An Analysis of the Changing Nature of Urban Crime and Victimisation: A Focus on Islington

Part Two
AUTHORS

Roger Matthews
Helen Johnson
Kerry Lee

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Helen Easton, Tara Young, Dainis Ignatans and Janet Ransom for their help and contributions to this research.
CONTENTS

List of Figures .......................................................................................................................... 5
List of Tables ............................................................................................................................. 6

Part 1: Overview ....................................................................................................................... 7
Introduction .................................................................................................................................. 7
The use and limitations of police generated data ...................................................................... 8
The Crime Survey for England and Wales Data (CSEW) ........................................................... 10
The case for conducting local crime surveys .......................................................................... 13
Examining crime trends ........................................................................................................... 13
Is violence decreasing? ............................................................................................................ 15
Trends in property crime ......................................................................................................... 18
Explaining crime trends ........................................................................................................ 20
Urban and rural crime trends ................................................................................................ 21
Summary .................................................................................................................................. 24

Part 2: Examining the Changing Context of Crime Victimisation in Islington between 1986 - 2016 ........................................................................................................ 25
Introduction ............................................................................................................................ 25
The first Islington crime survey in context .............................................................................. 25
The changing social, political and economic context 1986-2016 ........................................... 26
Changing forms of crime and control ...................................................................................... 27
The changing demographics of Islington from 1981 to 2011 ............................................... 29
Gentrification and deprivation in Islington from 1981 to 2011 .......................................... 30

Neighbourhood satisfaction ................................................................................................. 32
Neighbourhood concerns .................................................................................................... 32
Concerns relating to crime ................................................................. 34
Views on changing levels of crime ....................................................... 35
Changing priorities and conceptions of crime between 1986 and 2016 ........... 36
Perceptions of the likelihood of victimisation ........................................... 37
Fear of Crime .................................................................................... 38
Avoidance behaviours ......................................................................... 40
Security measures ............................................................................ 40
Witnessing and Reporting Crimes ......................................................... 41
Satisfaction with the police ................................................................. 41
Stop and search .................................................................................. 42
Public perceptions of police performance and attitudes ......................... 43
Co-operation with the police ............................................................... 44
Part 4: A Comparison between 1986 and 2016 Surveys by Crime Type........... 46
Overview ............................................................................................. 46
Property Crime – burglary and vandalism/criminal damage ....................... 48
Personal theft ..................................................................................... 49
Assault (1986), violence and hate crime (2016) ......................................... 52
Sexual assault .................................................................................... 52
Part 5: Summary and Conclusion .......................................................... 53
Introduction ......................................................................................... 53
Increased neighbourhood satisfaction ...................................................... 53
Crime as a neighbourhood problem ....................................................... 53
Fear of crime ...................................................................................... 54
Attitudes towards and co-operation with the police .................................... 54
Women and victimisation .................................................................... 55
Ethnicity and victimisation ................................................................... 56
The changing distribution of crime ........................................................ 57
The changing concentration of crime

New crimes, new victims

The end of the crime drop?

References

Appendix 1. Differences between the format of the two Islington Crime Surveys

Appendix 2. The categorisation of respondents

List of Figures

Figure 1: Trends in Crime Survey for England and Wales and police recorded crime

Figure 2: Ratio of police recorded crimes to CSEW reported incidents

Figure 3: Selected police recorded crime offences in England and Wales

Figure 4: Trends in Crime Survey for England and Wales, violence

Figure 5: Trends in violent crime 1981 to 2005/6, BCS

Figure 6: Long-term trends in CSEW, total crime and property crime

Figure 7: Long-term trends in property crime CSEW December 1981 to March 2016

Figure 8: Trends in selected police recorded theft offence in England and Wales

Figure 9: Burglary in England and Wales, 1981-2006: incidence, prevalence and concentration

Figure 10: Victimisation in London per 100 Households

Figure 11: Comparison of the Islington population in 1981 and 2011 by age, gender, and ethnicity

Figure 12: Comparison between Islington residents in 1981 and 2011 by tenure and economic activity

Figure 13: Neighbourhood issues seen as a major or minor problem

Figure 14: Crime as a major or minor problem

Figure 15: Percentage of respondents who believe specific crimes have increased

Figure 16: Percentage of men and women who feel personally at risk at night

Figure 17: Percentage of men and women avoiding certain streets or areas

Figure 18: Satisfaction with police conduct 1986 and 2016

Figure 19: Percentage of respondents who believe that the police treat people fairly
Figure 20: Rates of victimization per 10,000 households 1986 ..............................47
Figure 21: Differences between victims and non-victims ICS 2016 ..........................48
Figure 22: Property victimisation ICS 2016 .................................................................49
Figure 23: Personal theft victimisation ICS 2016 .........................................................50
Figure 24: Violence and hate crime victimisation ICS 2016 .........................................51
Figure 25: ICS 2016 comparison of victims and non-victims by ethnicity ..................56
Figure 26: Distribution of all crime by ward 1986 .........................................................57
Figure 27: Victimisation (weighted) by ward and income: linear trend .......................59
Figure 28: Index of deprivation by ward .......................................................................60
Figure 29: Victimisation by crime type and tenure per 1000 households 1986 ..........61
Figure 30: Victimisation by crime type and tenure in 2016 (weighted data) ...............61
Figure 31: Repeat crimes and repeat victimisation by individual crime type ...............63
Figure 32: Repeat victimisation 1986 and 2016 .............................................................64

List of Tables
Table 1: Crime rates in urban and rural areas compared 2003-04 ..............................21
Table 2: London Met Data for All London 2000-2016 ..................................................22
Table 3: London Met Data for Islington 2000-2016 ......................................................24
Table 4: Comparison between the survey respondents and Islington population .........29
Table 5: Changes in tenure between 1981 to 2011 by number of households ..........31
Table 6: Neighbourhood satisfaction by gender ...........................................................32
Table 7: Top five neighbourhood concerns in 1986 and 2016 .................................33
Table 8: Belief about crime increase by age, gender, and ethnicity ............................36
Table 9: Perceived likelihood of victimisation .................................................................37
Table 10: Feeling worried/unsafe by age and gender .....................................................39
Table 11: Feeling worried/unsafe by ethnicity and gender ............................................39
Table 12: Reporting of incidents to the police ..............................................................41
Table 13: Satisfaction with police handling of the case by crime type .......................41
Table 14: Percentage of people who believe the police people fairly and equally .........43
Table 15: Comparison of victim characteristics 1986 and 2016 .................................52
Table 16: Percentage reporting victimisation (weighted) and mean average income by ward 201658
Table 17: Concentration of victimisation ...................................................................63
Part 1: Overview

Introduction

Over the past two decades we have seen a remarkable decrease in recorded crime in England and Wales according to both the Crime Survey of England and Wales and police generated data. However, there are some significant fluctuations and variations in different locations and amongst different crime types.

In this section we aim to examine the changing nature of victimisation in one urban area – the London borough of Islington. This analysis draws upon two principal data sources – the First Islington Crime Survey published in 1986 and the more recent crime survey carried out some thirty years later. Because the two surveys are based on slightly different methodologies and include a different set of questions it is not possible to make direct comparisons. However, there is a sufficient degree of overlap between these two surveys to draw out some meaningful points of comparison. In particular, the analysis of these two data sources will address the question of how the experience of crime and victimisation has changed in the borough over the last three decades, changes in perceptions of crime, and views on the neighbourhood and the police, as well as how victimisation has impacted on different social groups over this period.

Apart from these general forms of analysis we aim to examine two hypotheses that claim to account for the recent changes in the distribution of crime and victimisation, particularly the remarkable ‘crime drop’ that has taken place in England and Wales over the past two decades. These are:

1. That both the decrease in recorded crime and changing patterns of victimisation are a result of the ability of the more affluent sections of the community to insulate themselves from the risks of victimisation.
2. That the recent changes in crime patterns over the past three decades are a function of the changing concentration of victimisation reflected in the changing degrees of multiple victimisation.

In this review of changing forms of crime and victimisation over the past three decades we begin with an examination of local and national police generated data and of the victimization data produced by what was called the British Crime Survey (’BCS’) and is now known as the Crime Survey for England and Wales (’CSEW’). Our aim is to outline how these data sources are generated, and their objectives, as well as their credibility and utility.

We then present a summary of the trends in crime that are presented in the official criminal statistics and the national victimisation survey. In the process, we address in some detail the question of whether violent crime is increasing or decreasing. We then look at variations in crime and victimisation at the local level, city-wide and in rural areas. Then we move on to the main section of the report which looks at the changes in both property and violent crime in Islington as well as the distribution and concentration of victimisation in the borough.
The use and limitations of police generated data

Police recorded crime is the principal source of sub-national crime statistics. It is also the primary source of local crime statistics and for specific offences such as homicide. Although police recorded crime is not currently considered a reliable measure of trends in crime for most crime types these data are still widely used and referred to in discussions about changes in the level and distribution of crime. Following the assessment of crime statistics by the UK Statistics Authority published in January 2014 the statistics based on police recorded crime data were found not to meet the required standard for designation as National Statistics.

In a recent report by the HMIC (2014) it was concluded that across England and Wales as a whole an estimated that 1 in 5 offences that should have been recorded as crimes were not. However, there was a considerable variation in the level of under-recording across the different offence types being investigated. It was estimated that 14% of criminal damage and arson offences that should have been recorded as crimes were not, as well as 14% of robbery offences, 11% of burglary offences and 17% of other offences.

The conclusion reached by the HMIC in their report Crime Recording: Making the Victim Count (2014) was that:

Victims of crime are being let down. The police are failing to record a large proportion of the crimes reported to them. Over 800,000 crimes reported to the police have gone unrecorded each year. This represents an under recording of 19 percent. The problem is greatest for victims of violence against the person and sexual offences, where the under-recording rates are 33 percent and 26 percent respectively. This failure to record such a significant proportion of reported crime is wholly unacceptable.

Even when crimes are correctly recorded, too many are removed or cancelled as recorded crimes for no good reason. Of the 3,246 decisions to cancel, or no-crime, a crime record that we reviewed, 664 were incorrect. These included over 200 rapes and more than 250 crimes of violence against the person. Offenders who should be being pursued by the police for these crimes are not being brought to justice and their victims are denied services to which they are entitled. (HMIC 2014: p18)

These sentiments were reinforced and extended by the House of Commons Public Administration Select Committee (PASC 2014). They made the point that deficiencies in recording crime data reduce police effectiveness in both protecting the public and reducing crime. A further implication of the under-reporting of crime is that the rate of decrease in crime may be exaggerated. Consequently, PASC decided in January 2014 to strip police recorded crime data of its designation as National Statistics.

One of the reasons given for the problems of crime recording is that the people responsible for generating data are subject to performance approval, meeting set targets and political pressure. The suggestion is that there is a tendency for the police to focus on those offences that are easiest to clear up and to respond to given targets.
As a consequence of the issues raised by HMIC and PASC some forces have changed their data collection methods and police recorded crime totals have been modified. This development compounds the changes in the nature of counting rules and the transition from the Home Office counting rules that were in force between 1982 and 1998 and the introduction of the new counting rules between 1989 and 2002. This in turn has been followed by the post NCRS implementation since 2003 (see Figure 1). Moreover, from the end of March 2012 onwards, police recorded crime data have included offences from additional sources including fraud data. This has had the effect of inflating overall levels of crime and making long-term trends more difficult to identify. Indeed the Public Administration Select Committee (2014) concluded that the PRC data ‘does not correctly represent the rate of decrease in crime or the composition of crime’ (p10).

However, there have been some notable increases in police recorded data over the past two years which the authors of the Crime Survey for England and Wales (2016) note and suggest that this could be the result of a number of factors but acknowledge that: ‘it is difficult to disentangle these different factors’ (p6).

Figure 1: Trends in Crime Survey for England and Wales and police recorded crime, year ending December 1981 to year ending June 2016

The Office for National Statistics however address the recent increases in the following terms:

Apparent increases in police force area data may reflect a number of factors, including tightening of recording practices, increase in reporting by victims and also genuine increases in the level of crime. It is thought that incidents of violence are more open to subjective judgements about recording and thus more prone to changes in police practice (ONS 2016).
The reality is that police generated data is unreliable and partial and changes in recording practices have affected the data in a way that makes long-term trends difficult to calculate.

It has also been suggested by these HMIC (2014) that the shift to neighbourhood policing in recent years may have led to a number of lower level offences being dealt with informally. However, it is not clear the extent to which the discrepancies in the figures are a result of a deliberate misreading of events or as a consequence of police officers’ misunderstanding or ignorance of the rules and principles of crime recording.

The Crime Survey for England and Wales data (CSEW)

The CSEW covers a broad range of victim-based crimes experienced by a sample of around 35,000 adults. First established in 1982 surveys have been conducted on a regular basis and this is seen to provide the ability to compare crime types over time. The CSEW by focusing on victimisation is able to capture a wider range of incidents than those recorded by the police. However, there are some serious offences such as homicide and some sexual offences that are not included in its estimates. Also, the CSEW sample frame excludes those not living in ‘normal households’.

According to the Public Administration Select Committee report Caught Red Handed (2014) the CSEW provides a ‘benchmark’ against which police generated data can be compared (see Figure 2). However, the report states that the CSEW cannot give a detailed indication of crime trends at a local level since the sample size is too small in each force area for the local area statistics to give meaningful results for most offences. Consequently, police recorded crime, with all of its limitations, is the only available detailed indication of crime trends at the local level.

The implicit assumption in national victimisation surveys is that crime is its own cause and that it can be altered by directly targeting crime, as well as adopting specific strategies such as situational crime prevention and problem solving policing. In contrast, criminological research has suggested that ‘exogenous’ socio-economic predictors of area-level crime rates such as the Area Deprivation Index, which highlight social exclusion and the concentration of poverty, may be more appropriate (Hope 2007).

The CSEW also creates pseudo-neighbourhoods and artificial boundaries that have proven to have limited ability to predict either incidence or prevalence rates (Kershaw and Tseloni 2005). There is a tendency to average out or flatten variations within selected areas and it may be overlooked that certain locations are composed of populations that are extremely vulnerable or highly immune. Thus, the resulting crime patterns may be an outcome of these conflicting forces. Patterns of crime will also be affected by different forms of securitisation, particularly in the form of private security and gated communities (Hope 2001).
A major difficulty in comparing more recent patterns and distributions of victimisation with those of the 1980s and 1990s is that a major sample redesign took place in the British Crime Survey in 2000. Until 1998 the British Crime Survey oversampled inner city areas. However, from 2000 onwards the sample selection for primary stratification changed and the procedure for oversampling inner-city areas was abandoned in favour of creating representative samples from each of the Police Force Areas (PFAs). One implication of this change of strategy is that since 2000 there is a greater likelihood of under-selecting these inner city residents within their own neighbourhoods who between them produce a high frequency of crime victimisation.

According to the independent think tank Civitas, the real level of crime is much higher than the Crime Survey for England and Wales suggests because it has omitted in the past offences against those under 16 as well as offences against businesses and manufacturers such as shoplifting. It also does not count offences against those living in institutions. Civitas estimated in 2005 that over 20 million offences take place in England and Wales that do not show up on the survey. If these calculations are accurate they raise issues about the extent of the ‘crime drop’ and suggests that crime may be a bigger problem in England and Wales than the CSEW suggests (Green and Cackett 2005).

One of the main points of uncertainty in the CSEW data is calculating the number of victims of all CSEW crimes since all adults resident in a household that have experienced a crime incident against the household are counted as victims of crime. The consequence is that the number of adults who are victims of all CSEW incidents is larger than the number of incidents presented. This research strategy means that the figures for the total number of victims are arbitrarily inflated.

There is a tension in conducting crime surveys between being ‘relevant’ and being ‘independent’. The former requires close control by the Government in setting priorities and tends to compromise the aim of being independent. Consequently, there have been calls for an external independent company to run CSEW on the basis that there needs to be a separation between those who produce statistical data and those who deliver policy.

The claims by the authors of CSEW (2016) that: 1) it provides a representative sample of the population 2) that the methodology has been consistent over time and 3) that it provides a reliable
measure of long term trends are open to dispute. In addition there are issues of sampling strategy and the ability of respondents to recall past events accurately. There are a number of crime types that are excluded (e.g. homicide, drug offences and business crime) as well as those offences that are difficult to capture in a victimisation survey such as sexual offences. Moreover, the data on which the CSEW is based are subject to a number of possible limitations, particularly those related to the recall of respondents. There is a tendency either for respondents to present selective incidents that occurred outside of the time period or alternatively to overlook incidents that have occurred within the time period. In addition, in large-scale surveys of this type there is also a real possibility of interviewer error.

Although it is frequently maintained that the CSEW has maintained a consistent methodology over time there have been some important changes. Notably, prior to 2002 CSEW respondents were asked about their experience of crime in the previous calendar year. Following the introduction of continuous interviewing respondents’ experience of crime relates to the full twelve months prior to the interview. As a result the period of reference is moved and it becomes difficult to make year on year comparisons.

Just as there has been a tendency to under-record crime by the police so there is a tendency to under-report crime by the CSEW. This tendency is linked to the omission of victimisation of young people aged 10-15 until 2009. In the 2015 CSEW it was estimated that there were approximately 800,000 incidents of victimisation experienced by young people in this age group over half of which were categorised as involving violence while a third involved thefts of personal property. Moreover, the authors of the CSEW note that as a result ‘trends can be difficult to interpret’ (CSEW 2016: 9). The sample size for 10-15 year olds is only 3,000 to cover this age group in England and Wales. Consequently, the CSEW like police recorded crime only provides a very partial picture of crime and victimisation, which makes it difficult to track crime trends.

In sum, victimisation surveys are particularly weak in relation to surveying sensitive topics such as sexual offences, rape and drug use. Understandably, respondents may be unwilling to give details of these experiences to an interviewer whom they do not know.

A number of factors can affect the response rate and substance of the survey:

• The age range of the respondents
• The length of recall period
• Whether they are panel or household surveys
• The design of the questionnaire and relation between structured and open-ended questions
• Whether interviews are computer based or face to face

Simply in terms of quality data collected may be altered by:

• A lack of awareness that a crime has been committed
• Forgetting relevant incidents
• An unwillingness to think seriously about questions
• A misunderstanding about the meaning of the questions
The content of the survey can also affect responses including:

- The climate of public opinion at the time of the survey
- The auspices under which the survey is being carried out
- The perceived purpose of the survey
- The characteristics of the interviewer
- The physical setting of the interview
- The order of questions

The case for conducting local crime surveys

In a review of crime data which Professor Adrian Smith carried out for the Secretary of State in 2006 he claimed that the ‘scope and definitions’ of the national statistics that are provided need a radical overhaul that significant groups of victims are not covered by current surveys and certain major current crime category definitions are confusing and misleading. Adrian Smith argued that national crime data are often at odds with individuals own experience and that the calculation data should be made available in a more accessible way since it is a ‘public’ resource, not just owned by the police. Most importantly that crime data needs to be available in a way that holds the police and local authority to account.

Thus, it is suggested that local crime surveys have the potential of providing detailed information on victimisation and are based on the recognition that crime varies considerably from area to area. Moreover, in contrast to national crime surveys based on aggregate statistical data, local surveys can make a significant contribution to local crime control policies.

Examining crime trends

Despite these caveats and limitations of both police recorded data and the CSEW it is necessary to draw on these data since they provide the only available guide to crime trends in England and Wales. Although we need to proceed with due caution an examination of these data sources will be undertaken in an attempt to gain some understanding of the changing nature of crime and victimisation in England and Wales over the past three decades.

Figure 1 above provides a widely circulated overview of crime trends according to both police generated data and the CSEW. The trend depicted by the CSEW, which is often held to provide a more reliable account of crime trends, indicates a steady increase the total number of offences between 1982 and 1994. Thereafter there is virtually year on year decrease with the total level of crime in 2012/13 significantly lower than it was in 1982 and some 40% lower than in 1994/95.

The police recorded data, on the other hand, presents a slightly different picture with some fluctuations that may reflect a change in the counting rules and the way in which different incidents are recorded. Significantly, there is a decrease in recorded crime under the old counting rules between 1992 and 1998/99, as well as a decrease after implementation of NCRS from 2002/3 to 2012/13.

Interestingly, there has been a 7% increase in police recorded crime between 2015 and 2016. This increase may in part be due to the implementation of more rigorous recording procedures following the HMIC reports. However, according to police generated data there has also been a significant
increase in violence against the person (up 24%), public order offences (up 28%) and sexual offences (up 14%). In addition, there have been moderate increases in theft (up 5%), vehicle offences (up 4%), fraud (up 5%) and shoplifting (up 3%) (see Figure 3).

**Figure 3: Selected police recorded crime offences in England and Wales: volumes and percentage change between year ending June 2015 and year ending June 2016**

The immediate question that arises from these figures whether this is the beginning of an upturn in crime and at the same time there is an indication of a significant disparity between police recorded data and the CSEW. The CSEW continues to show a decrease in most offence categories with the exception of violence, which shows no change from 2015/16 but there is a reported 15% decrease in the category ‘violence with injury’ as well as a 6% increase in homicides (CSEW 2016).

The CSEW included a self-completion questionnaire in 2005 which was designed to capture incidents of domestic violence. Again, the CSEW results show stability in the number of reported cases, while the police recorded data indicate a 21% increase in sexual offences. This includes a 22% increase in rape. In contrast, the CSEW reports a significant increase in fraud, particularly plastic card fraud, while the police recorded crime figures which have been reported to Action Fraud and the National Fraud Intelligence Bureau (NFIB) are significantly lower than the CSEW reports. Credit card and bank fraud are less likely to be referred to the NFIB and only the more serious incidents are likely to be reported to the police.

In an overview of crime trends over the past twenty-five years a Home Office report based on British Crime Survey/CSEW data has provided details about reported changes in both property and violent crime as well as changing levels of fear and risk (Janssen 2007). The report claims that the risk of victimisation decreased from 28% of the population to 23% between 1981 and 2005/6. Significantly, however, the composition of crimes has changed little between 1981 and 2005/6. For example, in 1981 20% of BCS incidents were violent crimes and by 2005/6 the percentage of violent crime had increased slightly to 23%.
The most noticeable decrease over the past two decades in BCS reported crime has been in relation to vehicle crime. The decrease in vehicle related crime has been attributed to various security measures that have been applied to vehicles (Farrall et al 2011). In England and Wales close to 90% of cars had central locking devices fitted by 2006-7 and 69% had an electronic immobiliser. The combination of these security measures, it is claimed, has had a major impact on vehicle related crime, notably in the UK but in other countries as well. Indeed, the application of security measures not only to vehicles but to other objects such as the use of door and window locks it is claimed lies behind the so called ‘crime drop’ that has taken place nationally and internationally since the mid 1990s (Tseloni et al 2010).

While there can be little doubt that the elaborate array of security measures that have been applied to vehicles over the past two decades or so have had an impact on car related crime the claim that it is only security measures that are totally responsible for either the decrease in vehicle related crime in particular or the ‘crime drop’ in general is questionable. In a recent Home Office report it is argued that the timing of the introduction of these security measures does not fit very well with the recorded decreases of vehicle related crime in the UK or other countries and that crime decrease was already underway:

Overall then, the analysis suggests that vehicle security – and electronic immobilisers in particular – made an important contribution to an already falling trend rather than causing initial crime turnaround (Morgan et al. 2016: 8).

This conclusion suggests that there were other factors in play, not only in relation to vehicle crime but also in relation to other crime types. Interestingly, the figures for the year 2014-15 showed a 3% increase in police recorded thefts from vehicles in England and Wales - the first increase in two decades.

According to BCS data there were 733,000 burglaries in 2005/6, which is just slightly less than the 749,000 that were recorded in 1981. Burglaries recorded by the BCS peaked in 1995 with 1,770,000 incidents. Since then the number of domestic burglaries has decreased by 59%. The BCS data for 2005/6 show that the factors associated with a higher risk of victimisation are: a) having no security measures, b) the household reference person being unemployed and c) living in a deprived area with high levels of physical disorder (Walker et al 2006).

Fear of crime also appears to have decreased nationally since the 1980s. Since the introduction of the ‘fear of crime’ questions into the BCS in 1984, worry about all types of crime has decreased until recently. These ‘fears’ appear to be associated with people’s expectations of future victimisation and this is particularly so for those living in high crime areas.

Is violence decreasing?

According to the CSEW both property crime and violent crime have decreased steadily over the last twenty years. However, although there can be little doubt that there has been a significant decrease in most forms of property crime the decrease in violent crime is far less certain.

A major consideration when estimating crime trends is the period covered. Much of the recent literature has focused on the perceived decrease in crime from its peak in the early 1990s, but if we take a longer-term view the decrease appears much less dramatic. If we examine the CSEW violent
crime trends from the earlier 1990s to the present day it may be more appropriate to try to explain why violent crime peaked in the mid 1990s (see Figure 4).

**Figure 4: Trends in Crime Survey for England and Wales, violence, year ending in December 1981 to year ending June 2016**

The CSEW surveys show a 41% decrease in violent crime between 1995 and 2002. This has been followed by a more gradual decrease. It is however estimated that between 2009 and 2015 there was a 26% decrease.

If we break the broad category of ‘violence’ down into different forms of violence it is evident from the victim form module of the CSEW (ONS 2013: Table A1) that following a fall in domestic violence between 1993 and 2010 to 289,000 incidents, this offence subsequently increased to 398,000 in 2013 (Walby et al. 2016).

In considering these changes it is important to note that there is a difference between the number of victims and the number of incidents reported. As such there will be fluctuations over time in relation to the number of victims and the number of incidents, depending on the level of repeats (Hope 1995; Farrall and Pease 2007).

A significant feature of the CSEW is that the data are capped. In England and Wales all serious incidents have been capped at five since the survey’s inception in 1982. In an attempt to re-examine trends in violent crime and victimization, Walby et al (2016) have reworked the capped data from the CSEW and developed an estimate of a three-year average in order to provide a more reliable measurement of volatility over time. By adopting this approach they conclude that since 2009 that nine of the twelve forms of violent crime examined show a significant change of slope and that they may now be increasing. These forms of violent crime include violence against women, including domestic violence, while violent crime against men continues to decrease.
An alternative measure of violence has been provided by researchers based at Cardiff University (Shepherd 2015). Based on a sample of 91 Emergency Departments (EDs), Minor Injury Units, and Walk-in Centres in England and Wales, the researchers found that there were an estimated 102,818 fewer ED violence related attendances in 2015 compared with 2010. Males, it was found, were two and a half times more likely than females to receive ED treatment following violence related injury. Serious violence affecting children (0-10 years) and young adults (18-30) decreased by 9% and 4% respectively in 2015 compared with 2014.

When examining trends in violence there is a tendency to focus on the decrease from the peak in the mid 1990s. However, if we take a longer-term view of the violence and take the early 1980s as our starting point we can see according to BCS data that the level of violence has fallen back to levels similar to thirty years ago. In 1981, there were 2.2 million violent incidents reported to the BCS and in 2005/6 this figure was 2.4 million (Janssen 2007).

**Figure 5: Trends in violent crime 1981 to 2005/6, BCS**

There have, of course, been changes in BCS sampling procedures and the questionnaire design over the period, which makes these findings not directly comparable, but there are clear indications of changes in the social and geographical composition of victims during the 1980s and 1990s (Trickett et al 1995).

There was a 27% increase in violence against the person offences recorded by the police in the year ending March 2016 compared with the previous year and the latest figures represent the highest number recorded in a 12 month period since the introduction of the NCRS in 2002. The police recorded 571 homicides in the last year, 34 more than in the previous year, an increase of 6%. Interestingly, the police recorded data for sexual offences in England and Wales shows an increase in sexual offences and the majority of those victims will be women. In line with the findings of Walby et al (2016) police recorded data show an increased in reported rape since 2009 and a significant increase in ‘other sexual offences’ since 2013.
Trends in property crime

Property crime according to the CSEW showed steady increases throughout the 1980s reaching a peak in 1995. Since then respective surveys have shown a decrease of over 60%. This trend is consistent with that seen in a number of other countries (Van Dyke, Tseloni and Farrell 2012)

**Figure 6: Long-term trends in CSEW, total crime and property crime, year ending December 1981 to year ending March 2016**

Property crime accounts for approximately 80% of all crime covered in the CSEW. Since 1995, the level of property crime has decreased significantly according to the CSEW with the most noticeable decreases occurring in relation to vehicle related incidents. Domestic burglary has also fallen over this period.
Police recorded data show a similar decrease in vehicle crime and burglary but show a decrease in theft from the person and robbery as well as an increase in shoplifting, bicycle theft and fraud, which have increased significantly.

Domestic burglary and other theft of personal property peaked in the mid 1990s but fell steadily until 2008-9. It has since leveled out. During 2015-2016 theft from the person has increased. According to police recorded data there has been a steady decrease in theft offences since 2003. However for burglary, vehicle theft, bicycle theft and robbery there has been a leveling out over the past two years (see Figure 8).

**Figure 8: Trends in selected police recorded theft offence in England and Wales**

![Graph showing trends in selected police recorded theft offence in England and Wales](image)
Explaining crime trends

In order to analyse crime trends over time, many researchers simply refer to the ‘headline’ figures showing an increase or decrease in reported crime or victimisation. However, criminologists who have examined these issues have developed the notion of ‘crime flux’, which distinguishes between:

- The incidence rate, which is the per capita number of household crime victimisation incidents
- The prevalence rate, which is the number of victimisation incidents per victim
- The concentration rate, which is the number of times that the same victims have been re-victimised
- The composition of crime types, which involves relative changes in the relation between different types of crime over time

There can be considerable variance between incidence and prevalence rates. This variance will be affected by the concentration rate, particularly in high crime areas (Hope 2007). The concentration rate will, in turn, exert an influence on the crime victimisation rate. As Figure 9 below indicates changes in the case of domestic burglary rates may have been driven by changes in prevalence rates, while the rate of concentration has remained fairly stable.

**Figure 9: Burglary in England and Wales, 1981-2006: incidence, prevalence and concentration**

![Figure 9: Burglary in England and Wales, 1981-2006: incidence, prevalence and concentration](image)

Source: T. Hope (2007)

In an analysis of BCS data on changes in property crime between 1982 and 1988 it was found that the recorded changes were largely attributable to changes in concentration rather than to victim prevalence (Trickett et al 1995). The authors argue that:

Clarifying the basis of area differences in these terms is not merely a trivial or statistical exercise. To take two implausible extremes, if area differences turned out to be a function exclusively of victim prevalence, crime control activity would need to be spread throughout the communities suffering much crime, since people who had not yet been victimised in those areas none the less would be at substantial risk of falling
victims. At the opposite extreme, if area differences were to be purely a function of the number of victimisations per victim, crime control could concentrate in the victimized population, since they are the only group at heightened risk in high crime areas (Trickett et al. 1995: 344)

**Urban and rural crime trends**

There are significant differences in the level and distribution of crime in urban, suburban and rural areas. According to the BCS data crime rates in urban and inner city area are between two and three times higher than in rural areas.

**Table 1: Crime rates in urban and rural areas compared 2003-04**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area type</th>
<th>% Victims once or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All vehicle theft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner city</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All non-rural</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All households/adults</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CSEW 2003-04, table 6.04

There is also considerable variation between different urban areas in terms of recorded crime with Nottingham having almost five times the level of crime of the safest town in national rankings – Colchester. Interestingly, London has been ranked 21st out of 55 for the overall rate of serious offences. This is partly because London contains some of the safest communities in the country, notably Richmond and Kingston-Upon-Thames. However, London also includes some of the most dangerous urban areas in the country with eleven London boroughs in the top twenty worst performing areas on six measures of crime seriousness (Gibbs and Haldenby 2006). Westminster tops the rankings for serious crime followed by Islington and Hackney.

London, like other parts of the country has experienced a significant decrease in crime and victimisation over the past two decades. As Figure 10 below indicates there has been a dramatic drop in vehicle related crime and a steady decrease in violent crime - at least until 2014 according to the CSEW.

Metropolitan police data shows a similar decrease in recorded crime between 2001/02 and 2012/13, as Table 2 below indicates. However, it should be noted that both that violence against the person peaked in the period 2004-06 and that the level of violence in 2011/12 was very similar to 2001/02, while sexual offences have increased over the period from 6,759 in 2001/02 to 9,841 in 2012/13. Drug related offences have also increased in this period while burglary and personal robbery have remained fairly stable. The offences with the most significant decreases between 2001/02 to 2012/13 are criminal damage and fraud.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Violence</th>
<th>Sexual Offences</th>
<th>Drugs</th>
<th>Robbery (Personal)</th>
<th>Burglary</th>
<th>Theft and handling</th>
<th>Fraud and Forgery</th>
<th>Criminal Damage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>994,233</td>
<td>155,276</td>
<td>6,759</td>
<td>23,626</td>
<td>37,623</td>
<td>112,376</td>
<td>451,740</td>
<td>83,453</td>
<td>144,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>1,057,360</td>
<td>161,359</td>
<td>5,944</td>
<td>26,206</td>
<td>49,446</td>
<td>116,027</td>
<td>443,572</td>
<td>87,873</td>
<td>147,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>1,080,741</td>
<td>178,802</td>
<td>10,427</td>
<td>33,321</td>
<td>38,948</td>
<td>113,027</td>
<td>463,710</td>
<td>82,896</td>
<td>144,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>1,060,930</td>
<td>186,188</td>
<td>10,200</td>
<td>32,332</td>
<td>37,476</td>
<td>105,361</td>
<td>448,818</td>
<td>78,133</td>
<td>147,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>1,015,121</td>
<td>201,926</td>
<td>10,864</td>
<td>33,011</td>
<td>36,807</td>
<td>101,474</td>
<td>412,264</td>
<td>70,144</td>
<td>135,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>984,125</td>
<td>197,264</td>
<td>10,293</td>
<td>42,681</td>
<td>42,481</td>
<td>103,510</td>
<td>400,376</td>
<td>52,319</td>
<td>122,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>921,779</td>
<td>182,355</td>
<td>9,305</td>
<td>53,967</td>
<td>42,460</td>
<td>96,728</td>
<td>365,714</td>
<td>42,957</td>
<td>113,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>862,632</td>
<td>172,743</td>
<td>8,766</td>
<td>71,260</td>
<td>33,645</td>
<td>93,894</td>
<td>332,156</td>
<td>33,011</td>
<td>102,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>845,040</td>
<td>174,414</td>
<td>8,748</td>
<td>76,545</td>
<td>29,344</td>
<td>93,575</td>
<td>313,329</td>
<td>38,862</td>
<td>95,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>829,319</td>
<td>174,616</td>
<td>9,930</td>
<td>67,500</td>
<td>30,202</td>
<td>92,807</td>
<td>312,542</td>
<td>38,151</td>
<td>88,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>823,419</td>
<td>165,899</td>
<td>10,177</td>
<td>64,046</td>
<td>32,848</td>
<td>93,401</td>
<td>324,126</td>
<td>37,991</td>
<td>80,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>814,727</td>
<td>153,841</td>
<td>10,110</td>
<td>61,003</td>
<td>36,131</td>
<td>96,193</td>
<td>332,608</td>
<td>38,287</td>
<td>72,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>771,566</td>
<td>149,716</td>
<td>9,841</td>
<td>52,386</td>
<td>32,335</td>
<td>92,684</td>
<td>333,769</td>
<td>27,173</td>
<td>59,924</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significantly, according to data supplied by the Metropolitan Police there has been a steady increase in the total level of recorded crime between 2012/13 and 2015/16. During this period, the total number of offences has increased from 710,000 to 761,869.

It should be noted that the category ‘vehicle offences’ has shown an increase of 15,227 incidents (4%) in the year ending March 2016. This is the first increase in this category since 2006. Shoplifting has increased according to police data between 2013 and 2016. Moreover, since March 2008 there has been an annual overall increase of 5% in theft from the person offences recorded by the police. This increase in theft from the person has been recorded in around two-thirds of police forces and is believed to mostly involve the theft of purses and wallets, mobile phones and credit cards (ONS 2016).

In relation to criminal damage and arson have also shown a 7% increase between the year March 2015 and March 2016. These increases were reported in 40 out of 44 police forces in England and Wales. The latest figures to June 2015 show a 3% increase nationally in police recorded thefts of vehicles in England and Wales, although it is suggested that this may be mainly due to the theft of motorcycles and scooters (Morgan et al 2016).
If we look in more detail at crime in the London Borough of Islington we see again that it peaked in 2004-06 and that the level in 2012/13 is similar to 2001/02 (see Table 3 below). A similar pattern emerges in relation to sexual offences. The most significant decreases that have taken place according to the Metropolitan Police figures are in relation to burglary, fraud and forgery, and criminal damage.

Over the last two years, however, there has been an increase in violence against the person in Islington from 7,484 incidents in 2014/15 to 7,560 in 2015/16. Similarly, in relation to sexual assault there has been an increase from 382 to 522 incidents over the same period.
Table 3: London Met Data for Islington 2000-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Violence</th>
<th>Sexual Offences</th>
<th>Drugs</th>
<th>Robbery (Personal)</th>
<th>Burglary</th>
<th>Theft and handling</th>
<th>Fraud and Forgery</th>
<th>Criminal Damage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>35,918</td>
<td>5,443</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>1,393</td>
<td>4,292</td>
<td>16,378</td>
<td>2,301</td>
<td>4,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>37,611</td>
<td>5,667</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>1,659</td>
<td>4,567</td>
<td>17,747</td>
<td>1,611</td>
<td>4,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>39,425</td>
<td>6,347</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>1,496</td>
<td>4,429</td>
<td>19,058</td>
<td>1,528</td>
<td>4,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>40,816</td>
<td>6,607</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>1,101</td>
<td>1,274</td>
<td>3,957</td>
<td>20,560</td>
<td>1,393</td>
<td>4,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>37,956</td>
<td>7,617</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>1,094</td>
<td>1,161</td>
<td>3,681</td>
<td>17,822</td>
<td>1,488</td>
<td>4,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>37,650</td>
<td>7,002</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>1,361</td>
<td>1,307</td>
<td>3,683</td>
<td>18,069</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>3,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>29,396</td>
<td>6,289</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>1,540</td>
<td>1,381</td>
<td>3,728</td>
<td>16,775</td>
<td>1,387</td>
<td>3,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>30,228</td>
<td>5,364</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>2,763</td>
<td>1,119</td>
<td>3,345</td>
<td>13,583</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>2,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>29,396</td>
<td>5,679</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>3,375</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>3,016</td>
<td>12,033</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>2,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>28,396</td>
<td>5,848</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>2,333</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>2,852</td>
<td>12,736</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>2,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>28,125</td>
<td>5,916</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>2,243</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>2,691</td>
<td>13,029</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>2,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>27,026</td>
<td>5,073</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>1,649</td>
<td>1,143</td>
<td>2,830</td>
<td>12,844</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>2,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>27,865</td>
<td>5,394</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>1,761</td>
<td>1,094</td>
<td>2,322</td>
<td>13,942</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>1,801</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

Analysing crime trends nationally and regionally over the past thirty years is fraught with difficulties. As has been suggested there are serious limitations in relation to the two most widely used data sources – the Crime Survey for England and Wales and the police generated data. These two sources use different categories, capture different aspects of crime and victimisation and only focus on a restricted range of incidents. Consequently, they present two partial and competing depictions of crime and victimisation that have to be treated with caution. However, in the absence of any other data source that might allow us to analyse long term trends in crime we are required to draw on these two data sources while recognising that the picture that is constructed is at best approximate. At certain points both data sources produce similar accounts of long-term trends while at other points there is considerable divergence. It is instructive, however, to examine these data sets critically and look in detail at local and regional variations. It is also necessary to examine these local and regional variations by crime type since the overall figures may show a general decrease in crime and victimisation while certain categories of crime are increasing or remaining stable. It has been suggested that the reduction in violent crime and sexual offences reported in the CSEW may be exaggerated, while in London and Islington the level of violent crime in 2012/13 are similar to those of 2001/02. Most significantly, over the last two years there are signs that crime and victimisation are either increasing or at least leveling out, although it is too early to say this may indicate the end of the ‘crime drop’ which has taken place over the last two decades.

Introduction

The aim of this section is to place the victimisation surveys carried out in Islington in 1986 and 2016 in context. Over this period considerable social, political, and demographic changes have taken place in the borough. The role and value of victimisation surveys is assessed in relation to other available data sources that are commonly used to analyse crime trends.

The first Islington crime survey in context

The first Islington Crime Survey was conducted in the mid 1980s during the era of Thatcherism and the consequent development of neo-liberalism (Jones, MacLean and Young 1986). The main tenet of this doctrine was a belief in the ability of the market mechanism to create a more efficient system of production and distribution and there was significant opposition to tax regulation, trade union activity or state protection. It was Margaret Thatcher’s classic doctrine following Hayek that ‘there is no such thing as society’. In the post-social and post-Keynsian world the campaign against trade unions culminated in the Miners strike of 1984. The ‘Battle of Orgreave’ between the police and the miners represented an increasing public order role for the police in which they came into conflict with different sections of the community.

A series of riots in Brixton, Bristol and Moss Side were attributed to police racism and the adoption of military style policing, together with a widening gap between the police – particularly the Metropolitan Police and the communities they serve. These riots were followed by a high-profile riot in Broadwater Farm in Tottenham, North London following the death of a Black woman, Cynthia Jarrett during a police search. During the riot PC Keith Blakelock was also killed.

These events contributed to the growing public and political debates about the role of the police and the Scarman Report which was commissioned following the Brixton riots in 1981. According to the Scarman Report the riots were a spontaneous outburst of built-up resentment, as well as a mix of complex political, social and economic factors together with problems of racial disadvantage and inner city decline. In particular, Scarman found evidence of the disproportionate and indiscriminate use of ‘stop and search’ powers by the police against Black people (Cowell, Jones and Young 1982).

Stuart Hall famously described these and related developments as ‘Drifting into a Law and Order Society’. He claimed that:

This drift into a ‘Law and Order’ society is no temporary affair. No doubt it is in part a response to the deepening economic recession, as well as to the political polarisation, social tensions and accumulating class antagonisms which inevitably accompany it (Hall 1980: 267).

Hall characterises the 1980s as a period of *authoritarian populism* in which the tendency towards authoritarianism from above is matched by populist punitiveness from below. In this context raising questions of rights and civil liberties is tantamount to being ‘subversive’.
It is against this background of increasing unemployment, growing inequality, and social unrest that there appeared to be a relentless increase in crime. Between 1970 and 1980 the total number of recorded crimes had increased from just over 1.55 million to 2.68 million cases. At this time there was no real prospect of crime decreasing or even levelling off. The main concern was what could be done to stop crime increasing even more rapidly.

One of the main functions of the British Crime Survey (BCS) which was introduced in 1982 was formally to gain a better understanding of the distribution of victimisation on one hand and to explore the so called ‘dark figure’ of crime on the other. Its less overt function, however, was to reduce public anxieties about crime by calculating the risk of victimisation on a national rather than local basis and by placing a limit on the number of incidents that respondents were allowed to report.

The First Islington Crime Survey (1986) was designed to serve in part as a compliment to the BCS by providing more detailed local information, but also as a critique of the political role and social impact of the BCS. As Brian MacLean, one of the authors of the First Islington Crime Survey argued:

> The British Crime Survey promised to provide more accurate measures of the frequency and distribution of crime, instead it reproduced the very categories and conceptual biases of the data collection system, which it sought to improve. Instead of addressing the political processes of data collection and reporting the crime survey only served to make them more obscure. While the responsibility for the collection of crime survey data was placed in departments of justice and not the police, it still vested with agents of formal social control. Thus, the crime survey data are still the products of political processes and are still used politically in the law and order debate (MacLean 1989: 95).

The BCS as well as other national and international surveys is charged with being of limited utility to local agencies in addressing the crime problem in their areas. In short, the practical utility of these national and international surveys it was argued are severely circumscribed. In contrast, local victimisation surveys like the First Islington Crime Survey promised to provide a ‘democratic instrument’ that could identify local concerns and priorities as well as providing detailed information about the public’s sense of safety.

The changing social, political and economic context 1986-2016

Over the past thirty years we have witnessed a rapid period of change in many aspects of social life, including the advent of the Internet and the widespread use of mobile phones as well as a perplexing array of new technologies that has transformed the social landscape in this country.

Despite the election of another Conservative neo-liberal government in 2010 following the economic crash in 2008 and growing inequality the level of unemployment has decreased from a peak of 12% in 1981/2 to a low of 5% in 2003/4. At the same time, there was a decline in manufacturing and a simultaneous expansion of the service sector. In conjunction with this change came a growth in the number of women in employment and a closing of the pay gap.

Family structure also changed. The number of lone parent families has increased as well as the rate of divorce in Britain. It would seem that the days of the Fordist ‘cornflake family’ are numbered.
Significant increases in the number of lone parent families, step families, cohabiting couples, same sex couples and children staying at home for longer has increased the variety of family formations. Parents, children and other family members may experience a number of different family structures over time. Fertility rates in the UK have also decreased steadily since the 1980s with the average number of children per woman being 1.91 in 2007 (SIRC 2008).

A greater percentage of the income for both men and women has been spent on the increase in house prices and rents, particularly in London. The sale of council houses under the right to buy scheme had a significant impact on the housing stock. The average house price in the UK has increased from £11,550 in 1976 to over £184,000 in 2011.

There have also been significant changes in the composition of the population over the last three decades. According to national census data the population of Islington increased by 30,000 (17%) between 2001 and 2011 to 206,000 residents. Almost 40% of this increase is accounted for by a growth in the population both in the European Union but outside of the UK and Ireland (11,560 people, 73% increase). The number of people born in non-EU countries increased by 10,000 (25% increase), while the number of people born in the UK increased by 9,600 (8% increase).

Islington’s population in 2011 in terms of relationship status was considerably different compared with the rest of London and England in general with the majority of residents recorded as single (60% vs. 44% in London and 35% in England). Moreover, Islington’s population became more ethnically diverse between 2001 and 2011 with less than half (48%) of residents being White British compared to 57% in 2001.

There have also been significant changes in the distribution of tenure with an 85% increase in private renting in Islington between 2001 and 2011. Home ownership has increased by 19% over this period. In contrast, social renting decreased by 17% over the same period.

**Changing forms of crime and control**

We have also witnessed a series of urban regeneration programmes in London over the past three decades, designed to attract investors, middle class shoppers and visitors by creating new consumption spaces. Thus:

> Ensuring that places are safe and are seen to be safe has taken a greater salience as these flows of income are easily disrupted by changing perceptions of fear and the threat of crime. At the same time, new technologies and policing strategies and tactics have been adopted in a number of regeneration areas which seek to establish control over these urban spaces. Policing space is increasingly about controlling human actions through design, surveillance technologies and codes of conduct and enforcement (Raco 2003: 1869).

The ‘securitisation of space’ is particularly evident in the London Borough of Islington. The role of public sector organisations has increasingly been supplemented by private security personnel. The aim is to provide more secure and aesthetically attractive urban spaces and to remove ‘social pollutants’. Consequently, the regeneration and increasing commercialisation of areas like Islington have effects on the use and policing of space.
Undoubtedly the most significant criminological change over the past two decades is the remarkable decrease in recorded and reported crime and victimisation in England and Wales. The decrease has been relatively consistent and has taken place across the country and across different crime types. The net result is that in the 1990s, according to the BCS, approximately 40% of adults had been in a household where someone was affected by crime. By 2014 the proportion has dropped to 20%. On an individual level one in thirty people aged 16 and over were victims of crime in 2013 compared with one in five in the mid 1990s. The decrease in crime from 1995-96 to 2014 is reported to be 77% for vehicle crime, 65% for burglary, 63% for violence and 61% for all acquisitive crime. In contrast, there has been a significant increase in cybercrime, particularly online fraud (see part A of this report).

While the level of ‘normal crime’ or ‘street crime’ has been decreasing there has been a growing focus on anti-social behaviour. Activities such as street begging, youths hanging around, cycling on pavements, graffiti, and abandoned cars that were considered minor issues in the 1980s have taken on a greater significance, particularly since the publication of Wilson and Kelling’s ‘Broken Windows’ article in 1982. This article argued that the police should focus on disorder rather than crime control and get tough on a range of incivilities. The growing concerns about anti-social behaviour resulted in the passing of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, which heralded the introduction of Anti-Social Behaviour Orders (ASBOs) and granted local authorities more responsibilities for reducing crime and disorder. Between April 1999 and December 2007 just under 15,000 ASBOs were issued in England and Wales. The use of ASBOs peaked in 2004 with approximately 4,500 issued in that year. Since then the use of ASBOs has steadily declined and has been replaced by the by the new powers contained in the Anti-Social Behaviour Act (2014) which include the Injunction to Prevent Nuisance and Annoyance and the Criminal Behaviour Order.

More recently there has been a growing focus on cybercrime, particularly online fraud. Based on Experimental Statistics from the new fraud and misuses questions that have been added to the Crime Survey for England and Wales in October 2015, adults aged 16 and over have reported that they have experienced an estimated 5.6 million fraud and computer misuse incidents in the twelve months prior to interview; 3.6 million of these were fraud incidents and 2 million were computer misuse incidents. The most common types of fraud reported were ‘bank and credit account’ fraud (2.4 million incidents; 65% of the total) followed by ‘non-investment fraud’ – such as fraud related to online shopping or fraudulent computer service calls. In addition, adults experienced an estimated 2 million computer misuse incidents, around two thirds (66%, 1.3 million incidents) of these were computer virus related and around third were related to unauthorised access to personal information.

The scale of these new forms of online crime has dwarfed some of the traditional offences and created a new set of victims, although since most of these ‘victims’ are routinely reimbursed for any loss by banks and other financial institutions. Consequently, their victim status is significantly different from the victims of ‘normal’ or ‘street crime’.

In turn, the social, demographic and criminological landscape has changed over the past three decades such that not only is the level and nature of crime and victimisation changing but also the context in which these changes have taken place is subject to radical transformation. Below, we explore specific changes in the demographic composition of Islington.
The changing demographics of Islington from 1981 to 2011

At the time of the first survey in 1986 the population of Islington was approximately 167,000, which rose to approximately 206,000 by 2016. Table 4 below compares the composition of the survey population (un-weighted) of the First and Third Islington Crime Surveys with the actual population of the borough at the time according to census data. Overall, the survey population in 2016 was older and less ethnically diverse than the actual population of the borough of Islington. In 1986 the ‘White’ population was underrepresented in the survey while the BME population was deliberately oversampled.

Table 4: Comparison between the survey respondents and Islington population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 plus</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BME</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11 below depicts the differences between the population of Islington in 1981 and 2011 (the most recent census data at the time). As can be seen, the gender balance of the population of Islington remains fairly equal but there have been significant changes in the composition of the borough in relation to age and ethnicity.

There has also been a growth in the number of people aged 25-44. The population increase, both in terms of the overall population and the increase in the number of young people as well as greater ethnic diversity, appears to be for the most part a function of changing patterns of immigration from both EU and non-EU countries. Census data shows that there has been a significant increase in the number of people migrating from EU countries (apart from the UK and Ireland) since 2011.
As can be seen above, in 1986, 14% of residents were classified as BME, whereas this figure has now increased to 40%, signifying increased diversity within the population and migration into the area.

The percentage of migrants aged 16-44 has increased by 18% (69% to 87%). This increase correlates with an increase in the private rented sector (see Figure 12 below). Relatedly, there has been a recent decrease in the older population and there are now fewer elderly people in the Islington area than in 1981 (9% compared with 17%).

**Gentrification and deprivation in Islington from 1981 to 2011**

In 1986, Islington was the seventh poorest borough in England and it is now twenty-sixth. However, in terms of income deprivation Islington ranks fifth nationally. Islington is characterized by a mixture of deprivation and affluence with considerable variation in income amongst its residents. Gentrification was underway at the time of the first survey and has steadily increased. There has also been a rise in commercial and leisure establishments.

Overcrowding and the demand for council housing were issues in the 1980s and continue to be so. In fact, Islington is now the most densely populated borough in England and Wales, more than twice the average for London. One of the current objectives of the Council is to provide affordable housing in the borough. Only 28% of householders own their home, compared with the national average of 63%. At present, the demand for housing of all types far outstrips supply.

The percentage of unemployed people has decreased from 13% to 5%. In real terms, the numbers have decreased from 10,803 to 8,960. In addition, currently there are 22,000 people who identify as disabled or have long-term health issues. Many of these people are economically inactive. As such, there continues to be a strong demand on social services.
Overall, the percentage of people in social housing and housing association rented properties has decreased by over 20% (as a percentage of the total housing population). However, there is still high demand for housing, reflecting an increase in the population as a whole. In terms of numbers, there were 41,098 social housing renters (35,741 local authority) in 1981 and now there are 39,369 (25,041 local authority). Therefore, the major change is in relation to owner-occupiers and private renters (13% and 10% respectively).

Table 5: Changes in tenure between 1981 and 2011 by number of households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1981</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Authority</td>
<td>35,741</td>
<td>25,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Assoc.</td>
<td>5,357</td>
<td>14,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total LA and HA</td>
<td>41,098</td>
<td>39,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner occupiers</td>
<td>10,900</td>
<td>27,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private rental</td>
<td>11,157</td>
<td>25,217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, despite a dramatic improvement in overall ranking relating to poverty and despite gentrification, pockets of deprivation remain. Further, rapidly increasing house prices mean that it is becoming increasingly difficult for young people or those on low incomes to become homeowners in the area.

Neighbourhood satisfaction

Neighbourhood satisfaction has significantly improved over the last 30 years.

Table 6: Neighbourhood satisfaction by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ICS 1986</th>
<th></th>
<th>ICS 2016</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1986, approximately a quarter of residents had low satisfaction with their neighbourhood, with women more likely to feel dissatisfied. High satisfaction with the neighbourhood was very rare at only 1.5% of respondents. This low satisfaction is reflected in high levels of concern relating to specific issues (see below).

In 2016, however, the overwhelming majority of respondents said that they were extremely satisfied. This was the case for both men and women. This represents a significant change since 1986.

Neighbourhood concerns

Table 7 below outlines the top five neighbourhood concerns in 1986 compared with 2016. As can be seen, crime features prominently in both surveys but is lower down on the list of major concerns for residents in 2016 compared with 1986. On the other hand, crime is seen as the second highest problem in 2016 when both major and minor concerns are taken into account.

Interestingly, the top five concerns in 2016 and 1986 are very similar, including housing, unemployment, not enough areas for children to play (2016) or things for young people to do (1986). The only variation is that in 1986, vandalism was seen as a problem, whereas in 2016 heavy lorry noise is identified as more of an issue.

Overall, residents in 2016 appear to be far less concerned with specific issues in their neighbourhood and the nature of these concerns has changed. Housing issues (the costs of housing) are now a major concern instead of unemployment. Further, crime is lower on the list of priorities and the removal of vandalism from the top five issues means that crime as a theme has significantly decreased.
Table 7: Top five neighbourhood concerns in 1986 and 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top five 'big/major' problem 1986</th>
<th>Top 5 'big/major' problem 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Unemployment</td>
<td>1. Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Not enough things for young people to do</td>
<td>2. Unemployment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Crime</td>
<td>3. Not enough places for children to play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Housing</td>
<td>4. Heavy lorry noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Vandalism</td>
<td>5. Crime</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top five 'total problem' 1986</th>
<th>Top 5 'total problem' 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Unemployment</td>
<td>1. Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Crime</td>
<td>2. Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Vandalism</td>
<td>3. Unemployment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Not Enough For Young People To Do</td>
<td>4. Not Enough Places for Children to Play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Housing</td>
<td>5. Heavy Lorry Noise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 13 below identifies a range of issues that were a problem for some residents in both 1986 and 2016. As discussed previously, there were differences between the forms of categorisation used in both surveys. Most notably, ‘poor housing’ in 1986 is replaced by ‘housing costs’ in 2016 and ‘poor schools’ in 1986 is ‘school availability’ in 2016. Overall, in 2016 residents are less likely to see neighbourhood issues as a major problem and the most striking variations by resident characteristics were that White Other were less concerned overall, whereas BME residents were more concerned about race relations and unfriendliness. In terms of gender, there was very little variation (women were slightly more concerned in general but by a small margin). Therefore, the marked differences in terms of ethnicity and gender that were present in the first survey are less evident in 2016. Further, it appears that older residents now feel comparatively more concerned than previously.
Figure 13: Neighbourhood issues seen as a major or minor problem

Concerns relating to crime

Figure 14 below presents respondents views on crime in 1986 and 2016. As can be seen, a relatively similar proportion agree that crime is a ‘minor’ or ‘bit of a’ problem. However, there is a significant difference in how many people believe that crime is a major concern in the two periods decreasing from 37% in 1986 to only 13% 2016.

Figure 14: Crime as a major or minor problem
There were significant differences between men and women’s views on crime in 1986 with young women being much more likely to see crime as a big problem and women generally being more likely to report low satisfaction with their neighbourhood. In 1986, 58% of victims of violence were female. Women generally had a greater likelihood of victimisation and were subject to a greater degree of verbal harassment and threats on the street.

Relatedly, in the 1986 survey, an interesting pattern emerged in relation to age, ethnicity and gender. The survey found that young Black women were more likely to see crime as a big problem, whereas older Asian women were least likely. In general, Asian respondents saw crime as less of a problem, whereas Black and White respondents had fairly similar responses. In 2016, there was very little variation by age, ethnicity and gender. The most striking distinction was between young Black and young Asian males, with only 9% of Black men aged 25-44 reporting crime as a major concern as opposed to 39% of Asian men in the same age group. This is a reversal of the situation in 1986 when Asians were less likely to see crime as a problem.

Views on changing levels of crime

Both surveys explored whether respondents believed that crime had increased, stayed the same or decreased within the last 5 years. There has been a significant shift over time. In 1986, the majority of residents unsurprisingly believed that crime was an increasing problem. Some 70% said crime and other problems had become more common in the area, 27% suggested that it had remained the same, and 3% that it was less common. In 2016, only 14% of respondents believed crime was increasing. Figure 15 below identifies the types of crime respondents believed to be increasing in both surveys. As can be seen, burglary and robbery/mugging were the most likely to be seen as having increased in 1986. In 2016, it was the ‘new crimes’ such cybercrime that were seen to have increased the most. Online crime and fraud are now standout issues in relation to crime, whereas some of the issues that were perceived to be increasing in 1986 are less of a concern to residents in the present period.

Figure 15: Percentage of respondents who believe specific types of crime have increased
Table 8 below depicts the percentage of respondents who believed crime had increased in the last five years in both surveys. These responses appear to reflect a general awareness of crime trends.

Table 8: Belief about crime increase by age, gender, and ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>ICS 1986</th>
<th>ICS 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45+</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>ICS 1986</th>
<th>ICS 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>ICS 1986</th>
<th>ICS 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1986, younger residents, particularly those between the ages of 25 and 44 were most likely to believe crime had increased, whereas in 2016 this age group was least likely to see crime as increasing. Thus there appears to be a general shift over time in relation to crime concerns from younger to older residents. In addition, the gap between men and women has widened, although smaller numbers of both sexes believe that crime is increasing. Further, there has been a change in terms of ethnicity. Although the proportion of BME respondents expressing the view that crime is increasing had decreased significantly from 63% to 22% over the period BME respondents were still twice as likely as White respondents to believe that crime was increasing.

It is indicative that in 2016 that the populations that are more vulnerable to victimisation - women, older residents, and BME respondents - are understandably more likely to believe that crime is increasing. In both surveys, the following variables were found to be inter-related

- Fear of crime
- Belief in higher likelihood of victimisation
- Dissatisfaction with neighbourhood
- Belief that crime had increased

Changing priorities and conceptions of crime between 1986 and 2016

In 1986, residents were asked what types of crime they considered should be police priorities. Violent crime and hard drugs were given the highest priority by residents. In contrast, these offences were less evident in the 2016 survey.

The police in 1986 were seen to spend too much time on prostitution, although at the time of the survey street prostitution was fairly common in some parts of the borough (see Matthews 1986). In 2016, this issue received little attention and was only cited as a major concern in relation to anti-social behaviour by 5% of respondents. As such, in 1986 there was a disparity between the public’s priorities
and those of the police and what they were focussing on. This is symptomatic of a general distrust of the police at the time (discussed further below).

In 2016, anti-social behaviour was seen to be a problem by 27% of respondents, whereas in 1986 there was some public concern about ‘rowdyism on the streets’, although it was relatively low on the list of priorities in the 1980s.

**Perceptions of the likelihood of victimisation**

Perceptions of the likelihood of victimisation have decreased dramatically since 1986 when almost 90% of residents felt vulnerable to a moderate or high extent. In 2016 a picture emerges of a community that although continuing to have concerns about crime and victimisation has in general a much greater sense of safety than thirty years ago.

**Table 9: Perceived likelihood of victimisation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICS 1986</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>High or moderate</th>
<th>ICS 2016</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Fairly</th>
<th>Fairly or very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>Owned</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public rental</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>Public rental</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private rental</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>Private rental</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 plus</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>45 plus</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most striking pattern that emerged in 1986 was that the over 45s felt that they were less likely to be victimised, while young people were more likely to feel that they had a high risk of victimisation. These perceptions in both cases were fairly realistic.

Although there was a great deal of variation in the perceived likelihood of victimisation in 1986 by gender, there were some significant differences between male and female respondents in terms of their concerns about crime. Women reported far more fear compared with men in relation to feeling
very or fairly unsafe at night (73% compared with only 27% of men). Overall, 60% of women stated that they felt that going out after dark posed a risk.

In contrast, the majority of respondents in 2016 felt that it was fairly or very unlikely that they will be victimised in the next 12 months and only 2% felt that it was very likely. Previous victims, women, and homeowners perceived themselves as more likely to be victimised, whereas White respondents perceived themselves as less likely.

**Fear of crime**

The 1986 survey explored specific fears relating to crime and found that nearly half of women fear being raped or being sexually molested, while 56% of men and women fear burglary, and 46% fear street robbery. A substantial number of residents had concerns relating to crimes such as vandalism, street harassment, and stranger attacks. The survey found that fear was actually closely linked to the actual experiences of victimisation. For example, one third of respondents knew someone who had been mugged in the last year and this correlated with the belief that street robbery had increased. Other examples include the fact that younger women were more likely to be victims of assault and personal theft and also expressed a greater level of fear. Older men were more fearful in relation to street fights/disturbances which is probably a function of their level of personal vulnerability.

Further in 1986, BME residents were more likely to have high fear of crime, as were public renters, people who were not in the highest income bracket, 16-24 year olds, and people aged 45 plus. Generally, therefore, the better off in society that respondents were the less likely they were to fear crime.

The 2016 survey did not explore these specific fears. However, a change in the levels of fear can be determined through other responses. Both surveys measured feeling worried (1986) or unsafe (2016) at night. The 1986 survey asked a yes/no question - whether people ‘feel worried about going out on your own in this area after dark (yes/no)’ whereas the 2016 survey asked ‘how safe do you feel walking alone in this area after dark (very safe, fairly safe, a bit unsafe, very unsafe). As can be seen in Figure 16 below, the situation with regard to fear at night has significantly improved. Overall, only a fifth of respondents reported feeling unsafe walking alone at night compared to half of people who felt worried about going out on their own in the area after dark in 1986. Further, 98% of respondents reported that they feel safe during the day.
Tables 10 and 11 below show the percentage of respondents who expressed feeling worried (1986) or very/fairly unsafe (2016) by age and gender and by ethnicity.

**Table 10: Feeling worried/unsafe by age and gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>ICS 1986</th>
<th>ICS 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45+</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 11: Feeling worried/unsafe by ethnicity and gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>ICS 1986</th>
<th>ICS 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The significant change that has taken place between 1986 and 2016 in relation to gender is a decrease in the number of women feeling unsafe at night in Islington, particularly Black women, while Asian women on the other hand continue to experience relatively high levels of fear.
Despite improvements in feelings of safety, it is clear that women continue to feel less safe than men. According to the Fairness Commission Report (2012) women in Islington feel less safe than men after dark and the over 60s feel less safe than other age groups, which matches resident responses in the 2016 survey. There was no identifiable difference in the perceptions of White and BME residents in the Fairness Commission Report. However, in the 2016 survey Asian and Mixed Race residents were more likely to report feeling unsafe (37%/35% compared to 17% of White and 20% of Black respondents).

**Avoidance behaviours**

As fear has reduced, so have avoidance behaviours. These safety strategies have halved for both men and women between 1986 and the present. In 1986, women’s higher levels of fear resulted in 84% of women using some sort of avoidance behaviour (such as avoiding going out after dark, using cars instead of walking etc.) as opposed to only 39% of men. The 2016 survey found that this had decreased to 20% and 9% respectively.

**Figure 17: Percentage of men and women avoiding certain streets or areas**

![Avoidance behaviours chart]

**Security measures**

In 2016, 62% of respondents had installed security measures in their home compared to 53% in 1986. In the 1980s homeowners were more likely to invest in their homes and council properties had higher safety standards than private rental properties. However, it appears that over the past thirty years the securitisation of properties has become the norm.

During the 1980s there was a growing pressure for residents to sign up to neighbourhood watch schemes which it was widely believed would increase their safety. However, in the recent crime survey only 52 respondents stated that they were members of neighbourhood watch and related schemes.
Witnessing and reporting crimes

In 1986, unreported crime was high, with overall only 50% of incidents being reported to the police either by the victim or someone else. The least likely to be reported were personal theft and theft from a dwelling, whereas burglary, robbery, and theft of a motor vehicle were the most likely to be reported. The most common reasons for not reporting were that victims felt that ‘it would do no good’ or that ‘it would be too much trouble’.

The groups who were less likely to report in 1986 were BME, particularly young people. This appears to be a consequence of the poor relation between the police and ethnic minority groups at the time. By 2016, the difference in reporting rates between different ethnic groups has levelled out and it is currently the economically inactive who are least likely to report.

Taken as an overall figure, the reporting of crime in 1986 was significantly lower than in 2016 (31% compared with 49%). There has been an increase in the reporting levels for all offences except vehicle crime which has remained at roughly the same level as 1986. The most noticeable increase in reporting has been in relation to sexual assault and harassment as well as burglary. This is probably a function of increased confidence in the police and improved police-public relations.

Table 12: Reporting of incidents to the police

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence Type</th>
<th>ICS1 - 1986</th>
<th>ICS3 – 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All offence types</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property offences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Theft</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Damage</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle crime</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crimes against the person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual assault &amp; Harassment</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hate Crime</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Satisfaction with the police

In 1986, satisfaction with the police was generally low. Table 13 below indicates residents’ degree of satisfaction with the police handling of their case:

Table 13: Satisfaction with police handling of the case by crime type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime Type</th>
<th>1986 %</th>
<th>2016 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mugging/street robbery</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence against the person</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism/criminal damage</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual assaults on women</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen the levels of satisfaction for comparable offences were much lower in 1986 than they were in 2016. In 1986 BME and older residents (over 45) were the most critical of police performance. In relation to sexual assault young women expressed a relatively low level of satisfaction in 1986 with the police’s ability to deal effectively with these matters. Amongst Asian women the level of satisfaction with the police was particularly low.

As noted above there was considerable disparity between priorities of the public and the police in 1986. As such, the police were not seen as being very effective in relation to offences such as sexual violence, robbery, the use of hard drugs, and burglary. Over a third (36%) of respondents also felt that the police did not have a good understanding of the problems in the area. Other indicators of a lack of confidence in the police include a strong belief in police malpractice.

Taken as an average from across selected categories (mugging, burglary, vandalism, sexual assault, women being molested or pestered), the general level of satisfaction in 1986 can be compared with that of 2016.

**Figure 18: Satisfaction with police conduct 1986 and 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2016, 18% of respondents had contact with the police and their satisfaction was high at 86%. There was very little variation by social group and the criticisms that were present in 1986, particularly in relation to ethnicity and violence against women, no longer appear to be a major concern.

Recent 2015/6 data released by the Metropolitan Police lends support to the observation that police-public relations are currently far better than in 1986 (Mopac 2015). According to this report 69% of residents in Islington stated that the police do an excellent or good job (compared with 67% London-wide), with a further 27% stating that the police do a ‘fair’ job. Only 5% believe that the police do a poor or very poor job. There is also high confidence in the police, with 81% of residents stating that the police are dealing with matters that are most important to the community.

**Stop and search**

In the 1980s stop and search was a widely used and highly contested policing strategy. Some 12% of respondents in the First Islington Crime Survey reported that they had been stopped and searched and 41% of these were dissatisfied with the conduct of the police. The incidents mainly yielded cannabis arrests, which was of low priority to Islington residents in 1986. The main concern about stop and
search at that time was that it was seen to be a strategy directed mainly towards young male Black residents, which had the effect of alienating this section of the community. Men were twice as likely to be stopped as women and Black men were far more likely to be stopped than other ethnic groups.

In the 2016 survey only 10 of the respondents had been stopped and searched of whom four were from BME groups. Although in the qualitative responses, there was some concern relating to police profiling, in general it seems that stop and search is far less of a widely used strategy in the borough than in 1986.

**Public perceptions of police performance and attitudes**

Another area of contrast between the two surveys is in relation to residents’ belief that the police treat people fairly and equally.

**Figure 19: Percentage of respondents who believe that the police treat people fairly and equally**

In 1986, when asked if the police treat everyone fairly and equally, two thirds of respondents agreed (68%). However, belief in police fairness varied significantly amongst different groups. Asian and White respondents were most likely to believe police were fair (70/71%) but only 39% of those categorised as Black felt that the police treated people equally and fairly. In both 1986 and 2016 there are some similarities in relation to those groups who are most or least likely to believe in police fairness with Black and younger residents being least likely.

**Table 14: Percentage of people who believe the police people fairly and equally**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1986</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The lower levels of trust in the police that were reported in the 1986 survey have become a central policy concern. Trust and confidence in the police have become increasingly important in academic and policy debates over the past 30 years and have been introduced as a key performance indicator for the police since 2009 (Hohl et al. 2010).

In conjunction with the debates about how to improve public confidence in the police there has been a focus on police-public contact. Findings routinely demonstrate that confidence and trust in the police is lower amongst individuals who have had contact with the police (Bradford et al. 2009). These findings are echoed in the 2016 survey. Whilst perceptions of police fairness were relatively high in both contact and non-contact groups, perceptions of fairness were lower in the contact group. Almost all (95%) residents who had not had any contact with the police in the preceding 12 months perceived the police as fair, whereas only 80% of those who had contact with the police thought so.

Residents were also asked to rate their experience of police contact in 2016. Over half (56%) stated they were very satisfied and just under a third (30%) fairly satisfied (86% satisfied in total). Of the remaining 14%, 10% reported they were fairly dissatisfied and 4% very dissatisfied.

**Co-operation with the police**

In 1986, although most respondents stated they would be willing to report an accident or stealing of a wallet (96% and 93% respectively), only 73% said they would report an incident of criminal damage. Willingness to co-operate reduced significantly when it came to being a witness or giving evidence in court. The reasons given for refusing to co-operate were that individuals feared reprisals or that they had a lack of trust in the police. Asians, young Black males, and women tended to be the least cooperative. In contrast, in 2016, 96% of respondents stated that they would report a ‘serious incident’ to the police.

Overall, the group least likely to report in 2016 were young women aged 16-24, with little variation by ethnicity, whereas in 1986 it was Asian women in all age groups. Both the 1986 and 2016 surveys found a slight gender difference in relation to likelihood of reporting. Similarly, both surveys found that younger residents were less likely to report.
Interestingly, residents who could be regarded as being vulnerable in terms of reprisals were less likely to state they would report – women and the economically inactive. However, comparing those who had contact with the police with residents who had not, the contact group were more likely to state they would report a serious crime they had witnessed. It would appear therefore, that whilst police-public contact may be associated with lower perceptions of police fairness, there is no significant negative impact on the public’s willingness to report.
Part 4: A Comparison between 1986 and 2016 Surveys by Crime Type

Overview

As might be expected rates of victimisation in Islington in the 1980s were considerably higher than the national figures reported by the BCS. The rate of burglary was found to be 9% and it was young and those categorised as Black who experienced the highest number of incidents. A significant proportion of those reporting a burglary had been burgled previously. The experience of being burgled was found to have a fairly direct effect on residents’ satisfaction with their neighbourhood. The incidence of burglary was found to be slightly higher for those living in private rental accommodation.

In terms of vandalism/criminal damage an estimated 11% of households were affected. Like burglary criminal damage tended to be directed at younger age groups and Black residents, whose likelihood of being a victim of this offence was almost 50% higher than other ethnic groups. Also, it was the high earners and owner occupiers who reported the highest number of incidents.

Theft from the person includes ‘mugging’ and robbery. However, because this crime is most often carried out on the street not all victims are resident in Islington. As with burglary and criminal damage the young and Black residents were found to be more likely to be victims of this offence. In fact, Black residents were twice as likely as their White or Asian counterparts to be a victim of theft. Theft was found to be more prevalent amongst higher earners and those living in private rentals.

For violence against the person the 1986 survey found that 22% of cases were domestic abuse and that domestic abuse was the least likely offence to be reported to the police. Violence against the person in general was found to be disproportionately directed to the 16-24 age group and members of the Black population. Rates of assault were found to be highest amongst middle income groups and those living in public rental.

In relation to sexual assault the survey estimated that there were about 1200 cases in Islington over the previous year. These figures include rapes which accounted for 23% of the sexual assaults reported. These assaults were most commonly directed at young White women aged 16-24, particularly those living in private rental.

In short, The First Islington Crime Survey showed the substantial impact of crime and victimisation on the lives of people in the borough. A full third of households were found to have been touched by serious crime (i.e. burglary robbery or sexual assault) over a twelve-month period. Crime was rated by residents as a major problem, only second to unemployment. According to one of the authors of the survey:

Crime shaped people’s lives to a remarkable degree. A quarter of respondents always avoided going out after dark, specifically because of fear of crime and 28 per cent felt unsafe in their own homes. There was a virtual curfew of a substantial section of the female population – with over half of women often or always not going out after dark because of fear of crime. Such a survey puts fear of crime in perspective. It is scarcely odd for example that 46 per cent of people should admit worrying ‘a lot’ about mugging given that over 40 per cent of the population actually know someone who
had been mugged in the last twelve months. Nor is it unrealistic to worry about burglary when its incidence runs at five times the national average and on some estates four out of five houses had been burgled in the last year. (Young 1988: 169-170).

The survey also found significant differences in the experience of crime amongst different subgroups. For example, it was found that those over 45 years old have a different experience of crime from younger people. Young white females, for example, were found to be twenty times more likely to be assaulted than those over 45. There were also found to be profound differences between women from different ethnic minority groups with Asian young women experiencing relatively low levels of sexual assault compared with their White or African Caribbean counterparts.

**Figure 20: Rates of victimization per 10,000 households 1986**
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Source: MacLean 1989

A comparison of the personal and household characteristics of those reporting one or more forms of victimisation with those reporting none revealed few significant differences. While Figure 21 shows some variation by age, with a higher proportion of young people aged 16-24 reporting one or more incidents, the difference is not statistically significant. In relation to ethnicity the percentage based differences between the three groups are small, but here, the higher proportion of those identifying as Asian is statistically significant.
A higher proportion of those who are employed and students reported one or more incidents in comparison with the unemployed and economically inactive. Of these it is the percentage of employed respondents that is statistically significant. In relation to tenure, it is homeowners who are more likely to report one or more incidents.

**Property Crime – burglary and vandalism/criminal damage**

Due to sampling differences, it is not possible to calculate prevalence rates or crime rates per thousand households from the 2016 ICS. It is possible however, to analyse the distribution of crime types within the pool of those victimised and explore the extent to which any groups are over-represented. The following analysis of the 2016 ICS is based on weighted data and respondents who had experienced at least one type of victimisation (the pool of victims in the sample).

The 1986 ICS found that burglary rates were higher amongst certain groups. Those with higher incomes, who were employed, were Black, residing in privately rented accommodation and those aged to 16-24 all had higher rates of burglary. A similar pattern was evident in rates for vandalism with the exception of employment status and tenure. For vandalism, it was unemployed respondents and home owners who had higher rates than those in employment and other forms of tenure.

In the 2016 data, for property crime (burglary and criminal damage) very few statistically significant differences emerged. The comparisons reported below are based on percentage differences. As can be seen there appears to be a levelling out of the victims of property offences which may be a result of the general securitisation of property in the form of locks, alarms and surveillance systems.
Where the youngest age group experienced higher rates of victimisation for vandalism, theft and assault than older age groups in 1986 but a slightly lower incidence of burglary. By 2016, the pattern has changed with those in the older age groups experiencing a higher level of property crime.

In 2016, there is very little difference in reported victimisation between White, Black and Asian respondents. This is in contrast to the 1986 ICS survey where Black respondents had far higher rates of victimisation than other ethnic groups (see below).

The 2016 data also show a different pattern by employment status and tenure, with a lower proportion of those in privately rented accommodation and a higher proportion of those who are economically inactive reporting one or more property crimes. For tenure, a slightly higher proportion of those in publicly rented accommodation report burglary (9%) in comparison with home owners (7%) and private renters (6%), whereas for criminal damage home owners have slightly higher reporting rates.

**Personal theft**

The 1986 ICS data revealed that for personal theft, those aged 16-24, who were Black, female, employed and living in privately rented accommodation had the highest rates of personal theft.

The 2016 data show a similar pattern to 1986, while only the differences by age are statistically significant. Higher proportions of females, those aged 16-24 and those residents living in privately rented accommodation reported one or more incidents of personal theft. Unlike 1986, a larger proportion of students and Asian respondents reported one or more incidents in comparison with their counterparts in each category.
For the 2016 analysis hate crime and violence have been combined for comparative purposes. Whilst the 1986 survey did not ask about hate crime separately, 7% of assaults reported by respondents were deemed to have racist motivations.
Figure 24: Violence and hate crime victimisation ICS 2016

![Figure 24: Violence and hate crime victimisation ICS 2016](image)

Unweighted Base: 1,500, all victims

In 1986, the risk of assault declined with age. Those in the 16-24 age group had the highest rates, as did those who were Black, female and those residing in publicly rented accommodation.

The 2016 data show a different pattern. There is little difference in the proportions of males and females reporting one or more incidents (and no difference for violence and hate crime analysed separately) and little difference, perhaps surprisingly given the inclusion of hate crime in this analysis, by ethnicity. Whilst Black respondents are slightly more likely to report hate crime (8%) in comparison with Asian (7%) and White (4% respondents), it is White respondents who are more likely to report violence (6% in comparison with 3% each of Black and Asian respondents).

In contrast to 1986 those aged 45 and over were more likely to report one or more incident, as well as those who are unemployed and economically inactive. A greater proportion of older respondents reported hate crime incidents as well as incidents of violence.

The 2016 data shows a similar pattern of victimisation to that presented in 1986 in relation to tenure, with a higher proportion of those in publicly rented accommodation reporting one or more incidents than those in other forms of tenure.

---

1 For violent incidents analysed separately, 4% of 16-24 year olds report one or more incidents, 5% of 25-44 year olds and 6% of those aged 45 and over. Whilst the difference is not as pronounced as for Hate Crime it is in the same direction.
**Sexual assault**

A number of sexual assaults were reported in the 1986 survey and respondents were asked about their experience of sexual assault in 2016. However, the number of incidents reported was very low in 2016 and any comparisons with 1986 should be treated with caution.

As in 1986, all those reporting sexual victimisation in 2016 were female. The 1986 ICS found that women aged 16-24, who were employed and in privately rented accommodation had the highest rates of sexual victimisation. In contrast, there are no differences by age in the 2016 data. There is a slight difference by employment status in that a higher proportion of full time students (3%) reported one or more incidents in comparison with those who were unemployed (2%), economically inactive (1%) and employed (less than 1%).

Table 15: Comparison of victim characteristics 1986 and 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1986</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property Crime (Burglary and Vandalism/Criminal Damage)</strong></td>
<td>16-24 years old Black Employed Private Rent</td>
<td>45 and over Economically Inactive Home owner (criminal damage) &amp; Public rent (burglary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theft</strong></td>
<td>16-24 years old Black Female Employed Private Rent</td>
<td>16-24 years old Asian Female Private Rent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assault, Violence/Hate Crime</strong></td>
<td>16-24 years old Black Female Public Rent</td>
<td>45 and over (for both violence and hate crime) Public Rent Unemployed (more so for violence) and economically inactive (more so for hate crime)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual Violence</strong></td>
<td>Female 16-24 years old Employed Private Rent</td>
<td>Female Student Private Rent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*small numbers and very slight differences

Thus, it would appear, that in comparison with 1986, the profile of victimisation has largely changed. With the exception of personal theft, it is no longer the youngest age group who are over-represented as victims for each crime type. Instead, in comparison with other age groups, higher proportions of those aged 45 and over have reported one or more incident of property crime, violence or hate crime. Black respondents are no longer over-represented in any of the crime types and again with the exception of personal theft there are few if any differences by ethnicity in the 2016 data.
Part 5: Summary and Conclusion

Introduction

In this section of the report we have sought to examine the changes in relation to different aspects of crime, victimisation and safety between 1986 and 2016. As noted above these two surveys are not directly comparable and they employ different sampling strategies and use different categories. However, as far as it is possible we have attempted to identify some of the main changes that have taken place over this period.

We have also set out to illustrate the changing context in which these surveys were carried out. In particular, we have drawn attention to the remarkable decrease in recorded crime that has taken place in England and Wales since the mid 1990s. The implications of this ‘crime drop’ are that individuals and households are generally less likely to be victimised in 2016 than they were twenty or thirty years earlier. As might be expected this decrease in victimisation has positive consequences for many resident’s sense of safety, their satisfaction with the neighbourhood and their fear of crime.

Increased neighbourhood satisfaction

Findings from the two surveys reveal a changing picture with respect to residents’ satisfaction with their neighbourhood. The 1986 survey revealed a significant degree of discontent amongst residents with various aspects of their neighbourhood. unemployment was rated the highest resident concern with two thirds citing this as a ‘big’ problem, but a third also rated crime as a significant concern.

In 2016, this picture changed quite radically with just over half of residents (51%) expressing a high level of satisfaction and 48% expressing a medium level of satisfaction. The top concerns have also changed with affordability of housing the ‘major’ concern for half of residents. Unemployment, not enough places for children to play and crime remained in the top five major concerns, but the proportion of residents perceiving these to be a ‘major’ problem had declined significantly.

It is perhaps unsurprising that affordability of housing is the top concern in 2016 given the rapid increase in house prices and private rents over the last 30 years. A recent report found that Islington had become more socially polarised with home ownership and privately rented accommodation increasingly unaffordable for residents in the low and middle-income brackets (Penny et al., 2013). The findings from the 2016 survey echoed this with unemployed residents and those in privately rented accommodation significantly more likely to cite housing costs as a problem.

Crime as a neighbourhood problem

As stated above, the proportion of residents citing crime as a major problem in their neighbourhood has declined significantly since 1986 with 13% in 2016 compared with 37% in 1986 stating it was a major problem. However, whilst perceptions of crime as a neighbourhood problem have decreased in general over time women are still more likely to perceive crime as a problem.

The 2016 survey found that homeowners were also more likely to perceive crime as a problem. The pattern for ethnicity, however, has been reversed. In 1986, Asian residents were far less likely than
Black or White residents to view crime as a problem, but in 2016 Asian respondents were more likely to perceive crime as a problem.

As in 1986, the 2016 survey sought to determine whether residents believed that crime was increasing, decreasing or had remained the same, since they had become resident in the borough. In 1986, almost three quarters (70%) thought crime to be more common, just over a quarter stated crime had remained the same (27%) and 3% thought crime less common. In 2016 views had radically changed with only 14% stating that crime had increased, a fifth stating it had decreased and two thirds (66%) stating it had remained the same. Burglary and robbery/mugging were the most likely to be seen as increasing in 1986. In 2016, it was the ‘new crimes’ of online crime that were seen to have increased the most.

In general, the picture that emerges in 2016 is radically different from that presented in 1986. Islington residents have become more satisfied with their neighbourhood, less concerned about crime and are much less likely to see crime as increasing.

**Fear of crime**

Increased satisfaction with neighbourhood is accompanied by an increased sense of safety amongst residents. The 1986 survey presented a relatively fearful population with high levels of concern about the risk of victimisation. The 2016 survey revealed that these fears for most sections of the community are much reduced.

The reduction of public concerns about crime is linked to the likelihood of victimisation and this has decreased for most groups 1986. A picture emerges of a community that although continuing to have concerns about crime and victimisation has in general a much greater sense of safety than thirty years ago. The dramatic reduction in the perceived likelihood of victimisation was found across virtually all social groups.

**Attitudes towards and co-operation with the police**

In 1986, a significant percentage of Islington residents had a low level of trust in the police, with a third of residents stating that they did not think the police treated all people fairly and equally. Those who were young (16-24), Black and those who were unemployed were particularly likely to think the police were unfair to certain groups. There was considerable degree of disparity in 1986 between the publics sense of priorities and those of the police.

Whereas in 1986 only 43% of respondents said that they were satisfied with police performance by 2016 this had increased to 86%. There are some similarities however, in who is more likely to think the police do not treat everyone fairly. In both the 1986 and the 2016 surveys Black residents were more likely than White or Asian residents to think that the police were unfair, although, the number of Black respondents who expressed this view in 2016 had decreased significantly. Trust and confidence in the police has become a key performance indicator of the police since 2009 (Hohl et al., 2010). The change of attitude reflected in the two surveys may reflect to some degree the various initiatives seeking to foster greater trust in the police.
Women and victimisation

The 1986 survey reported relatively high levels of physical and sexual assault against women, particularly those in younger age groups. While noting that forms of sexual assault tend to be under reported and under recorded the 1986 survey estimated that there were approximately 1200 cases of sexual and physical assault in Islington in the twelve months prior to the survey. The high level of assaults directed at women was seen to adversely affect their satisfaction with the neighbourhood and increase their fear of crime. Women living in private rentals reported the highest level of sexual assault and in over a quarter of cases the victim knew the offender. In relation to the injuries sustained by the assault 26% of female respondents reported bruising, 19% reported scratches and 5% reported cuts.

In relation to sexual harassment just under a third of all young women reported being followed and one in five said that they had been intimidated by kerb crawlers in 1986. Sexual harassment was reported not only on the street but also in the workplace. Significantly the 1986 report found that over a third (36%) of women said that they never went out alone after dark, while 16% said that they always avoided certain areas. These findings are fairly similar to those reported in the BCS at the time (Hough and Mayhew 1985:40)

The findings of the 2016 survey indicate that with regard to feelings of safety the situation has significantly improved, with just over a quarter of female respondents (26%) reporting that they felt unsafe at night. The percentage of men who said that they felt unsafe at night has also decreased in 2016, falling to 11%.

There were some variations amongst different age groups. In 1986 over 70% of all age groups of women said that they felt unsafe. By 2016 some 40% of those women aged between 16 and 24 said they felt unsafe but for older women the percentage was in the region of 25%. There are also significant differences amongst different ethnic groups over the period. In 1986, around 70% of women from all ethnic groups reported feeling unsafe. In the 2016 survey a quarter of both Black and White women reported feeling unsafe, while 41% of Asian women said they felt unsafe.

The extent to which the actual victimisation of women has decreased is difficult to assess. It is widely recognised that victim surveys and official statistics tend to underestimate sexual offences because these are under reported and under recorded. As discussed above Sylvia Walby (2016) and her colleagues have indicated in their reworking of BCS data that certain forms of violence may have increased rather than decreased over time and that this includes violence against women.

A recent survey carried out by Islington Council estimates that only 38% of all domestic abuse cases and only 19% of sexual offences were recorded (Hayden 2016). In Islington the levels of reported domestic abuse were 60% higher in 2015/16 than they were in 2011/12 according to police generated data. It is also noted that Islington has the highest levels of violence against the person in London where the victim is female and a third of these cases are domestic abuse. It is also the case that the reported number of rapes nationally is increasing. It is not clear, however, whether these increases represent an actual increase in levels of victimisation or an increased propensity to report.
Ethnicity and victimisation

It is in relation to ethnicity that some important differences emerge between 1986 and 2016. In the 1986 survey it was reported that young Black women aged 25-44 were more frequently subject to vandalism, theft from the person, assault, and sexual assault than their White and Asian counterparts. In addition, Black women aged 16-24 had higher levels of burglary.

There were major concerns about stop and search and the disproportionate focus on young Black men. Relations between the Black community and the police were fraught with tensions as the police were not seen to treat Black residents fairly, particularly young Black males.

In 2016, these particular tensions are far less evident. Ethnicity was less of a factor in indicating victimisation, with the exception of hate crime. In 1986 those respondents categorised as Black reported the highest levels of victimisation for all crime types and for assault they were twice as likely to be victimised as other ethnic groups (MacLean 1989). However, as Table 16 below indicates the victimisation profile for Black residents as a whole in the borough is now fairly similar to other ethnic groups. Although these figures are not statistically significant they suggest that the proportional distribution amongst different ethnic groups in Islington has changed considerably since 1986.

Figure 25: ICS 2016 comparison of victims and non-victims by ethnicity

There has been a major change in the ethnic composition of the borough. The growing proportion of ‘White Other’ has added to the increased diversity in Islington. This group is mainly drawn from different European countries. The percentage of migrants aged 16-44 has increased by 18%, many of whom live in the private rented sector. Relatedly, there has been a decrease in the older population and there are now fewer pensioners in the Islington area than in 1981 (9% compared with 17% previously).

Those categorised as White Other reported the lowest overall level of victimisation, including lower levels of burglary, violence and theft than other ethnic groups. They were also less likely than other groups to believe that they would be victimised in the next twelve months and expressed a high level of satisfaction with the neighbourhood as well as confidence in the police. The effects of the increase
of White Other residents in urban areas like Islington appears to have a significant impact on the distribution of crime and victimisation and requires more detailed investigation.

A further finding of the survey was a very high rate of victimisation by those categorised as ‘mixed race’, although the numbers of people in the survey was too small to base any statistical analysis the very level of victimisation amongst this group also calls for further investigation.

The changing distribution of crime

In terms of the changing distribution of crime in the borough the question that arises is whether there has been a shift over time from the more affluent wards to the less well-off areas.

According to the 1986 survey the wards that had the highest levels of victimisation were Bunhill, Mildmay, Thornhill and Canonbury West. The wards with the lowest level of victimisation at that time were Highbury, Hillmartin, Junction and Holloway. According to the 2016 survey data the highest crime wards in 2015-16 are Holloway, Hillrise, Bunhill and Mildmay. These figures suggest that there has been some degree of spatial redistribution of victimisation over time in the borough.

Figure 26: Distribution of all crime by ward 1986

Source: MacLean 1989 (figure A-9)

In order to address the question of whether the more affluent sectors of the population have been more effective in reducing their level of victimisation by insulating themselves from various forms of crime we examined the distribution of victimisation by ward. Working from Figure 25 above we aimed to examine the changing distribution of crime over time.

To do this we looked at the Household Income estimates produced by the GLA for 2012/3 (latest figures available). We compared this with the rates of victimisation amongst the survey respondents for each ward (the data was weighted to reflect the actual population, however, these are not prevalence rates but the trends within the survey population). There is a 10% difference between the
lowest rate of victimisation at 11% (Clerkenwell) and the highest at 21% (Hillrise). Although there is by no means a strong correlation between income and victimisation, there is a general downward trend in victimisation as mean average income rises (see Figure 26).

Table 16: Percentage reporting victimisation (weighted) and mean average income by ward 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Victim since 2015</th>
<th>Mean average income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finsbury Park</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>£46,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holloway</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>£48,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledonian</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>£49,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tollington</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>£52,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillrise</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>£53,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunhill</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>£54,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildmay</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>£54,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junction</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>£54,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canonbury</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>£56,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St George’s</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>£56,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerkenwell</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>£60,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highbury West</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>£60,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Peter’s</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>£61,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnsbury</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>£62,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mary’s</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>£64,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highbury East</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>£67,250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The limitation of this type of analysis is that nearly all of the wards in Islington have a mixture of affluence and deprivation. Also, these aggregate figures mask variations in the type of crime recorded. That is, a ward may have a low level of crime but this may involve a disproportionate amount of serious crime.
An alternative measure of the relation between the distribution of crime and affluence is through the examination of the relationship between tenure and crime. The evidence is that those who own their houses outright tend in general to be wealthier than private renters who in turn tend to be better off than public renters.

According to the 1986 survey owner occupiers experienced a lower level of assault and sexual assault although they reported by far the highest number of incidents of vandalism. Those in public rental experienced the highest level of assault, while those in private rental experienced the highest level of personal theft. The weighted data from the 2016 survey comparing the relationship between tenure and victimisation indicates significant differences in the likelihood of victimisation between these groups with owner occupiers having a slightly lower overall level of victimisation for most offences.
Although these two data sets employ slightly different categories and measures of victimisation, there is a general level of comparison that can be made. Overall, there seems to be an evening out in terms of victimisation by tenure.
In 1986, public rental residents had much higher rates of assault than those in other forms of tenure, whereas the spread in 2016 is relatively even. In relation to property crime there is little difference in the distribution in 2016 which may well be a function of increased securitisation by which not only are the majority of dwellings and vehicles fitted with locks and alarms but also there has been a proliferation of surveillance devices as well as the growth of both private and public security agencies designed to provide more comprehensive levels of protection.

The changing concentration of crime

As already discussed, a defining feature of many Western societies over the past decade or so is that crime rates have steadily decreased. There is as yet no clear consensus on the primary drivers of this ‘crime drop’, and indeed, some argue that the ‘drop’ may not be as significant as it appears due to an undercounting of some forms of violence (Walby et al., 2016).

It is within this context that an interest in the concentration of victimisation has emerged. Ignatans and Pease (2015) recently demonstrated through analysis of Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW) data, that whilst those who were most victimised in society are now experiencing fewer victimisations, they still bear the brunt of a disproportionate share of crime victimisation overall.

Drawing on the 2016 ICS data we have applied three commonly used indicators of repeat victimisation (Tseloni and Pease, 2014):

- Crime concentration – the average number of crimes per victim.
- The percentage of repeat crimes.
- The percentage of repeat victims.

All figures reported here are based on unweighted and un-capped data (see Ignatans and Pease, 2015 for a discussion of the disadvantages of capping). The analysis reveals distinct differences between crime types. Overall, across the 1,498 victims in the sample for whom a number of victimisations could be determined, a total of 11,294 incidents were reported. The number of incidents reported ranged from 1 through to 1,000. Whilst the proportion of repeat victims was much lower than in the 1986 survey (27% in comparison with 47%), there is a rather high average of 7.5 crimes per victim. Similarly, of the 11,233 crimes a high percentage - 91% (n=10,200) were repeat offences.

Further analysis revealed that the high average number of crimes per victim and repeat crimes across the sample of victims were largely driven by the inclusion of the ‘new’ offence types with fraud and other online crime containing the largest volumes of repeat incidents. To explore this further, we have divided the crime types into two broad groups:

- ‘Traditional’ offences – this category includes burglary, personal theft, vehicle crime, violence, hate crime, sexual assault and criminal damage.
- ‘New’ offences – this category includes fraud, the vast majority of which was online fraud and other online offences.
Table 17: Concentration of victimisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Traditional</th>
<th>New</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of victims</td>
<td>1,498</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of offences</td>
<td>11,233</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>10,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean number per victim</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Repeat victims</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Repeat crimes</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of incidents</td>
<td>1-1000</td>
<td>1-37</td>
<td>1-1000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17 above demonstrates significant differences in the concentration of crime between ‘traditional’ and ‘new’ offences. For traditional offences, the average number of crimes per victim, the proportion of repeat victims and the proportion of repeat crimes are all far lower in comparison with ‘new’ offence types. Whilst in the traditional offence category there is a small group of repeat victims, just under a fifth, who carry the burden of just under half of all offences (44%), the concentration of victimisation in the ‘new’ offence category is much greater, with a quarter of all victims experiencing 93% of the total volume of online related crimes, reporting an online related offence (17%) experiencing two or more.

Figure 31: Repeat crimes and repeat victimisation by individual crime type

Further analysis revealed variations by specific crime type. Some caution is needed here since the number of offences is fairly small. Fraud and other online crime has been included in Figure 28 above for comparative purposes.
The 1986 ICS demonstrated that for a significant proportion of residents repeat victimisation was relatively high. Overall, almost half (47%) of households surveyed experienced repeat victimisation, with repeat victimisation for assault and vandalism 38% and 37% respectively, and 15% for sexual assault. By 2016, repeat victimisation had significantly decreased with the majority of respondents reporting one victimisation experience (73%).

For other crime types, the proportion of repeat victims ranged from 16% for hate crime, 14% for vehicle crime, 12% for burglary, 9% for personal theft and 4% for criminal damage. Where comparisons are possible with the 1986 survey, the data from 2016 suggest significantly fewer repeat victims both overall and for specific crime types.

**Figure 32: Repeat victimisation 1986 and 2016**

From the 2016 survey, there are also differences between crime types as to the proportion of repeat crimes (see Figure 29 above). Fraud and other online crime have already been discussed. Sexual violence and hate crime stand out as offences types with the highest proportion of repeat crimes. For sexual violence, a third of victims experienced over 80% of the total number of incidents. With respect to hate crime, it would appear that 16% of victims experience over half of all the incidents (54%). For property crime, 12% of burglary victims experience almost two fifths of all burglary incidents (37%), and the disparity is even greater for those reporting criminal damage, with just 4% of victims experiencing just under two fifths of the total volume of criminal damage incidents (37%).

In sum, levels of repeat victimisation are much lower in 2016 in comparison with 1986. Thus, overall the 2016 survey yielded a much higher volume of ‘new’ crime types which, in comparison with ‘traditional’ crime types have higher repeat victimisation rates and a significantly higher mean number of incidents per victim (using un-capped data). In terms of volume, a very high percentage of the ‘new’ crime types are repeat crimes.

These findings are generally in line with those reported in the BCS/CSEW. In reviewing this data Britton et al. (2012) found that between 1981 and 1995 the number of multiple incidents in England and
Wales increased by 83%, compared with the number of single incidents which increased by 49%. However, between 1995 and 2010-11 the number of multiple incidents decreased by 60% and the number of single incidents decreased by 21%. This relationship is also reflected in the proportion of multiple incidents; for example, in 1995 multiple incidents made up 74% of all BCS crime compared with 59% in 2010-11. It is suggested that the decrease in concentration, it is suggested, that is directly linked to the dramatic decrease in recorded crime that has taken place over the last two decades.

In conjunction with the changing concentration of crime future research needs to focus in more detail on the changing distribution of crime. According to ICS 1 some 31% of households in Islington were victims of crime. In 2016 the proportion of households subject to victimisation has dropped in Islington to 15% according to the Metropolitan Police survey and in London as a whole to 21% according to the CSEW. Our data suggests that there has been a decrease in victimisation across different social groups, particularly in relation to property crime. This ‘levelling out’ of victimisation in terms of traditional crimes may be a function of the widespread use of security in all social sectors which includes a proliferation of locks and bolts, alarms and forms of surveillance as well as an array of security devices that are widely available. Other research has also found that all sub-groups are better off in crime risk terms in 2009-10 compared with 1995 (Grove et al. 2012).

New crimes, new victims?

Probably the most dramatic change in relation to crime and victimisation has been the proliferation of forms of online crime. In our survey it was found that just over half of those who had been victimised in the previous twelve months had been victims of online crime. Of these approximately half had been victimised more than once.

The most common form of online crime was bank and credit card fraud (67%) followed by advanced fee fraud (19%). Four out of five of the incidents were not reported to the police, but to another body – normally a financial institution which reimbursed victims who lost money in the majority of cases.

The high incidence of online crime has radically changed the profile of victims who are now spread more evenly across the population. The fact that in many cases there is no actual financial loss or physical damage means that the definition of what constitutes a ‘victim’ is called into question.

The end of the crime drop?

There are a growing number of indicators that suggest that the decrease in recorded crime that we have witnessed over the last two decades may be coming to an end. Recorded crime in Islington increased by 9.2% in 2015/16, which is faster than the London average of 4.4%, and recorded crime is at its highest level for five years.

Nationally, according to police generated data there has been a 27% increase in violence against the person in 2015-16. This is the highest increase in a twelve month period since 2002. In fact, every police force in the country recorded an increase in violence in 2015-16 compared with the previous year. Between 2010 and 2016 there has been a 10% increase in knife crime, 26% increase in attempted murder, 26% increase in attempts to kill and 15% increase in assaults with injury. The CSEW in contrast indicates not so much an increase but rather the slowing down and in some cases the levelling out of different forms of crime.
However, it is probably not surprising given the decrease in recorded crime over the past two decades that public attitudes towards crime and victimisation have radically changed. It would seem that residents in urban areas like Islington feel safer and less likely to be victimised than those living in the area in the 1980s. There appears to be both a widening and redistribution of victimisation together with a greater levelling out of victimisation resulting in what might be referred to as the ‘democratisation of victimisation’.

References


Appendix 1. Differences between the format of the two Islington Crime Surveys

There were some key differences between the way that the 1986 and 2016 surveys were conducted, which means that a direct comparison between the two is not possible. However, there are several points of similarity and crossover, which means that some meaningful comparisons can be made. This chapter outlines the key differences between the two surveys.

Crime categories

There were some differences in the crime categories used in the surveys

- Personal Theft: both surveys gathered data on personal theft. However, there were some differences. For example, in 1986, there was more emphasis on experiences of ‘robbery’ whereas in 2016 the focus was on ‘muggings’. This category also includes items taken from the home (without forced/deception entry) or offences that have taken place public spaces.

- Vandalism/Criminal Damage: in 1986 questions were asked about ‘vandalism’ whereas in 2016 questions were asked about ‘criminal damage’ as a new and more clearly defined crime category. However, these offences are sufficiently similar to be compared and involve the deliberate damaging or defacing of property.

- Vehicle Crime: theft of and theft from a vehicle were measured in both surveys. In 2016, these crimes were also analysed alongside criminal damage of a vehicle as a separate category. In 1986, damage to a vehicle was analysed under the category of vandalism.

- Assault/Violence Against the Person: although different language was used in 1986 (assault) and 2016 (violence against the person), the surveys adopted the same legal understanding of these offences (in line with violence against the person offences). However, the 1986 survey investigated ethnicity, domestic and police assaults to a greater degree than the 2016 survey.

- Sexual Assault and Harassment: sexual assault was investigated by both surveys. However, street harassment was categorised as ‘non-criminal street harassment’ which includes behaviour relating to street harassment of women (being stared at, followed, approached, shouted at, touched, kerb crawled, or confronted).

- Hate Crime: the 1986 category of ‘non-criminal street harassment’ also included harassment directed at people due to ethnicity, which overlaps to some degree with the 2016 category of hate crime.

- Anti-Social Behaviour: anti-social behaviour as a category had not been ‘invented’ in 1986. However, there was some discussion of teenage rowdiness and fights or disturbance in the street. Nevertheless, this does not capture the range of concerns discussed under this heading in the 2016 survey (such as drug use and littering).

Variations in research instruments

In addition to differences in categories of crime, the nature of the questions asked differed in the following ways:
• Neighbourhood satisfaction was measured using the categories ‘big problem, bit of a problem, not really, don’t know’ in 1986 and ‘major problem, minor problem, not a problem, don’t know’ in 2016.

• ‘Poor housing’ in 1986 is replaced by ‘housing costs’ in 2016 and ‘poor schools’ in 1986 is replaced by ‘school availability’ in 2016.

• In 1986, residents were asked if crime had increased in the last five years, whereas in 2016 residents were asked if crime had increased from the date that they moved into the area.

• The likelihood of victimisation was measured slightly differently in both surveys. In 1986 the divisions of ‘high, moderate, and low’ were used, while in 2016 the distinctions ‘fairly likely, very likely, fairly unlikely, and very unlikely’ were adopted. However, in both years residents were asked about the likelihood of victimisation in the next 12 months.

• The 1986 survey explored worry relating to specific types of crime, which were not measured in 2016. Fear of crime more generally was measured in both years by whether respondents felt worried (1986) or unsafe at night (2016). In 2016 this was also measured during the daytime, whereas in 1986 respondents were asked about feeling unsafe in their homes and whether they felt women were at risk in the area at night.

• In 1986, willingness to co-operate with the police was determined through a series of questions that put forward different scenarios – witnessing an accident, youths stealing a wallet, and youths smashing up a bus shelter – in combination with different levels of engagement – reporting, giving a witness statement, and appearing in court. In 2016, respondents were asked about willingness to report a ‘serious incident’.

• Satisfaction with the police was measured in different ways in both surveys. In 1986, respondents were asked about police handling of the case as well as general confidence in police handling of specific issues. In contrast, in 2016 residents were asked about satisfaction with the outcome of a case.

• Further, in 1986 respondents were asked about policing priorities and perception of the ways in which the police handle specific types of crime. In 2016 residents were not asked this question. However, both surveys measured whether the police were viewed as treating people fairly and equally.

**Sampling strategies**

The First Islington Crime Survey conducted in 1986 was based on a random sample of 1,974 respondents. A booster sample of ethnic minority residents was included in order to contact enough BME residents to provide a basis for meaningful analysis. The data was then weighted.

In 2016, the sample deliberately over-sampled those with at least one victimisation experience. This yielded 1,501 victims out of 2,025 interviewed.

This means that prevalence can be measured in 1986 but not in 2016 due to the deliberate over-sampling of victims. Nevertheless, rates of victimisation within the survey population can be measured.
against the proportions of respondents with particular characteristics in order to determine whether their victimisation is disproportionate to their numbers in the survey population.

Appendix 2. The categorisation of respondents

Because of the way that the first survey categorised ethnicity, the only direct comparison possible is between White and BME residents. It is important to note that the first survey used the categories ‘White’, ‘Black’, ‘Asian’, and ‘Other Non-White’. The most recent Islington Crime Survey, however, created the category ‘White Other’ for analysis because of the increase in white immigrants over the last 30 years in order to capture the differences in how they experience their neighbourhood and crime compared with White British. ‘White Other’ is a diverse category, which mainly includes recent immigrants from European Countries as well as Australasia and South America.

In the remainder of this document, we use the data for ‘White’, ‘Black’, and ‘Asian’ respondents in the two surveys to make relevant comparisons. However, the differences in categorisation should be noted. It is likely that people in 1986 would have been categorised differently under the 2016 criteria.

In addition, the 1986 survey measured income levels, whereas the 2016 survey did not. Income levels are one way of gauging the levels of affluence in a particular household. In the 2016 survey there was greater emphasis on tenure and employment status, which is not directly related to income. Most importantly, it is likely that private renters are more affluent than in 1986 as house prices and rents rise. Therefore, in 2016 there is likely to be a difference in affluence between public renters and other types of tenure.

Further, length of tenure was not used as a category for analysis in 1986, whereas this became a relevant category in 2016 due in part to rising migration. Residents who had been in the borough for less time appeared to have a different relationship to the neighbourhood (in essence, displaying less concern and more satisfaction) from residents who had been in the borough for longer.

Analysis in 1986 was also conducted on a different basis from 2016. The 1986 survey favoured cross-tabulations by ethnicity, gender, and age, as well as other characteristics where relevant. The raw numbers – for example total number of residents who reported high levels of fear, or total numbers in each category by characteristic – were not made available. Therefore, cross-tabulations have been used where possible in order to make relevant comparisons.