	-6
Nuneaton and Bedworth	32	27	5
Oadby and Wigston	19	23	-4
Oswestry	20	21	-1
Oxford	23	25	-2
Pendle	46	29	17
Penwith	33	24	
Preston	24	31	-7
Purbeck	11	16	-5
Redditch	20	29	-0
Reigate and Banstead	13	18	-5
Postormal	22	10	0
	22	16	0
Dichmondohiro	22	10	0
Rochford	13	12	
	17	19	-2
RUSSenuale	35	28	1
Kother	16	17	-1
Rugby	26	20	6

Runnymede	19	16	3
Rushcliffe	11	16	-5
Rushmoor	27	25	2
Ryedale	11	15	-4
Salisbury	13	16	-3
Scarborough	29	23	6
Sedgefield	30	28	2
Sedgemoor	20	21	-1
Selby	21	19	2
Sevenoaks	14	18	-4
Shepway	24	21	3
Shrewsbury and Atcham	13	21	-8
South Bedfordshire	19	22	-3
South Bucks	17	17	0
South Cambridgeshire	10	14	-4
South Derbyshire	18	20	-2
South Hams	13	18	-5
South Holland	21	16	5
South Kesteven	21	19	2
South Lakeland	10	15	-5
South Norfolk	11	16	-5
South Northamptonshire	11	14	-3
South Oxfordshire	19	16	3
South Ribble	16	22	-6
South Shropshire	11	17	-6
South Somerset	26	20	6
South Staffordshire	14	19	-5
Spelthorne	21	21	0
St Albans	13	19	-6
St Edmundsbury	16	13	-1
Stafford	12	20	-8
Staffordshire Moorlands	28	20	7
Stevenage	20	26	-2
Stratford-on-Avon	18	15	- 3
Stroud	22	18	4
Suffolk Coastal	9	16	-7
Surrey Heath	11	19	-8
Swale	28	23	5
Tamworth	33	30	3
Tandridge	14	17	-3
Taunton Deane	19	19	0
Teesdale	12	13	-1
Teianbridae	20	18	2
Tendring	24	20	4
Test Valley	20	19	1
Tewkesbury	19	10	2
Thanet	37	26	- 11
Three Rivers	21	20	1
Tonbridge and Malling	19	19	0
Torridae	17	18	-1
Tunbridge Wells	19	20	-1
Tynedale	9	16	-7
Uttlesford	15	16	-1
Vale of White Horse	15	15	0

Vale Royal	21	22	-1
Wansbeck	30	29	1
Warwick	17	17	0
Watford	32	27	5
Waveney	22	23	-1
Waverley	11	16	-5
Wealden	17	16	1
Wear Valley	27	27	0
Wellingborough	36	24	12
Welwyn Hatfield	23	22	1
West Devon	12	17	-5
West Dorset	12	14	-2
West Lancashire	17	23	-6
West Lindsey	17	19	-2
West Oxfordshire	14	17	-3
West Somerset	19	18	1
West Wiltshire	18	17	1
Weymouth and Portland	35	24	11
Winchester	11	15	-4
Woking	22	19	3
Worcester	20	27	-7
Worthing	32	22	10
Wychavon	21	17	4
Wycombe	22	21	1
Wyre	29	19	10
Wyre Forest	26	24	2

Unitary

			GAP
	Actual ASB (%)	Predicted ASB (%)	(percentage points)
Bath & NE Somerset	19	19	0
	29	34	
Віаскрооі	31	32	
Bournemouth	26	25	1
Bracknell Forest	21	21	0
Brighton & Hove	36	25	- 11
Bristol	27	31	-4
Darlington	23	25	-2
Derby	23	31	-8
East Riding of Yorkshire	10	19	-3
Halton	35	34	1
Напіерооі	31	33	-2
Herefordshire	27	19	8
	20	21	-1
Kingston upon Hull	31	38	-7
Leicester	27	35	-8
Luton	31	32	-1
Middlesharowsh		20	0
Milton Kornee	30	38	-3
Milton Keynes	20	24	-4
North East Lincoinshire	30	31	5
North Linconstine	30	20	C
North Somerset	21	20	1
Nottingnam	32	30	-4
Peterborough	29	29	0
Pipilouti	22	20	-0
Polle	19	22	-3
Polisilouti	29	20	1
Reduing Redear & Cleveland	35	27	0
Red and Cleveland	12	29	0
Slough	12	10	2
South Claucastarshira	14	10	5
Southampton	20	19	-5
Southand-on-soa	20	29	6
Stockton-on-Tees	20	20	1
Stoke-on-Trent	23	20	-3
Swindon	27	24	-0
Telford and Wrekin	21	24	0
Thurrock	20	20	8
Tarbay	30	27	12
Warrington	30	24	
West Barkshire	21	20	-4
Windoor & Moidophood	20	10	0
Wokingham	23	19	4
Vork	22	18	4
IUIK	14	21	-7

Metropolitan

			GAP
LA Name	Actual ASB (%)	Predicted ASB (%)	(percentage points)
Barnsley	33	28	5
Birmingham	30	37	-7
Bolton	28	31	-3
Bradford	30	34	-4
Bury	24	28	-4
Calderdale	25	28	-3
Coventry	22	32	-10
Doncaster	32	28	4
Dudley	27	28	-1
Gateshead	30	30	0
Kirklees	25	29	-4
Knowsley	32	37	-5
Leeds	22	29	-7
Liverpool	35	40	-5
Manchester	29	40	-11
Newcastle upon Tyne	24	32	-8
North Tyneside	30	26	4
Oldham	28	32	-4
Rochdale	35	33	2
Rotherham	30	27	3
Salford	35	33	2
Sandwell	28	34	-6
Sefton	25	28	-3
Sheffield	23	27	-4
Solihull	22	24	-2
South Tyneside	28	30	-2
St Helens	26	30	-4
Stockport	19	26	-7
Sunderland	30	32	-2
Tameside	31	31	0
Trafford	19	26	-7
Wakefield	41	29	12
Walsall	26	32	-6
Wigan	27	29	-2
Wirral	26	30	-4
Wolverhampton	22	34	-12