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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Survey Findings

Neighbourhood concerns
Housing costs topped the list of neighbourhood concerns, with crime in second place. Unemployment, lack of places for children to play and traffic noise were seen as significant problems amongst residents in Islington.

Anti-social behaviour
Just over one quarter of respondents thought anti-social behaviour was a problem with the most common concerns being youths hanging around followed by litter and rubbish and drug use/selling. Also, there were concerns relating to people riding bicycles on pavements and street drinking.

Changes in levels of crime
Overall, most respondents (66%) thought crime levels had remained unchanged during their period of residence in Islington. Women were more likely than men to believe there had been an increase in specific types of offences, including drug and alcohol use/selling, theft-related crimes, muggings and fraud.

Likelihood of victimisation
The vast majority (81%) of respondents thought it very or fairly unlikely that they would personally fall victim to crime in the following twelve months. Overall, women were more likely than men to believe they would be personally victimised. White Other respondents were least likely to believe they would be victimised.

Safety in the neighbourhood
Almost all respondents (98%) felt some degree of safety during the day and the majority (81%) also felt some degree of safety at night. Overall, although most women (73%) said they felt safe day and night, this was less than men (89%).

Avoidance behaviours
Twice as many women as men said they would avoid certain streets or areas. This was mainly due to fear of theft and other crime and/or feelings of intimidation by groups and gangs. Generally these respondents avoided locations that were badly lit or secluded.

Security measures
Most respondents had some security measures in their home. All respondents who said they felt unsafe in their neighbourhood had three or four security measures. The most common were window locks, followed by exterior doors with deadlocks and security chains or bolts on exterior doors. There were no differences by tenure.
Contact and satisfaction with police

Less than one fifth of respondents had contact with police during the preceding twelve months. Over half of the respondents (56%) said that they were very satisfied with the police and described them as efficient and concerned. A further 30% said that they were fairly satisfied, while 14% said that they were dissatisfied. A significant minority were critical of the way in which the police handled cases and/or the inability of the police to apprehend offenders, as well as claims of heavy handedness.

Police fairness

Nearly all respondents (92%) felt that the police treated everyone fairly and equally. White Other respondents had the highest degree of confidence in fair and equal treatment of all. However, there were a few negative perceptions of the police, which related mainly to the perception of unfair profiling on the base of youth or race.

Reporting serious crime

Nearly all respondents (96%) said they would report to police a serious crime they had witnessed. Young people were less likely than other age bands to do so, and men were a little more likely than women to say they would report a serious crime to police. Where people stated that they would not report this was mainly due to the perception that the case was too trivial or nothing could be done.

Burglary

Some 8% of respondents experienced a burglary or attempted burglary. In most cases the main mode of entry was by forcing the outside door. Almost a third of burglary victims were insured. Offenders were caught in 15% of cases. The most common areas were near Archway and Junction Road, around Arsenal and around Lever Street.

Personal Theft

The majority of thefts took place on the street – often near the offender’s home. The most common items stolen were bicycles, mobile phones, cash and wallets, and garden items. Just under half of incidents were reported to the police and offenders were caught in 10% of cases.

Criminal Damage

Most cases of criminal damage involved damage to the outside of residents dwellings or near the home of victims. The most common incidents included the breaking of garden furniture or plants, graffiti, gouging or scratching brickwork, and damage to windows and doors. Some 38% of incidents were reported to the police and offenders were caught in 8% of cases.

Vehicle Crime

Vehicle crime includes theft of and theft from vehicles as well as damage to vehicles. Eight vehicles were reported stolen. Theft from vehicles involved mainly cash or mobile phones. Most owners had some form of security on their vehicles and offenders mainly gained access by breaking windows or forcing doors. In nearly a third of incidents involving theft from vehicles the door or window was
unlocked. Damage to vehicles mainly involved dents and scratches, broken windows or the removal of external parts. Offenders were caught in only 4% of damage to vehicle cases. Few respondents reported incidents of theft from their vehicle to the police. The area surrounding Arsenal station is a hotspot for all three types of vehicle crime. Tufnell Park and Upper Holloway are hotspots for theft from a vehicle and both these areas as well as Kings Cross and Upper Street for damage to vehicle.

**Violence Against the Person**

Violent incidents occurred mostly at home or on the street, with a few incidents reported in the workplace. There were significant differences between the experience of violence by men and women both in terms of location and impact. A great deal of violence involved threats to harm while in some cases victims were grabbed, pushed, punched or slapped. Weapons were used in 13% of incidents – mainly knives. The main response to these incidents was for victims to take precautionary measures to avoid certain people and places. In 27% of cases the victim knew the offender by sight and in 15% of cases the offender was a neighbour or a housemate. Over half of the victims reported the incident to the police and in half of these cases the perpetrator was caught.

**Sexual Assault and Harassment**

Twenty-four incidents of sexual assault were reported. In all cases the victims were women, most of whom were in the 25 to 34 age group. Over half of the incidents involved verbal abuse or forms of sexual harassment. One in five incidents involved a woman being followed while 13% involved unwanted groping or touching. All of the incidents were reported to the police and there was a high level of satisfaction amongst victims with the police response. Six offenders were caught.

**Hate Crime**

Some 85 respondents reported incidents of hate crime. Just under half of the victims were categorised as BME. The majority of victims lived in public sector rented accommodation. Most of the incidents were racial but some were sexual (homophobic) while a significant number involved the disabled and infirm. Although very few victims of hate crime reported the incident immediately to the police, over half did at a later date. The police apprehended the offenders in half of the cases reported to them.

**Fraud**

In line with the Crime Survey of England and Wales (ONS 2015) questions relating to online fraud were included in the survey. Some 41% of those interviewed reported some form of fraud or attempted fraud. This included bank or credit card incidents in two thirds of cases. Other forms of fraud involved unauthorised access to residents’ savings accounts. Less than a quarter of victims reported the incidents to the police but the majority of victims did report the incidents to the banks or other financial institutions to deal with. Not surprisingly little was known about offenders and very few were caught.
Other Online Crime

This is commonly referred to as ‘cybercrime’ and involves offences against computer technology and data and was reported by 8% of respondents. This form of victimisation involved mainly computer hacking and viruses as well as online harassment. Again only a small percentage of victims reported the incidents to the police and most people either dealt with it themselves or referred the matter to their internet provider or computer support agency.

General Observations

Crime Victimisation by Ethnicity

Adopting a threefold classification of White British, BME and White Other it was found that White Other respondents were overrepresented in the category of sexual assault and harassment, as well as violence against the person, whereas BME respondents are overrepresented in terms of hate crime. White British people are slightly more likely to be victims of fraud or other online crime.

White Other is a new category and one that has distinct patterns in comparison to other ethnicities. Their most striking characteristic is their higher likelihood of being satisfied with their neighbourhood and the police and their lower fear of crime. They are more likely to be shorter-term residents (less than two years) and private renters. BME respondents are less likely to perceive the police as fair (though still high at 90%), are more likely to be public renters, and have more concerns about unfriendliness in their area.

Women and Victimisation

Women were more likely to believe they would be victims of crime in the future and more likely to believe there has been an increase in crime. They were also more likely to avoid certain areas, particularly at night, and had greater fear of crime. Women were more likely to be victims of hate crime (two thirds), just under half of which were BME women. Women aged 25 to 34 were most likely to be victims of sexual harassment, which mainly occurred on the street. Experiences of the police, particularly relating to cases of domestic violence, were generally positive.

Neighbours

Neighbours were a source of concern for a number of respondents and particularly in relation to anti-social behaviour and violence, including intimidation. Issues with neighbours had the potential to significantly affect the wellbeing of residents. Problems relating to nuisance were frequently mentioned, including noise, interpersonal conflict, criminal damage, and hate crime.

Vulnerable and Disabled Respondents

There were a number of respondents who raised issues specifically in relation to disability, vulnerability or old age. People mentioned issues with their neighbourhood such as poor pavements or placement of bus stops as well as a fear of crime. Some felt that they were targeted simply because they were seen as vulnerable.
PART A: BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

1 Crime and Victimisation in Islington

1.1 Examining crime and victimisation in the locality

Since the publication of the pioneering study of the First Islington Crime Survey (Jones, MacLean and Young 1986) there has been a growing recognition of the importance of examining crime and victimisation in the local context. This is mainly because the incidence of crime and victimisation can vary considerably from one area to another and even from street to street. Consequently national surveys have a limited value in developing local policies. The principle aim of this study is to provide a more detailed account of the nature and distribution of crime in the London borough of Islington and to give expression to the experiences of those living in the borough.

1.2 Crime and victimisation in Islington

Victimisation surveys have arisen in part as an alternative to the perceived limitations of police generated data, on one hand, and a growing interest in the experience of victims, on the other. Surveying victims, it is argued, provides valuable information about the public’s experience of crime as well as their attitudes towards the operation of criminal justice agencies. The interest in local victimisation surveys was stimulated by the publication in 1977 of Sparks, Genn and Dodd’s explorative study Surveying Victims which examined victimisation in three London boroughs – Brixton, Hackney and Kensington - as well as a small comparative study conducted in Cambridge. Their aim was to identify the so-called ‘dark figure’ of unrecorded crime by asking people directly about their experiences of victimisation. The motivation for undertaking this study was the belief that surveying victims would reveal the existence of a much greater amount of crime than is disclosed in the official statistics. As Sparks et al. (1977) note these surveys not only provide useful information on the distribution of crime but also have political implications, as they can have a powerful impact on the public’s perception of the ‘crime problem’.

However, victim surveys are beset with methodological and conceptual difficulties. These mainly involve the ability of respondents to accurately remember incidents. Normally, respondents are asked to report incidents that they have experienced over a twelve-month period. There is always a danger of ‘telescoping’, by which the respondent recalls the event as having occurred either earlier or later than the designated period. There are also recurring issues of sampling and selection bias.

In the process of understanding what is meant by ‘crime’ it becomes apparent that the victim plays a key role, as they must define a specific incident as potentially constituting a ‘crime’ rather than, say, an accident. Assuming that the person defines an incident as an illegal act of some sort s/he must decide whether or not to report it to the police. The police, in turn, have to decide whether to record it as a crime incident or not. Thus, from the initial process of defining an incident as a potential crime to the recording and processing of the case, some incidents for various reasons will fail to move through all the available stages. Thus, it is the case that victimisation surveys do not attempt to measure the total volume of illegal incidents that take place in a specified period of time, but only those defined as possible crimes by the victims surveyed.
In addition, victim surveys can provide details about why people report or do not report incidents. This process is not just a function of victim motivation, but also what might be called the ‘reportability’ of different types of incidents. Some incidents that people find offensive or harmful may not be considered by the general public or the authorities as worthy of investigation and therefore they are unlikely to be reported or recorded. Thus victimisation surveys have the potential of helping to understand the processes by which crime is constructed and the critical role that the victim plays in defining different types of incidents. Victimisation surveys also allow members of the public to express their anxieties and fears related to crime and safety in the areas where they work and live. They also allow respondents to express the level of satisfaction with crime control agencies and related services. In this way victimisation surveys can be identified as a social democratic tool, allowing a fuller understanding not only of the experiences of those who are victimised but also of the operation of different criminal justice agencies.

1.3 The distribution of victimisation

Just as it is claimed that a relatively small number of offenders are disproportionately ‘responsible’ for a considerable amount of crime, it is also claimed that a small number of victims are disproportionately ‘responsible’ for a large proportion of total victimisation. The implication of this observation is that victimisation is not equally spread across the population, but rather is socially and geographically concentrated. This, in turn, leads to the concentration and compounding of victimisation.

The question then arises whether this is a function of individual attributes – what criminologists refer to as ‘victim proneness’ – or alternatively a consequence of social and structural processes. Richard Sparks (1981) in a paper on multiple victimisation addressed the question of why some people are more ‘victim prone’ than others. He suggests that there are six ways in which the actions, attributes and the social situation of the victims contributes to the variation of victimisation rates:

- **Precipitation** – the victim may act in such a way as to precipitate or encourage the offender’s behaviour
- **Facilitation** – the victim, although not necessarily precipitating the crime may put themselves at special risk
- **Vulnerability** – some people may be physically unable to resist an attack or not experienced enough to avoid forms of deception
- **Opportunity** – those who do not protect themselves or their possessions may provide opportunities for potential offenders
- **Attractiveness** – displays of wealth may draw attention from prospective offenders
- **Impunity** – The person may be perceived as a relatively ‘easy target’ who won’t complain or seek retribution

The recognition that victimisation is socially and geographically concentrated and that there are certain individuals who may be termed ‘chronic victims’ raises the question of multiple and repeat victimisation (Genn 1998). The significance of this realisation is that the study of victimisation moves away from the focus on crime as a series of discrete events to seeing it as a process. Crimes, like
domestic violence in particular, often involve repeated attacks over time. However, there is a tendency in national victimisation surveys to limit the number of incidents that can be reported in a given period of time and this tends to limit the appreciation of the continuous and repeated nature of certain types of offences.

The work on multiple and repeat victimisation illustrates the importance of social context in relation to the experience of victimisation. Victimisation studies have found that a major feature of high crime areas is evidence of a high level of repeat victimisation (Trickett et al 1991). Patterns of repeat victimisation have been found for most types of crime and have provided a basis for developing effective crime prevention strategies (Farrall and Pease 1993).

The question also arises of the impact of victimisation on the victim, not only in terms of physical injury or the ability to bear the loss of possessions but also the effect on victims’ social attitudes and their fear of crime. That is, the extent to which the different forms of victimisation influence attitudes and people’s beliefs about crime and sense of security in the areas where they live and work. This, in turn, raises the issue of which crimes most people fear and what impact does their perception of crime victimisation have on their levels of social interaction. Wilson and Kelling (1983), in the classic article on ‘Broken Windows’, argued that the growth of crime and disorder in particular neighbourhoods can promote fear and erode informal controls leading to a spiral of increased crime and disorder and ultimately to neighbourhood decline. While this model may be too simplistic it does capture some important elements of the relation between increasing levels of crime, disorder and social instability (Matthews 1992).

Most importantly, local victimisation surveys have the ability to capture the specificity of crime victimisation. It is widely recognised that in most urban areas that levels of crime vary considerably from one street or neighbourhood to another. Locality matters. The ability of local victimisation surveys to ‘drill down’ into different areas with different population characteristics, allows for a more detailed examination of the distribution and effects of victimisation.

Thus, the promise of local victimisation surveys is to provide a more realistic picture of the incidence and distribution of crime. By drawing attention to the so-called ‘dark figure’ of unreported incidents they provide an account of why certain incidents are reported while others are not and they also allow us to focus on police recording practices (Young 1988).

1.4 The Main Features of the First Islington Crime Survey (1986)

The First Islington Crime Survey (1986) was conducted by Trevor Jones, Brian Maclean, and Jock Young who were at the time based at the Centre for Criminology at Middlesex University. The research was based on a survey of 80 enumeration districts in the borough involving a total of 3360 addresses. The survey oversampled young people and included a booster sample of 400 residents from different ethnic minority groups. However, it was the aim of the survey to include a representative sample of respondents from across the borough including residents from different age groups, different forms of housing tenure and different income bands. The actual survey sampled just over 2000 households in Islington. The study 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 lower levels of sexual assault than White or African Caribbean women.

A major focus of the first Islington Crime Survey (ICS 1) was on policing in the borough. It was found that the statistics generated by the police produced a picture of the distribution of crime that was significantly different from that produced by the victimisation survey. To some extent the distribution of police recorded crime in the borough was seen to be a function of police activities and priorities, rather than people's experiences (Maclean 1993). Moreover, it was found that nearly one half of victims who did not report the crime to the police cited the reason as a lack of confidence and ability of the police to do anything. Respondents were asked which offences should be given the lowest priority. One third of the Islington population responded that too much police time was spent on prostitution and a quarter of respondents felt that there was too much time spent on policing cannabis use. On the other hand, there was a remarkable consensus regarding the public’s view of serious crime, with violence, sexual violence, street robbery and burglary being prioritised. Amongst ethnic minority groups issues such as dealing with racial attacks and sexual attacks on women were seen as a priority. However the police were widely seen by respondents as being relatively unsuccessful in dealing with what were widely considered to be the most serious crimes.

The experience of women was a major focus of ICS 1. The low level of reporting and recording of domestic violence and sexual assault was seen in part as a function of the lack of police responsiveness to reports. Women were found to routinely engage in avoidance behaviour, consciously avoiding certain streets and areas. Unlike other national surveys ICS 1 revealed a high level of domestic assaults. Many of these cases involved serious and repeated forms of violence with a large percentage of respondents reporting injuries. In addition to domestic violence and sexual assault over 60% of white and 7% of African Caribbean women between the ages of 16 to 24 reported some form of harassment. In sum, ICS 1 found in contrast to the claims of the British Crime
Survey that women’s fear of crime was far from irrational and that women have a higher rate of victimisation than men and suffer from both serious crimes as well as low-level harassment.

1.5 The Second Islington Crime Survey

The Second Islington Crime Survey was carried out by a different set of authors also based at the Centre of Criminology at Middlesex University (Crawford, Jones, Woodhouse and Young 1990). This survey was funded by the ESRC and involved a sample size of 1621 respondents with a response rate of 76.5%. To some extent it covered the same ground as ICS 1 examining issues such as burglary, vandalism and policing, but focused in more detail on the fear crime, sexual offences, crime prevention, anti-social behaviour, as well as the development of policy options. As in the previous survey the aim was to pinpoint particular crime problems in order to facilitate the rational allocation of resources and to identify targets for policy intervention.

An important aspect of the Second Islington Crime Survey (ICS 2) was an examination of the relative ranking of crime and other social concerns. The result was that during the intervening period crime was identified as a major problem in the borough followed by vandalism, dirty streets and litter, and unemployment. Thus a striking feature of the changes in people’s view of the area since ICS 1 was a growing perception of crime as a problem together with the growing concern with environmental issues. There were found to be noticeable differences in the perception of different ethnic minority groups and between men and women. People from ethnic minority groups were less likely to identify crime is a major problem while women were more likely to view crime more seriously.

As in ICS 1 the Second Islington Crime Survey found that residents expressed a lack of confidence in the police, particularly in relation to offences such as street robbery, burglary, vandalism and sexual assaults on women. The older residents, in particular, were found to be critical of police performance. The Second Islington Crime Survey also focused in more detail on fear of crime breaking it down into different areas – the street, public transport, and the home. As in ICS 1, it was found that a considerable proportion of the population surveyed did not go out alone after dark. What was particularly interesting was that whereas some men reported experiencing fear of crime in public areas, a significant number of women experienced both fear and actual victimisation in all three of these arenas. For many women, of course, the home is a major site of sexual and physical assaults. Women were also found to engage in avoidance behaviour avoiding certain types of people and specific places.

Writing in a period of steadily increasing levels of recorded crime, together with growing concerns about violence against women, the authors of ICS 2 engaged in some discussion about preventing and reducing crime. They explored the possibilities of increasing penalties for specific offences and of employing more female judges as well as considering the effects of target hardening as a way to prevent different types of crime. The authors recognised, however, that you cannot read off policy directives directly from crime surveys, but argued that they can make an important contribution to our understanding the problem. The authors of the Second Islington Crime Survey suggested that moving from the information gathered from the public to the development of crime control policies involves four stages: the identification of the problem; the assessment of priorities; the application of principles; and ascertaining possible policy options. In response to the various critiques of victimisation surveys the authors of ICS 2 argued that:
“The social survey is a democratic instrument. It provides an accurate appraisal of people’s fears of the experiences of victimisation; it enables the public to express their assessment of police and public authority effectiveness and their doubts as to the extent to which the police stay within the boundaries of the rule of law. If we are able to view the public as the consumer... Then the social survey provides a detailed picture of consumer demand and satisfaction.” (Crawford et al. 1990:153).
Taking public priorities and experiences of crime as a starting point as well as a point of evaluation, the authors sought to provide a more realistic approach. As a result of the initiative more police were introduced into the area, police-public cooperation was increased, anti-social behaviour was addressed mainly by members of the public, and some target hardening measures were also introduced along with an improvement in street lighting. In addition a tenant mediation scheme was recommended together with a neighbourhood watch scheme. Support was provided to victims and work was initiated in local schools to discuss crime related issues. In this way, the researchers sought to provide a wide ranging but responsive set of initiatives that were designed to address the various aspects of crime on the estate.

A similar ‘action research’ project was carried out on the Miranda estate in the north of Islington in 1992. This research was commissioned by Islington Council and involved 571 female and 429 male respondents. The aim of the survey was not only to measure the level of domestic violence and the support services available to victims, but also to examine the attitudes of men. Consequently a self-report study was carried out with male respondents. This involved presenting a series of vignettes to respondents and then asking them how they would respond to different ‘conflict situations’. This was followed up by a number of in-depth interviews with women who reported experiencing domestic violence. The survey found that there were high levels of non-reporting, while domestic violence was found to be highest in the 16 to 24 age group. Some 30% of female respondents reported experiencing some form of domestic violence over the previous twelve months. Overall, the survey found high levels of spousal assault and physical injury, as well as mental cruelty.

A slightly different type of survey was carried out in Finsbury Park in the mid-1980s, which was designed to address the issue of street prostitution. Street prostitution was seen by many residents in the area as a priority issue. It was estimated that there were at that time over 200 women engaged in street prostitution in the Finsbury Park area, and this was seen by local residents not only as a public order issue, but also an issue which affected the safety of ordinary women living in the area - many of whom were reticent about moving around the streets alone. A multiagency initiative was set up which included local residents groups, the police and the Local Council, which focused primarily on the problem of kerb crawling. As a result a road closure scheme was implemented in order to restrict the flow of traffic and the number of prospective sex buyers driving around the area. Following the implementation of an extensive road closure scheme the number of women engaged in street prostitution in the area declined dramatically, together with the associated public order problems, within two or three years.

These surveys and related research initiatives sought to contribute to policy development in the borough and they were a more or less direct offshoot of the First Islington Crime Survey (see islingtocrimesurvey.com). Between them, the aim was to demonstrate that well thought out evidence-based interventions could be effective in controlling crime and increasing public safety. In general, the Middlesex University researchers advocated multiagency interventions designed to address the problem on a number of different levels and from a number of different vantage points. Providing coordinated interventions, it was felt, could have a substantial impact on the distribution and impact of crime in the borough.
1.7 The London Borough of Islington: A socio-demographic Profile

The London Borough of Islington was selected as the site for the First Islington Crime Survey because it represented a diverse inner-city area, containing areas of Georgian grandeur together with areas of poverty and deprivation. During the 1980s some 18% of the working population was unemployed and 67% of households had an income of less than £8000 per annum. According to the Department of the Environment, Islington was the seventh most deprived area in England in the 1980s. It was estimated that between 3000 and 4000 households lived in overcrowded conditions. There were 7000 people on the council house waiting list and 9000 waiting for transfer to better accommodation. It was felt that this picture, involving a combination of affluence and deprivation, provided a suitable example of a diverse inner-city borough at that time.

Over the past 30 years, however, the socio-demographic profile of Islington has changed considerably. The borough has seen a significant development of commercial and leisure activities, although pockets of poverty and deprivation remain. Islington still has one of the highest proportions of social tenants in the country as well as a large private rented sector according to the index of multiple deprivation (IMD 2007). Two thirds of the 118 super output areas (SOAs) in the borough are among the 20 per cent most deprived SOAs in the country.

A recent equality report for Islington stated the following (IC 2016, p16):

- Overall, Islington is the 26th most deprived local authority in England: this represents a relative improvement from the 2014 position of 14th.
- However, Islington ranks third nationally on the income deprivation indicator for children, and fifth for income deprivation affecting older people. On both measures, this represents an improvement in relative deprivation by one place on 2014.
- Every ward in Islington has at least one area that is among the 20% most deprived areas of England.
- The general pattern of deprivation in Islington is similar to previous years: Hillrise, Finsbury Park, Caledonian, and areas of Mildmay, Junction, St George’s and Canonbury were all in the most deprived areas of Islington in the last assessment, and continued to be in 2015.
- The most common types of housing tenure in Islington are social housing rented from the council and private rented housing (27% and 26% of all households respectively). 28% of all householders own their own home, less than half the national average (63%).
At the other end of the social spectrum Islington scores as one of the most prosperous parts of the country in relation to house prices. While 15% of households in 2007 had an income of £15,000, just under half had an income of under £30,000, while one in six households in the borough had an income of over £60,000. In 2007, 40,000 people were of working age, two thirds of whom were in employment.
Islington’s population is very diverse. Of the 200,000 residents in the borough just over a quarter are from BME communities and a further fifth are described as ‘White Other’, which means not of British heritage. Compared to London as a whole, some 74 per cent of Islington’s population in 2007 was described as ‘White Other’, while in London in general the figure was 65%. Some 13% of Islington’s population was described as ‘Black’ and 5 per cent ‘Asian’ compared with 14% and 12% for London as a whole.

In relation to crime, Islington had one of the highest rates of recorded crime in the country in 2008-2010. Crime, however, was not equally distributed throughout the borough with some areas having higher crime rates than others as figure 2 below indicates.

**Figure 2: 2008-2010 Crime rates by ward**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Violence Against The Person</th>
<th>Robbery</th>
<th>Burglary</th>
<th>Theft Handling &amp; Criminal Damage</th>
<th>Other Notifiable Offences</th>
<th>Total Notifiable Offences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barnsbury</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunhill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledonian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canonbury</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerkenwell</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finsbury Park</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highbury East</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highbury West</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillrise</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holloway</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junction</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildmay</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St George’s</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mary’s</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Peter’s</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tollington</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Metropolitan Police*

**1.8 Recent changes in the level and distribution of crime in Islington**

However, over the past decade or so there has been a substantial reduction in reported crime levels according to police recorded data. There were, for example, 10,000 fewer crimes reported in the borough in 2010 compared with 2005. In recent years the frequency distribution of crime has changed significantly. Following the steady decrease in most crime types up to 2012 there has been, however, an increase over the last two or three years. During 2015-2016 for example there was a 9.2% increase in recorded crime in the borough compared with an average increase in London of 4.4%. Indeed, in 2015 the crime rate in Islington reached its highest level for five years. Significantly, in 2015 recorded levels of violent crime have increased nationally, as well as across London in
general and in Islington in particular. As figure 3 below indicates there have been some significant variations in relation to different crime types in the borough over the past few years. Overall, according to Metropolitan Police data for 2015, Islington has the second highest crime rate in London after Westminster and is one of only three London Boroughs with above average crime rates. Significantly, Camden, which neighbours Islington, is the third highest.

According to the Metropolitan Police data, St Mary’s ward experiences more crime than any other in the Borough. However, on closer examination, it has, by some margin, the highest rate of theft (which includes shoplifting and pickpocketing) reflecting the number of shops and businesses in the area around Upper Street. Violence against the person is most prevalent in Finsbury Park and St Mary’s both of which are over 60% higher than the Islington average. Robbery is a much less common offence but again is most common in Finsbury Park, followed by Junction and Mildmay. Clerkenwell, Bunhill and Finsbury Park are the wards with the highest rate of burglary. The wards with the lowest level of crime overall are Highbury East and Hillrise.

**Figure 3: 2015-2016 Crime rates by ward**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Violent Against the Person</th>
<th>Robbery</th>
<th>Burglary</th>
<th>Theft &amp; Handling</th>
<th>Criminal Damage</th>
<th>Drugs</th>
<th>Fraud or Forgery</th>
<th>Sexual Offences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barnsbury</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunhill</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>98.7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledonian</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canonbury</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerkenwell</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finsbury Park</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highbury East</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highbury West</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillrise</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holloway</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junction</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildmay</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St George’s</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mary’s</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>114.3</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Peter’s</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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. There was no detected difference in the perceptions of White and BME residents. Finally, social housing tenants were much more likely to feel unsafe at night than people in other forms of tenure. There are variations by ward too. Well over half of residents in Clerkenwell, Bunhill and St George’s wards feel safe after dark, but fewer than 40% of residents in Caledonian, Finsbury Park, Holloway and Junction wards feel safe once night falls.

According to police generated data all forms of violence have increased in the borough over the last two or three years, particularly involving serious youth violence, while the number of domestic abuse cases in the borough decreased slightly from 4382 to 4260 between 2014 and 2015. However, detection rates also went down in this period (see Hayden 2016). As figure 4 below indicates there is considerable variation between the number of domestic abuse cases reported and those processed in the borough.

**Figure 4: 2015 Domestic abuse estimated, recorded, and identified individuals**

![Graph showing domestic abuse data](source: Hayden (2016) Violence Against Women and Girls Analysis. LBI.)

The available figures also indicate that there has been an increase in recent years in all forms of hate crime. Approximately three quarters of hate crimes reported are racial or religious. However, again the detection rates for hate crime decreased significantly in 2014-2015. Reports of anti-social behaviour have also increased in the borough with a significant rise in the number of repeat callers. The extent to which the increase in calls is a function of more incidents occurring in the borough or a greater propensity of some residents to report incidents, however, is not clear.
Youth offending and gang-related violence have also become a growing cause of concern in the borough and this has resulted in the introduction of a new initiative designed to reduce youth involvement in crime in general and gangs in particular. To put this into context, the Metropolitan Police data suggest that knife crime and teenage assaults have risen in London and Islington is no exception. Although these numbers had been declining, 2015 saw a rise in knife incidents.

It is evident from figure 5 below that 15 to 17-year-olds feature significantly in the arrest data produced by the Metropolitan Police and many of these offences are linked to theft and snatch. Islington has the highest level of theft and snatch in London during 2015. There has also been an increase in arrests of 18 to 20 year-olds in the borough and this increase appears to be linked to gang activities and serious youth violence.

**Figure 5: 2014/2015 Arrests by age group**

As noted above the distribution of crime varies from one location to another. As figure 6 below indicates, the recorded level of residential burglary is particularly high in the north of the borough, while Finsbury Park is identified as one of the main areas for the sale and purchase of illegal drugs. Youth issues are seen to be most pronounced in the Caledonian Road and Mildmay areas, while robbery and theft tend to take place in central locations. There are also some areas that experience high levels of different crime types.
In sum, although there has been a welcome reduction of different forms of crime in Islington between 2003 and 2013 there has been a worrying increase in the level of recorded crime in the borough over the last 2-3 years. Whether this is a short-term upswing or the beginning of the steady rise in crime is of critical importance. Consequently, trying to understand the causes of these changes and their impact on the residents of Islington has now become more urgent.

Figures 7 and 8 below show the changing rates of crime from 2004-2016 in Islington and are based on police generated statistics. As can be seen, the figure indicates a general decline in crime rates over this period but with a slight rise between 2014/15 and 2015/16. Violence against the person has apparently increased to previous levels between 2013 and 2016, after a decrease in the intervening period. Motor vehicle offences have decreased the most and drug offences deviate from the general pattern by spiking in the years 2006-2009.
Figure 7: Changing levels of crime in Islington (1)

Figure 8: Changing levels of crime in Islington (2)
Using the lower super output areas for Islington, the following crime maps have been supplied by the Community Safety Team in Islington to show the concentration of burglaries, robbery, theft and handling, and violence against the person for the year October 2014 - September 2015.

**Figure 9: Residential Burglary by LSOA October 2014 to September 2015**

As can be seen, areas of higher concentration are mainly in the north of the Borough, around Highbury and Junction Road, the Emirates stadium and Holloway Road, and around the Hilldrop Estate, and the south side of the Camden Road. These areas are generally more deprived. An exception to this is the more affluent area behind Angel station.

This is in contrast to robbery and theft and Handling, which are more concentrated in the south of the borough.
The areas of highest concentration are the north end of Essex Road, the southern end of the same road and the area behind Angel Station, City Road, Clerkenwell, and Old Street. Many of these areas are associated with business and commerce.
Similar to robbery, theft and handling has also been found to be concentrated in the Old Street, Clerkenwell, Angel Station and lower Essex Road areas. In addition, the lower end of Holloway Road behind Highbury and Islington station is another area of high concentration.

Whereas these theft offences seem to be related to the presence of commerce in the area, unsurprisingly violence against the person presents a very different picture.
Figure 12: Violence Against the Person by LSOA October 2014 to September 2015

The areas of highest concentration span the length of the Holloway Road and spread into the Arsenal area and the area surrounding Archway Station. They are also concentrated in the area behind Angel Station and near Old Street, which is similar to theft and handling and robbery. These two areas contain both commercial premises and pockets of deprivation.

1.9 Rise in fraud and online crime

Strikingly, fraud and online crime are overtaking other areas of criminality in the borough, yet the lack of a visible perpetrator and the private nature of these crimes means that they do not have a high profile in relation to community or neighbourhood concerns. In other words, these are not ‘social’ issues in the same way that gang violence, muggings, and other forms of crime are perceived to be. Nevertheless, they affect a large percentage of the population. The Crime Survey of England and Wales suggests that approximately 10% of the population are victims of online crime and this is a problem that spans demographic categories so long as they have an online presence.

Offences such as phishing (tricking people into handing over their personal details), identity theft, hacking, and online harassment are becoming more prevalent. The Crime Survey for England and Wales suggests that almost half (2.5 million) of the 5.8 million incidents recorded in 2015 related to bank and credit card fraud. The next highest was 1.4 million computer virus attacks. More generally,
the survey also reported 3.8 million incidents of fraud and suggests that fraud is now the most common type of crime.

The challenge for policing these crimes is that the perpetrators do not need to be in the vicinity of the victim. In fact many of them are based abroad. Thus, although protection and prevention may be local concerns, punishment and policing necessitate a national and global perspective.

1.10 Victimisation in Islington

Changes in crime in the UK and in Islington are occurring – most notably a rise in online crime and fraud and a rise in gang/group related issues. Notably, these are very different types of crime. For one – gangs and groups – issues of community cohesion and perceived threat will affect a person’s experience of their neighbourhood. On the other hand, recent crime data suggests that in general people are far more likely to fall victim to cyber related crimes. Overall, the existing crime data and history of crime in Islington demonstrate a shifting landscape with new issues emerging. Thus a survey of residents experiences of different forms of crime and their changing experience of victimisation can help to gain a better understanding of this changing landscape.
2 Demographics

This section considers the demographic composition of the sample, providing an analysis of the gender, age and ethnicity of respondents, and their employment and marital status. It also looks at their religious affiliations, their residence status or tenure together with the length of time they have lived in the borough.

2.1 Gender

After weights were applied, the sample was equally divided between women and men.

2.2 Age

Figure 13: Age of respondents

Respondents were asked their age on his or her last birthday. The largest group at nearly 49% of the sample were those aged 25-44, followed by young people aged 16 to 24 years (16%) and those aged 45 to 54 years (16%). Just below 10% were aged 55 to 64 years and the 65 years or more category constituted less than 10%. The majority of the sample population was therefore of working age.

2.2.1 Age and gender

For the 16 to 24 years category, the gender balance was 55% male compared to 45% female. This is reversed for the 25-44 years category with 54% female and 43% male. With respect to respondents aged 45 years and older, men again outnumber women at 57% to 42%.

2.3 Ethnicity

When using a 5+1 classification (White, Black, Asian, Mixed, Chinese, Other), the largest category at 71% is ‘White’. However, when a 3 band classification is used (White British, White Other and BME), the proportions change to White British at 48%, White Other at 23% and BME at 29%. Hence, using the 5+1 classification masks the diversity of the ‘White’ group where just under half are White British. The category of White Other is also diverse, including groups from South, Central and North
America, Australia and New Zealand, as well groups from other European countries. It is interesting to note that a greater proportion of people from those countries that belatedly joined the European Union in 2004 – mostly former Eastern bloc countries – were already in Islington beforehand, 13% compared with 4.2% after 2004.

2.4 Employment status

Figure 14: Employment status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Looking after the home</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholly retired from work</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanently sick or disabled</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time education</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self employed (full or part-time)</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed part time (less than 31 hours)</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed full time (31 or more hours)</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, more than half the sample population was employed full or part-time – 40% and 11% respectively – while a smaller proportion were self-employed at 8%. The categories of retirees and people looking after the home each made up 10% of the sample. 3% were permanently sick or disabled and 7% were unemployed but available for work. Of the remaining sample, most were students in full-time education (10%). Hence, some 70% of the sample population was either working or in full-time education.

2.5 Marital status

There were similar proportions of those who were single (and had never been married) to those who were married or in a civil partnership – 40% and 38% respectively. The next largest category comprised respondents who were in a relationship (of more than one year) but were not married or civil partnered at 14%. Smaller proportions were widowed (3%), divorced (3%), in a relationship of less than one year (2%) or separated (0.5%).

2.6 Religion

Overall, two fifths of the respondents said they were practising members of a religion (39%). Of these, the vast majority were Christian (72%), followed by 22% Muslim and much smaller proportions of respondents who said they were practising members of Hinduism (3%), Buddhism (2%), Sikhism (0.6%), Judaism (0.6%) or other religion (0.5%).

2.7 Residential status/tenure

The greatest proportion of respondents rented in the private sector (34%), followed by homeowners (30%). Of these 13% owned their property outright. Council tenants accounted for 28% and
housing association or other social landlord tenants accounted for 7%. A very small proportion had shared ownership (0.3%) or some other living arrangement (0.2%). Hence, most respondents overall were private sector tenants.

**Figure 15: Tenure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Tenure</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rented from a private landlord</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented from a housing association or another Registered Social Landlord</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented from the Council</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned with a mortgage or loan</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned outright</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2.8 Length of time in present home**

**Figure 16: Length of time in present home**

The majority of respondents had lived in their current property for more than five years (55.9%) but the next largest proportion had occupied their present homes for less than one year (17.6%). Similar proportions had lived in their properties for between one and two years (13.1%) or for between two and five years (13.4%).
2.9 Length of time in Islington

Figure 17: Length of time in Islington

The majority of respondents had lived in the borough for more than five years (65%) with 14% having lived there for less than one year, 10% for between one and two years, and 11% for between two and five years.

2.9.1 Years in Islington by tenure by ethnicity

Figure 18: Years resident in Islington and tenure by ethnicity

BME respondents comprised the greatest proportion of those who had lived in Islington for more than five years, 76% compared with 70% White British and 41% White Other. Similarly, higher proportions of White Other respondents had lived in Islington for less than one year, between one and two years, and between two and five years than either their White British or BME counterparts.
The most significant pattern to emerge regarding tenure was that White Other respondents were far more likely to live in privately rented properties, BME to live in publicly rented accommodation, and that just under half of White British respondents were home owners.

2.10 Distribution of respondents by ward

Respondents were broadly evenly distributed across the wards.
PART B: PERCEPTIONS OF NEIGHBOURHOOD AND CRIME

3 Perceptions of neighbourhood, crime and policing in Islington

Survey participants were asked about their perception of their neighbourhood, their primary concerns and their perceptions of anti-social behaviour and crime, in particular, whether they believe that rates of specific crimes had increased or decreased during their period of residence in the borough. They were also asked about their perceptions and experiences of policing.

Victimisation in relation to crime and anti-social behaviour were amongst the top concerns for residents and in a number of cases were linked to other issues of concern such as a lack of suitable places for children to play, noise, and litter/rubbish. However, respondents were largely satisfied with their neighbourhood and with the police.

3.1 Primary neighbourhood concerns

Respondents were asked to indicate which, from a list of items, they perceived to be a problem or not in their area. For all questions ‘area’ is defined as being within a fifteen-minute walk of their residence. Figure 19 below illustrates response patterns.

Figure 19: Perception of neighbourhood problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>70%</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>90%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public transport (2018)</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race relations (2021)</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of street lighting (2024)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School availability (2013)</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfriendliness (2023)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street gangs (2007)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism and graffiti (2019)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy lorry noise (2018)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough places for children to play (1866)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment (1905)</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime (2013)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing costs (1987)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Housing costs emerged as the source of greatest concern, with nearly three quarters (70%) citing this item as a problem and in some cases linking this to concerns about the economy more generally (which can also be evidenced by responses relating to unemployment, a concern for half of respondents). Crime was the second highest concern with just over half of respondents (54%) listing this as a problem. The need for a police presence was mentioned throughout the interviews in relation to both ASB and crime. Respondents indicated that they wanted to see more police patrols and felt that this would be reassuring.
Just under a third of respondents cited crime-related items such as vandalism, graffiti and street gangs, as a problem (see below for a discussion of anti-social behaviour). However, the lack of places for children to play and heavy lorry noise were also regarded as significant problems. Respondents raised issues of safety in relation to children’s play areas and these were frequently perceived to be associated with ASB and crime:

“My local play area for the children is unacceptable due to dangerous dogs and alcohol and gangs”

(Asian Male, Aged 35-44. Council rented property in Tollington)

Other issues mentioned by respondents (in far smaller numbers) included lack of parking, upkeep of both public spaces and housing, litter and rubbish, traffic control, and the need for more CCTV. Interestingly, elderly and disabled people reported a number of hazards such as uneven pavements and potholes, as well as inconveniences such as recycling bins being located too far away and one case of a bus stop that obstructs wheelchairs being able to pass (St John’s Way). Issues of community cohesion were also mentioned in relation to both race and disability/age, which is consistent with the fact that ‘unfriendliness’ was mentioned by almost a third of respondents.

3.1.1 Who was most concerned?

Respondents were asked to indicate whether or not they were concerned about the following issues: Housing Costs, Crime, Unemployment, Not Enough Places for Children to Play, Heavy Lorry Noise, Vandalism and Graffiti, Street Gangs, Unfriendliness, School Availability, Quality of Street Lighting, Race Relations, Public Transport.

*Gender*

Women were more concerned than men about their neighbourhood in relation to all categories. This is in line with other findings in the research, which found that women were more likely to fear crime overall. As such, women generally display more concern relating to their neighbourhood than men.

*Employment status*

When looking at the pattern of responses by employment status, unsurprisingly, the unemployed were more likely to regard unemployment and housing costs as problems in their area. Conversely, employed respondents considered crime and vandalism to be more of a problem. Surprisingly, employed respondents were also more likely to regard unfriendliness as a problem. Of those not working or in full time education, a large number could be classed as vulnerable in some way – whether due to being elderly, sick or disabled. Although they spend a greater amount of time in their homes they felt that they were more likely to be targets of crime and anti-social behaviour.
Ethnicity

When analysing responses by ethnicity, those categorised as BME were more likely to see race relations and unfriendliness as problems in their area. However, the most significant pattern to emerge here is that respondents categorised as White Other identified very few items as problematic with the exception of housing costs and street lighting – see below.

Age

Respondents aged 16 to 24 years were more likely to regard unemployment, transport, unfriendliness and a lack of places for children to play as problems. By contrast, older residents were more likely to see lorry noise, crime and the quality of street lighting as problems. Older residents raised a number of concerns in relation to their age, including uneven pavements and other hazards, anti-social behaviour (particularly noise), and feeling targeted as a vulnerable group. Age and disability are linked in this respect – disabled people also felt that they are more frequently targeted and face particular hazards. In contrast, young people were seen as a cause of anti-social behaviour (congregating in groups).

Tenure

Homeowners (including those with a mortgage) were significantly more likely to regard several items as a problem than their counterparts in the public and private rent sectors. The items included lorry noise, crime, school availability, transport, quality of street lighting, vandalism and graffiti, unfriendliness and street gangs. Arguably, these are all factors that could have a bearing on the value of their property or denote that financial investment in a property increases emotional investment in the area itself.

3.1.2 Who was least concerned?

As indicated above, respondents in the White Other category were significantly more likely than their White British and BME counterparts to cite almost all neighbourhood items as ‘not a problem’. The only exceptions were quality of street lighting, where there were no differences by ethnicity, and housing costs where White Other respondents were more likely to consider this a problem than both White British and BME respondents. As stated in the demographics section, a higher proportion of White Other respondents lived in privately rented accommodation and a higher proportion had also lived in Islington for two years or less.
3.2 Satisfaction with neighbourhood

Most respondents had a reasonable level of satisfaction with their neighbourhood. Women were more likely to be dissatisfied than men across most categories, which can be linked to the fact that they are also more likely to be victims of a wider range of crimes. With respect to ethnicity, a slightly higher proportion of White British and BME respondents had a low level of satisfaction. Interestingly, a greater proportion of White Other respondents reported a high level of satisfaction compared with BME and White British. This is consistent with the findings above.

3.3 Crime

Looking specifically at crime, Figure 21 below presents the differences by demographic characteristics.
3.3.1 Crime and length of time in Islington

As can be seen from the above, the longer respondents had lived in Islington, the more likely they were to see crime as a problem, and longer standing residents were between two and three times as likely to see it as a major problem compared to respondents who had lived in Islington for less than five years. Conversely, well over half of residents who had lived in Islington for two or fewer years considered crime not to be a problem.

3.3.2 Crime and tenure

The smallest proportion of respondents who considered crime to be a major problem was in the privately rented sector (6%). This is consistent with other findings given that most private sector tenants are categorised as White Other.
3.3.3 Crime and employment status

Interestingly, the unemployed were most likely to see crime as a major problem whereas employed respondents were the least likely to see crime as not a problem at all. Students, the economically inactive and employed respondents had similar percentages of people stating that crime was a major problem.

3.3.4 Crime and gender

Similar proportions of women and men considered crime to be a major problem (13% and 12% respectively) despite the fact that women were more likely to be victims of crime and were more concerned about their neighbourhood more generally.

3.3.5 Crime and victim status

Unsurprisingly, more respondents who had been victims of crime within the previous twelve months considered crime to be a major problem, 18% compared with 12% of non-victims.

3.4 Perceptions of the changing level of crime

Overall, the majority of respondents (66%) stated that they felt crime had stayed the same since they first lived in the borough. A fifth reported it had decreased and 14% that it had increased. Figure 22 (see next page) provides further demographic analysis. Specifically, people mentioned being concerned about burglary, car crime, muggings and vehicle and bike theft.
3.4.1 Changes in levels of crime by length of time in Islington

There is a clear relationship between length of time that respondents have lived in the borough and their view on changing levels of crime. The majority who have lived in the borough for less than two years felt that crime had stayed the same in recent years whereas those who have lived in the borough for longer were less likely to see crime levels as stable.
3.4.2 Changes in levels of crime by tenure

A significant majority of all respondents living in different housing types felt that crime levels were relatively stable. However, those in public rented accommodation were most likely to feel that crime had increased.

3.4.3 Changes in levels of crime by employment status

Again there was a broad consensus amongst those with different employment status that crime levels were stable compared with those who were unemployed, economically inactive or students feeling that there had been a slightly greater increase in crime than those in employment.

3.4.4 Changes in crime levels by ethnicity

A higher proportion of BME respondents believed there had been an increase in crime – 21% compared with 14% of White British and only 7% of White Other. White Other respondents were more likely to think crime levels were unchanged or that crime had decreased.

3.4.5 Changes in levels of crime by age

Interestingly, a higher proportion of the youngest and the oldest respondents thought there had been an increase in crime levels – 25% in each case – while those aged between 25 and 45 were least likely to believe there had been an increase. At the same time, a considerably greater proportion of respondents aged 55 to 64 years believed crime levels had fallen compared to all other age groups.

3.4.6 Changes in crime levels by gender

A higher proportion of women thought crime had increased – 17% compared with 11% of men.

3.4.7 Changes in levels of crime by victim status

Unsurprisingly, respondents who had been victims of crime in the preceding twelve months were more likely to believe crime levels had risen – 20% compared with only 13% of respondents who had not been victimised over the same period. Similarly, victims of crime were less likely to think crime had decreased compared with their non-victim counterparts – 17% and 21% respectively.

3.4.8 Changes in levels of specific types of crime

Respondents were also asked about their perceptions of specific types of crime. Figure 23 (see next page) depicts their responses.
Unsurprisingly perhaps, fraud including Internet and other online crime was believed more likely to have increased more than any other crime category. A greater proportion of respondents believed vehicle crime had increased as opposed to decreased. When asked to expand on increases in crime, other categories that were mentioned included drug and alcohol use/selling, deception burglary, muggings, knife crimes, and gang/group related crime. Deception burglary was described as a combination of fraud, theft, and assault:

“Rough tradesmen scamming people, particularly the vulnerable without a lot of money. They also can become aggressive and threatening”

(Asian Woman, 25-34. Property owner in St George’s)

Relatedly, respondents were also concerned about vulnerable adults either causing or being the victims of crime. By contrast, a relatively small proportion of respondents believed sexual assault and harassment had increased. Very similar proportions also thought the crimes of criminal damage and violence or threats of violence had likewise fallen. When asked to expand on perceptions of decreases in crime, respondents mentioned groups and gangs, drugs, littering and theft.

In respect to crime generally, further analysis showed that overall women were more likely to believe there had been an increase in all of the above offences, except hate crime, fraud and other online crime, where men were more likely to believe they had increased.

People aged 45 years or older were more likely to think burglary had increased while those in the youngest age band thought there had been an increase in vehicle crime, criminal damage, hate crime, fraud and other online crime.
White Other respondents were more likely to believe that crime rates had remained the same except for fraud and other online crime. BME respondents thought there had been an increase in violence, theft, vehicle crime, and hate crime. White British respondents also believed there had been an increase in hate crime.

3.5 Perception of probability of crime and fear of crime

This section considers how likely respondents thought it would be that they would personally become victims of crime in the following twelve months, how safe or unsafe they felt in their local areas, any use of avoidance behaviours, and any security measures that they had in their homes.

As can be seen, for the most part respondents were not in fear of crime and those who were often had previous experiences of victimisation. Nevertheless, people do take security measures both on their properties and when walking around, particularly in the dark. Respondents described avoiding gangs and groups of people and anywhere that is isolated or badly lit.

3.5.1 Perception of likelihood of victimisation

Respondents were asked how likely they thought it was that they would personally become a victim of crime in the following twelve months.

Figure 24: Likelihood of victimisation in the next 12 months

As can be seen, the majority thought it either very or fairly unlikely that they would become a victim of crime in the following twelve months (81%). Only 2% thought it very likely that they would personally be victimised.
There were fewer significant differences with respect to perceived risk of victimisation in comparison with other variables. As indicated above, no differences emerged by age but, again, women generally believed they were more likely to be victimised than their male counterparts – 21% compared to 13% respectively. With respect to ethnicity, White Other respondents were the least likely to believe they would personally become a victim of crime – 89% compared with 81% of White British and 80% of BME respondents. When taking account of tenure, homeowners were more likely to think they would be personally victimised – 23% in comparison with 15% of public sector tenants and 4% of private sector tenants. This may be related to the number of White Other respondents in the private sector who were also the group most likely to feel safe both during the day and at night and who were least likely to engage in avoidance behaviour.

Respondents who had been victims of crime since the beginning of 2015 were twice as likely to believe they would be victimised again as those who had not been victims – 29% compared with 15% respectively.

3.5.2 Feelings of safety and risk avoidance behaviour

Respondents were asked two questions to ascertain how safe they felt walking alone in their area during the day, and at night. Figures 26 and 27 below illustrate responses as a whole and by ward.
As would be expected more respondents felt safe walking alone in their area during the day than at night. Overall feelings of safety were very high, with 98% feeling some degree of safety during the day and 81% at night. Respondents in the youngest age group (16 to 24 years) were most likely to
say they felt safe only during the day (26% in comparison with 16% and 18% for other age groups) – but less safe at night.

With respect to ethnicity, those from BME communities were less likely than their White British or White Other counterparts to feel safe only during the day (26%, compared with 16% White British and 15% White Other).

When asked to elaborate 20 respondents simply stated that they have a blanket policy of not going out after dark. A few had specific reasons for feeling unsafe, mostly at night. These include being a previous or on-going victim of crime and conflicts with neighbours. Examples given by respondents included continued feelings of concern/lack of safety after having been burgled, feeling vulnerable because of a disability (wheelchair bound), and not leaving the home when gangs of youths were hanging around. One disabled person had a friend who was killed and described feeling under serious threat:

“I am scared to go out even day or night time, people target me since I am a disabled person. Recently my friend was killed since he was disabled too”

(Asian Male, 16-24. Housing Association rented property in Highbury West)

3.5.3 Feelings of safety and avoidance behaviours

Respondents who reported they felt safe day and night were less likely to avoid certain areas (10%) in comparison with those who felt safe during the day only (35%) and 45% said that they felt unsafe to some degree both day and night (see Appendix B).

A fifth of women reported that they avoided certain areas in comparison to 9% of men. There were no differences by ethnicity. Victims of crime were also more likely to avoid certain areas (21% in comparison with 14% of non-victims).

The four main areas people mentioned avoiding are:

- Archway and Junction Road: 8
- Caledonian Rd: 16
- Finsbury Park and Quill St: 19
- Holloway Rd: 20

Other areas cited include: Hornsey Rd and surrounding area (6), Tufnell Park and Carlton Rd (3), North Rd (6), Copenhagen St area (4), Camden Rd (2), York Way and Railway St area (4), Angel Station and St John St (4), Liverpool St (2), Seven Sisters Road (2), Upper St and Highbury and Islington Station (4), Essex Rd (11), New North Rd and area (3), St Luke’s and area (8), Highbury New Park Area (5).

The map below (see next page) indicates the areas that people tend to avoid. The larger circles signify the most avoided and the smaller circles signify the other areas that were mentioned.
The reasons given by residents for avoiding certain areas include:

**Theft and crime**

Areas known for muggings (Brecknock Road and Highbury Fields were mentioned) and for high crime rates more generally (Finsbury Park, Upper Holloway and Holloway Road were mentioned) were avoided. One person mentioned that an alleyway on Holloway Road is often used by criminals.
Avoiding groups (including street harassment and drug/alcohol use)

Areas associated with gang activity such as parks, the canal and estates were avoided, as well as groups of youths and anybody using drugs or alcohol. (See below discussion on anti-social behaviour for more on avoiding gangs and groups).

Avoiding isolated and dark areas

Anywhere that is not well patrolled, is secluded and quiet, and/or not well lit. These areas also tend to be sites for anti-social behaviour.

Avoiding particular types of area

Particular types of area avoided after dark are:

- The Canal (12)
- Parks (38)
- Estates (60)
- Side/back streets, alleyways (66)

3.5.4 Security measures

All respondents were asked if they had any security measures in their homes and, if so, what types of measures they had. Figure 29 below illustrates the responses.

Figure 29: Type of home security measures

As can be seen, the majority of respondents had some kind of security measure to protect their homes, the most common being window locks, followed by exterior doors with deadlocks and security chains or bolts on exterior doors. There were no differences by tenure.
3.5.5 Number of security measures

There was no correlation between the number of security measures and burglary victimisation or tenure. However, the most significant correlation was found to be between perception of safety and the number of security measures where ‘basic’ equates to up to two security measures, ‘medium’ three to four, and ‘high’ five or more measures.

Figure 30: Feelings of safety and security measures
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Other security measures that people reported using included:

- **Buzzer (39)**
- **Door Gate (12)**
- **CCTV (8)**
- **Spy Hole (5)**
- **Concierge (7)**
- **Double Door (6)**
- **Dog (7)**

Double doors and gates could be on the front or back of the property. Anti-burglary measures included smart paint for belongings (provided by the police), film, sealant for windows, unbreakable glass, and wire on the back fence.
3.6 Membership of neighbourhood watch

Respondents were asked whether they were members of any type of neighbourhood watch or similar scheme. Only 52 reported being members of any such scheme, which includes Area and Tenant Associations, Local Residents Groups, Safer Neighbourhood Groups and Estate Committees.

An example of good practice is the over 60s monthly meeting with police officers, which includes sharing information and ensuring that over 60s know how to contact the police (the location of the nearest phone to call the police).

“Over 60s club sees a police officer monthly. He warns about problems and we tell him about crimes or problems”

(Spanish Woman, 65-74, Property owner in Caledonian)

3.7 Anti-social behaviour

Respondents were also asked if they considered anti-social behaviour (ASB) to be a problem in their area. A substantial majority of respondents did not consider it to be a problem. Overall, just over one quarter (27%) thought it was a problem. Figure 31 (see next page) provides the details of the responses to ASB against different groups.

In keeping with the response patterns found with respect to neighbourhood problems outlined above, women were more likely than men to see ASB as a problem. This was also the case for respondents who had been victims of crime in the previous twelve months, while those categorised as White Other were least likely to see ASB as a problem. White British and BME respondents, the employed and the economically inactive, as well as homeowners and public sector tenants were also all more likely to consider ASB to be a problem in their area. All differences are statistically significant. With respect to age, the only statistically significant difference was that those in the age band of 54 – 65 years were more likely to see ASB as a problem than younger respondents.
3.7.1 Nature of concerns

Residents who expressed the view that ASB was a problem in their area were then also presented with a list of issues and asked to indicate how far they felt each of them was a concern. Figure 32 illustrates.
Bearing in mind that just over a quarter of respondents felt that ASB was a major problem these issues were the greatest concern in descending order:

**Youths hanging around (51%)**

Respondents cited young people gathering in groups as their greatest concern, particularly with regard to smoking, drinking and making noise.

**Litter and rubbish (41%)**

Lack of rubbish bins, general increases in the amount of litter, and fly tipping in alleyways and on the estates were mentioned.

**Dealing or using illicit drugs (40%)**

Respondents were concerned about both the consumption and sale of drugs, with frequent mention of marijuana use. No other drug was mentioned by name. Respondents associated drug related activity with intimidating behaviour and gangs:

“Drug dealing and gang activities, sometimes they are blocking the entrance. They will fight you if you try to tell them anything. It’s very risky in this area.”

(Asian Man 25-34. Council rented property in Bunhill)

Areas that were associated with drug use included Wilmington Square (for marijuana), the canal, parks, estates, and quiet or secluded areas.

**Riding bicycles on the pavement (38%)**

As well as comments about bicycles on the pavements, there were associated concerns about kids on mopeds and even cars racing down the roads, all of which some residents found intimidating.
Street drinking (31%)

Homelessness and people sleeping rough was perceived to be strongly associated with street drinking. Some respondents suggested that drunk people are a cause for concern and that they take active measures to avoid these groups:

“A lot of homeless and alcoholic people drinking, swearing and cursing outside of this building, they are with their dogs. They sit and sleep out there making it frightening for us to pass through”

(African Caribbean Woman, over 75. Housing Association rented property in Junction)

3.7.2 Experiences of Anti-social Behaviour

Drug and alcohol use

It was evident that the use of alcohol and drugs were seen to be associated with other forms of nuisance and disorder – crime, urinating, vomiting, littering, and noise. Some respondents described those who use drugs and alcohol in public as “intimidating”.

Further, respondents described feeling threatened by homeless people and people sleeping rough. Archway was mentioned in relation to this concern.

Parks and community spaces

Parks and community spaces were identified as areas of particular concern:

“(There are) lots of dealing and alcoholics around here, who then go to the local park, and the small green space around here making it unsafe for people. Last year they used to sleep there, the council cut the bushes off, but they are still there, they now use the benches which I think they should remove”

(White Irish Man, 55-64. Council rented property in Junction)

These areas designated for leisure were mentioned by respondents as locations for incidents such as muggings, drinking and alcohol consumption, groups and gangs, littering, and noise. When discussing places to avoid, parks were mentioned, particularly at night. In addition, issues such as traffic and dangerous driving were mentioned with some respondents stating that traffic control near to where children play is an issue (cars driving too fast for example).

Noise and other nuisance

Noise was identified as a particular source of concern coming from pubs and clubs, 24-hour shops, and other commercial establishments. These premises were seen to attract a range of anti-social behaviour (drinking, drugs, noise, littering, violence), indecency such as public urination and vomiting, and homelessness and begging.
Also mentioned was the noise from police sirens, delivery bikes, loud traffic, noisy mopeds, and dangerous driving from stolen cars and mopeds. Further, a significant number of respondents raised concerns about noise from neighbours.

**Gangs and groups**

It is difficult to clearly distinguish between gangs and groups within the responses. The terms gangs and groups were used interchangeably, sometimes referring to groups of youths or other people gathering in numbers. While some residents describe groups of young people as intimidating or a nuisance, others pointed out that youths hanging around could be due to boredom:

> “Lot of youths in the estate who are bored. More youth clubs needed”

(White British Woman 25-44. Property owner in Hillrise)

Locations associated with gangs were mentioned by some respondents, including Plough Road End, Holloway Road near Waitrose (which was also described as an area where women are hassled), Pultney Street, and North Road (mentioned by 6 respondents).

**Dogs**

Dogs were identified as an issue either because they were perceived to be out of control and/or because they were vicious. Respondents also mentioned dog fouling:

> “Dog poo on the pavement and parks... the perpetrators are often known in the community. Often the dogs are the large vicious kind and people are frightened to approach the owners. This contributes to a sense that the outdoors is dangerous or at least unfriendly”

(White British Woman, 55-64. Property owner in St George’s)

Dog fouling was also viewed as a health hazard and something that has so far been difficult to control.

**3.8 Contact with and perceptions of the police**

This section looks at whether respondents had contact with the police over the previous 12 months. Respondents were asked about their levels of satisfaction, details of stop and search incidents by police, perceptions of police, the witnessing of crime and the reporting of serious crime to police.

**3.8.1 Contact with local police?**

All respondents were asked: Have you had any contact with your local police over the past twelve months, whether initiated by you or by a police officer? Overall, just under a fifth (18%) said yes.
The vast majority of respondents reported that they had no contact with police in the preceding 12 months. Unsurprisingly, those who had reported at least one incident of victimisation had had more contact with police than non-victims – 32% and 16% respectively. Those aged 45 years or older had more contact compared with their counterparts in other age bands, with those in the medium age band having had the least contact. Women had had more contact – 21% compared with men at 15%. This is possibly because more women had been victims of crime and is consistent with their beliefs of the likelihood of being victimised. Similarly, White British respondents were more likely to have had contact while White Other were least likely. With respect to employment and residence status, the unemployed were least likely and homeowners most likely to have had contact with police during the past 12 months. Conversely, private tenants were least likely to have had contact. As the majority of private sector tenants were White Other, this is consistent with the above.

Those who were unemployed were significantly less likely to have had contact with the police (4%) in comparison with those in full or part time employment (20%), economically inactive respondents (19%) and students (18%).
3.8.2 Satisfaction with police conduct

This section looks at whether the respondents who had contact with the police over the last 12 months were satisfied with the police response.

Figure 34: Satisfaction with police conduct

As can be seen, 56% of respondents were very satisfied. No statistically significant differences were found by age, gender, employment and tenure.

3.8.3 Perceptions of police

The vast majority of respondents thought the police treated everyone fairly and equally (92%). No significant differences were found by age, religion, gender or victimhood, but some differences were found by ethnicity. Here, White Other respondents had the highest degree of confidence that the police treat everyone equally and fairly at 96%, compared with 92% of White British and 90% of BME respondents. The in-depth reports give further details of satisfaction with police conduct relating to each crime.

A relatively small minority of respondents did not believe that the police act fairly and equally. Some suggested that the police are ineffective (12) or targeted the wrong people (10). A number of these suggested that because of limited resources the police do not make the effort to understand certain issues and instead target groups that are more readily available:

“I think the police are poorly trained and don’t do their jobs anymore. They want crime in front of them and even then they don’t act, they just go for easy targets like motorists and cyclists”

(White British Man, 45-54. Private rented property in Caledonian)

“They target the wrong kids. They go after 1 or 2 boys and don’t target whole groups. They pick who they want to pick”

(White British Woman, 35-44. Housing Association rented property in Caledonian)
Others (24) described personal experience of harassment or victimisation by police. Thirteen of these incidents were believed to be motivated by gender or race.

“Because a police officer put his hands on me for no reason and bruised me, he sat on my head with his full weight leaving me bruised and dizzy”

(White British Woman, 25-34. Council rented property in Bunhill)

“Police were racist and made a few racist comments, he was a white policeman. He was racist to people in this area”

(White British Woman, 25-34. Private rented property in Highbury East)

In addition, a number of respondents said that police unfairly profile people (17), treat young people in a heavy handed way (15), and are racist (54):

“There was an incident where a man was damaging his own property. The guy died from police restraint that is the understanding I have. He was black which has made me question as to why”

(South African Man, 35-44. Council rented property in Holloway)

3.8.4 Stop and search

Only a very small proportion of respondents had been stopped and searched by the police (10). Just under half were White British (4), one was White Other, one was mixed race, one was Asian and three were Black (two African and one African Caribbean). Hence, in broad terms equal numbers of White and BME respondents had been stopped and searched by police in the preceding twelve months. The majority were employed (4), while three were students, two were permanently sick or disabled and one respondent was retired. Nearly all were public sector tenants (eight were Council tenants and one Housing Association resident); one respondent was a homeowner. The majority of those stopped were male (8) compared with two women.

In terms of perception, a handful of respondents believe that stop and search is unfair and based on racial profiling:

“From here to the bridge towards Muswell Hill they stopped my son 3 times because he drives a Mercedes and has dreadlocks. They also kicked his door in because they thought he had drugs and they later apologised because they had the wrong address”

(African Caribbean Man, over 75. Housing Association rented property in Junction)

“Most people I see pulled over by the police are black male drivers in flash cars”

(White Irish Woman, 35-44. Property owner in Highbury West)

3.8.5 Witnessing a crime

Respondents were asked if they had personally witnessed a crime in the last 12 months. Overall, 13% (263) said they had witnessed a crime.
In considering who had witnessed a crime, some key differences emerged. These were as follows:

- Those aged 16 to 24 years (19%) and 55 to 64 years (22%) were significantly more likely to have witnessed a crime.
- Interestingly, White Other (17%) respondents were slightly more likely to have witnessed a crime in comparison with other ethnic groups.
- Those who were studying/in full time education (19%) were more likely to have witnessed a crime.

Respondents reported witnessing the following:

*Theft related offences*

The most mentioned crime to be witnessed was muggings (74), including 50 phone snatchings, mainly using motorbikes. Other forms of theft (27 respondents mentioned this) related mainly to...
petty theft, particularly shoplifting, as well as bike and motorbike thefts. Burglary was also mentioned thirteen times while six respondents witnessed vehicles being broken into.

**Aggressive and disturbing behaviour**

The majority of responses in this category concerned fighting (28), followed by physical attacks (20), of which seven were stabbings, one fatal, and there was one other mention of murder (unspecified method). Also mentioned was domestic abuse, such as hitting children or aggression towards partners during public fights, sexual harassment (4), as well as more general intimidation and aggression (14), which included one mention of young people bullying people on streets. Hate crime was also mentioned by five respondents, including one respondent mentioning they had witnessed attacks on Muslims.

**Vandalism**

This included criminal damage (7), particularly smashed windows and graffiti, and car vandalism (15), including multiple stories of cars being smashed.

**Fraud**

Three people mentioned fraud, including one example of repeated bank fraud.

**Drugs use and dealing**

The second most frequently cited witnessed crime was drug use (11), particularly smoking marijuana and drug dealing (28).

**3.8.5 Reporting of crime**

Respondents were also asked whether they would report a serious crime they had witnessed to police. Overall, the vast majority of people (96%) said they would report a serious crime they had witnessed.

There were only minor variations by age, ethnicity, tenure etc. with over 90% of all groups stating they would report a serious crime. Those aged 16 to 24 were least likely to state they would report in comparison with other age groups. Men were a little more likely than women to report. Nearly all unemployed respondents said they would report a serious crime they had witnessed. However, the economically inactive respondents said that they would be less likely to report, perhaps because this group contains more long term sick or disabled people and elderly people who may feel more vulnerable.

Of the small number who said they would not report a serious crime they had witnessed, the reason given by the majority (59%) was that they did not want to get involved. 30% said they did not like talking to the police, 26% felt it would be too much trouble, and 11% feared reprisals. A very small number cited other reasons, for example, that they might not be believed.

The reasons given by respondents for not reporting generally were that it was not their concern, there was a lack of evidence, or distrust of the police.
SECTION C: CRIME IN-DEPTH

This section covers a range of offences in depth, exploring the demographics, nature of the incident and outcome of their case. Data in this section is un-weighted.

4   Burglary

This section provides an in-depth analysis of burglary or attempted burglary incidents. The characteristics of victims are explored before a discussion of the details of the incidents.

It needs to be noted that a number of incidents initially reported as burglary in the survey were re-coded as theft because upon closer inspection of the details provided there was no attempt to enter the dwelling. Rather items had been stolen from gardens or from areas outside the property (such as outdoor storage units, sheds etc.). The incidents included in this section therefore focus on incidents where a person has entered (or attempted to enter) any dwelling or part of a dwelling.

4.1  Victim characteristics

From all those reporting at least one victimisation experience since the beginning of 2015, 8% (120 respondents) experienced at least one burglary or attempted burglary. The majority reported one (106), eight reported two burglaries or attempts, and six reported three or more.

Detailed information was collected about up to two incidents of burglary. In total, information about 134 burglaries or attempts was captured, reported by 120 individuals. Their characteristics are as follows:

Very few burglary victims were aged 16 to 24 years (3%). Burglary victims were most commonly aged 35 to 44 years (21%), followed by 75 plus and 45 to 54 years (18% each). Those aged 65 years and above (pension age) comprised a third (32%) of those reporting burglary.

Using the 5+1 ethnicity classification: the majority of victims were White (71%), with 16% Black and 6% Asian victims.

The majority were economically inactive (53%), 7% were unemployed, 38% of respondents were in either full or part time employment and 3% were students.

The majority rented their accommodation from a public landlord (66%), a quarter of victims (23%) were homeowners and 11% rented from a private landlord.

4.2  Time and location of burglaries

Figures 36 and 37 below depict the areas in Islington where burglaries occurred. As can be seen, there is a high concentration near Archway and Junction road, around Arsenal and then further south around Lever Street.
Respondents were asked the earliest and latest time (in whole hours) that the burglary could have occurred. For ease of reporting the time frames have been combined into groups. Figure 38 below details their responses.
Figure 38: Time of the incidents

As can be seen, the most common time for burglaries (or attempted burglaries) to occur was between noon and 6pm, followed by between 6pm and midnight. These time frames account for just over half (58%) of incidents.

4.3 Method of entry, items stolen and damage done

Respondents were asked details of how offenders had gained entry to the building, what, if anything was stolen and what, if any, damage had been caused.

4.3.1 Method of entry

Figure 39: Method of Entry

The most common method of entry (or attempted entry) was forcing the door (44%). This also included two incidents where someone had tried the door handle and two where the respondent believed the burglar had a master key for security gates.

Forcing or breaking the window was the means of entry for about one fifth of incidents (19%) and the next most common means of entry or attempted entry was that the resident had left a door or window open (10%).
The offender talked or attempted to talk their way into the dwelling in 7% of incidents. The victim was aged 65 or over in seven of these nine incidents.

The offender was seen or caught looking into the dwelling from an outdoor area in 7% of incidents and attempts to get keys through the letterbox accounted for 4% of incidents.

Respondents were also asked if a member of the household was at home at the time of the burglary or attempted burglary. They stated that someone was at home at the time of half of all incidents (67). The offender was confronted in two fifths (42%) of all incidents where someone was at home.

4.3.2 Items stolen

Respondents were asked what, if any, items were stolen in the burglary. Two thirds (65%, n =86) responded that nothing had been stolen. This was because the offender had either been disturbed or had failed to gain entry.

Of the 48 incidents in which at least one item had been stolen, electronics, such as smart phones, laptops, games consoles and similar items were taken in over half of incidents (52%). Cash, credit cards or chequebooks were stolen in 42% of incidents and jewellery and watches were taken in 39%. Entertainment systems (televisions, stereo- and similar equipment) were stolen in 21%.

Figure 40: Items stolen

Not included in the figure above is a range of other items stolen in less 2% of incidents. These include: food and drink items (4), clothing and household items such as chairs, a pressure iron (3), bicycles (2) and items such as a school bag, and CDs, DVDs.

4.3.3 Damage caused

Respondents were asked if any damage had occurred as a result of the burglary or attempt. Responses are largely what would be expected given the most common methods of entry outlined above.
Some degree of damage was caused in the majority of incidents (60%). Most commonly this was damage to an outside door and damage to a door lock. This is unsurprising given that forcing the door was the most common method of entry.

4.4 Insurance, reporting and satisfaction with outcome

All victims were asked if they were insured at the time of the incident, as well as if they claimed on their insurance and reported the incident to the police, in which case they were also asked if the offender had been caught. Where victims had not reported the incident to police they were asked for their reasons.

4.4.1 Insurance

Respondents were insured in only a third of incidents (40). However, of those that were insured at the time of the burglary or attempt, just under half made a claim (19 incidents). A fifth (8 incidents) of the victims that were insured stated that no claim had been made because no damage or loss had occurred as a result of the incident.

4.4.2 Reporting and satisfaction with outcome

Whilst insurance claims were not made for the majority of incidents, just over two thirds were reported to the police (93 incidents). Victims were then asked if, to their knowledge, the offender had been apprehended and, then, how satisfied they were with the outcome of the police investigation. Figure 40 below shows how many offenders had been apprehended.
Figure 42: Has offender been caught?

As can be seen, victims indicated that the offenders had been caught in only 15% of reported incidents.

Overall, victims reported being satisfied with the police response and outcome in two thirds (60) of incidents that were reported. Those stating they were dissatisfied with the outcome were asked for more detail.

4.4.3 Reasons for satisfaction

Interestingly, the strongest reason for both satisfaction and non-satisfaction was whether the police handled the case well as opposed to whether loss was recovered (two losses, four recovered). Similarly, whether or not the perpetrator was caught was of more interest (five caught, thirteen not caught) than recovery of items.

Six were satisfied as they recovered their loss compared to four who did not and were not satisfied as a result. Amongst those satisfied, one expected nothing could be done, nine found the council/others helpful and two had moved past the experience. In contrast, four were unsatisfied as they did not recover their losses, four because the council/others were unhelpful, one because there was no evidence, and three because they felt unsafe. Four were satisfied as the burglar was caught, whereas nine were unsatisfied as they were not caught.

Many more people were positive (40) about the police (either because they handled the case well or were sympathetic) than negative (13). Criticisms of the police included that they were too slow or did not do enough or that they did not take the crime seriously/seemed disinterested.

It is possible that these were simply cases that were routinely difficult to solve and suggests that victims could be better reassured even where there is not much that can be done in practice. Further, some of these complaints related to possible missed opportunities to collect evidence, in which case either cases had been badly handled or the victim is not fully informed as to why:

“They did not follow through with forensics, the blood was there and it dried up”
In some cases it was felt that the police were allowing people to get away with crimes in cases where the perpetrator is known to the victim. Therefore, further information would be needed to identify the specific barriers in cases where the perpetrator is known:

“Police know that it is my next door neighbour who is stealing food and a lot of valuable items from my home almost every month but the police haven’t done anything to punish them”

Nevertheless, in general the responses were positive about how the case was handled, including people specifically stating that they were happy even though they were unable to resolve the situation because they felt that the police had done everything they could.

In a number of cases the police were described as courteous, sympathetic, helpful and doing their best. The council was also mentioned as being helpful in coming to repair broken fixtures and fittings (8 respondents), although two respondents mentioned not having had their side door/windows fixed despite contacting the council. Additionally, installing CCTV in the area had increased the feeling of safety and reduced crime.

4.5 Knowledge of offender

Victims were also asked what, if anything, they knew about the offenders in each incident. Figure 43 below shows their responses.

Figure 43: What is known about the offender?

As can be seen, nothing was known about the offenders in the majority of incidents (78%). Where some details were known the responses suggest that they either lived locally (5%) or were perhaps regularly present in the local area (12% knew the offenders by sight).
4.4.4 Non-reporting

Victims declined to report a total of 41 incidents to the police. Further questions were asked to explore why this was the case.

**Figure 44: Why not report?**
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Just under a fifth (17%) responded that they felt the police wouldn’t be interested or they had dealt with the matter themselves. In a further 14% of incidents respondents felt the incident was too trivial to report. Respondents stated ‘other’ in a third of incidents. In the ‘other’ category, respondents stated that no harm was caused (7), they just wanted to move on (2), they took other security measures (2), they had a similar experience that wasn’t dealt with (1), and that this was just a first attempt (1).

4.5 Was the burglary preventable?

Finally, victims were asked whether, in their view, the burglary they had experienced was preventable. Figure 45 (see next page) illustrates their responses.
Respondents claimed the burglary was not preventable in only 8% of incidents. Better security measures were cited as potentially preventing the burglary or attempted in a third of incidents and being more security conscious was cited in 13% of incidents.

The presence of someone at home was cited in a fifth of incidents. It is worth noting that someone was at home in half of all incidents (see 6.3.1 above). This may have contributed to nothing being stolen in 65% of incidents, insofar as the offender was disturbed or failed to gain entry. 16% of victims cited the presence of others, such as more police on the streets, as potentially preventative and a smaller portion referred to more vigilant neighbours. Again, however, it is worth noting the very small proportion of respondents overall who were members of a neighbourhood watch or similar scheme (see section 3.7). Even so, when respondents who had experienced attempted burglaries were asked what they believed had prevented the offender from gaining entry, most cited as their reasons that it was either because someone was at home at the time of the incident or that it was because of vigilant neighbours.
5 Personal Theft

This section provides an overview of the victim characteristics of respondents who had been victims of personal theft. It details where the offence occurred, the time of day and what was stolen. The following sub-sections then look at whether respondents had reported the incident to police. Where respondents had reported their victimization to police, an analysis is provided of how satisfied they were with the outcome of the process.

5.1 Victim characteristics

Personal theft is where personal belongings are deliberately taken, borrowed but never returned or hidden so that the owner permanently cannot find them. Items can be taken from the person directly (e.g. pickpocketing), but if force or threats of force are used then this is classed as robbery. Respondents reported nine incidents of robbery and these are included in the section on violence. Personal items may also be taken from an individual’s property. A key distinction here is whether the offender gains entry to a dwelling (or attempts to), which is burglary rather than personal theft.

All bicycle thefts were coded as personal theft with the exception of where a bike was taken as part of a burglary.

From all those reporting at least one victimisation experience since the beginning of 2015, 12% (177 respondents) experienced at least one theft or attempt. The majority reported one (161), eleven reported two; three reported three incidents, one reported four and one five or more.

Detailed information was collected about up to two incidents of theft. In total, information about 194 thefts or attempts was captured, reported by 177 individuals.

The characteristics of the 177 individuals are as follows:

A quarter of theft victims were aged 35 to 44 (24%). In comparison with burglary and criminal damage, theft victims were younger, with two fifths aged under 34 years old (22% of 16 to 24 and 20% of 25 to 34). Again in contrast to burglary in particular, theft victimisation decreased with age. Those aged 55 and above comprised 15% of all theft victims.

Two thirds were female (63%).

Using the threefold categorisation of ethnicity separating White British from White Other, we find that two fifths were White British (42%), 24% were White Other and 35% were BME.

The majority were employed (49%), 9% unemployed and 11% students. 32% were economically inactive.

The majority were in public rented accommodation (55%), 21% in private rented accommodation and 24% were homeowners.
5.2 Location and time of incidents

Respondents were asked to determine a more specific location for each incident.

Figure 46: Location of incidents

The majority of theft incidents (and attempts) occurred in the street (41%). Overall, less than a tenth occurred in places such as pubs and clubs, at work, at other leisure venues or on transport. In the ‘other’ category, 45 people stated that the incident occurred in the vicinity or inside their home or property, one stated that it happened in a park, one at a cash machine, one in a hospital, and three in shops. The remaining responses in this category named specific roads or establishments spanning across the Borough to expand on their answer.
5.2.1 Timing of thefts and attempts

Figure 47: Timing of Incidents

The time that the theft occurred was not known in a third of incidents. Where time was known (127 incidents), the most common time was in the afternoon (defined here as between noon and 6pm), followed by 6pm to midnight. These time frames accounted for just over half (56%) of all incidents where time was known.

5.3 Items stolen

Respondents were asked what items were stolen during the theft incident.

Bicycles were the most common item stolen in almost a quarter of all incidents (23%), followed by mobile phones (20%). Handbags or wallets and cash were stolen in 10% of incidents. A surprisingly low proportion of incidents involved theft of a laptop, tablet or notebook (2%).

The disparate list of items stolen largely reflects the number of thefts from respondents’ gardens and communal areas in flats such as balconies and stairways. It is from these spaces that items such as plants and gates were stolen (8% of incidents), children’s items such as toys and pushchairs (2%), pets (2%), tools (2%), other household items such as rugs (2%) and even food that was kept in outdoor fridges.
5.4 Knowledge of Offender

Figure 49: What was known about the offender?

Nothing was known about the offenders in almost three quarters of incidents (74%). Offenders were known either by sight or by age in just under a tenth of incidents.
5.5 Police involvement

This section considers whether or not respondents had reported the incident in which they had been victimised to police and, if so, how satisfied they were with the outcome of the police process. It also provides an analysis of respondents’ reasons for not reporting the incident to police.

5.5.1 Reporting to police

All respondents were asked if they reported the theft or attempt to the police or any other body (such as an insurer).

Figure 50: Reporting to police
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Just over half (52%) of theft incidents were reported to the police and a quarter were reported to another body (26%). Where incidents were reported to the police (100) the offenders had been caught in 10% of the cases.

5.5.2 Were respondents satisfied with the outcome of reporting?

Where incidents had been reported to the police or another body such as an insurer, respondents were satisfied with the outcome in just under half (45%) of the incidents (112).

Further information was obtained to explore this. Again, the most important factors for respondents were whether or not they recovered their loss and whether the police handled the case well, either by communicating well or by investigating thoroughly.

Sixteen respondents were dissatisfied as they did not recover their loss, compared to 17 who were satisfied because they did. There was not enough evidence in four cases and one person stated that they were still distressed at what had happened. 12 stated that the police handled the case badly (and four stated that others handled it badly, such as the Apple store in which a theft occurred). Notably, one respondent judged the police not on the outcome but more on the fact he did not feel well informed:
“I gave the moped registration and description of the two offenders and a witness statement and I felt either more progress could have been made to investigate or I could have been informed better by the police”

(White British Man, 35-44. Property owner in Highbury West)

In contrast, the police were described as handling the case well by 19 people and as being polite/sympathetic by four. One person mentioned that the police had helped them to secure their letterbox and prevent further thefts, so again the focus was on the engagement of the police with their problem as opposed to the outcome of the case. Two people were satisfied because the perpetrator was caught.

5.5.3 Reasons for not reporting

Lastly, respondents were asked their reasons for not reporting theft incidents (94).

Figure 51: Why not report?

The majority of theft incidents were not reported as respondents deemed the incident to be too trivial (36%). Respondents dealt with the matter themselves in 28% of incidents and felt the police wouldn’t be interested in 26%.

One example of how a bicycle theft was dealt with by the respondent involved the use of social media:

“The stealing of the bike was recorded on CCTV, so have shared the video and in a few hours 6,000 people shared it over social media. The children’s mum got the bike back and apologised to me”

(White British Woman, 35-44. Council rented property in St Peter’s)

Respondents provided ‘other’ reasons for not reporting just under a third of incidents. Most common within this category was a presumption that the police would not be able to apprehend the offenders. Others stated it was only an attempted theft or that they dealt with it through their bank and recovered their losses.
6 Criminal Damage

This section provides an analysis of criminal damage incidents. The offence of criminal damage occurs where someone without lawful excuse destroys or damages any property belonging to another.

This section contains an overview of victim characteristics and a discussion of the details of the incidents.

6.1 Victim characteristics

From all those reporting at least one victimisation experience since the beginning of 2015 5% (70 respondents) experienced at least one criminal damage incident. The majority (n = 67) reported one, two respondents reported two incidents and one reported three or more incidents.

Detailed information was collected about up to two incidents of criminal damage. In total, information about 73 criminal damage incidents was captured, reported by 70 individuals. Their characteristics are as follows.

Few victims were aged 16 to 24 years (7%) or 75 years and above (6%). Criminal damage victims were most commonly aged 45 to 54 years (28%) followed by 25 to 34 and 35 to 44 years (17% each).

Just under two thirds (59%) were female.

Using the threefold categorisation of ethnicity separating White British from White Other, just under half of the victims were White British (45%), 23% were White Other and 32% were BME.

The majority were economically inactive (47%), 7% were unemployed, 40% were in either full or part time employment and 6% were students.

The majority rented their accommodation from a public landlord (61%), a third (30%) were homeowners and 9% rented from a private landlord.

6.2 Where did the offence and damage occur?

This sub-section considers where the offence occurred, in terms of the borough and by ward, and then provides an analysis of where and what type of damage was done.

6.2.1 Location

All but one of the incidents occurred in Islington.
6.2.2 Property damaged and type of damage

Figure 52: Where did the damage occur?

Damage to the outside of the dwelling was most commonly reported. Damage to property inside the home was reported in only 4% of all incidents. Damage to property outside the home included, damage to garden furniture, gates, satellite equipment and plants. Figure 53 below shows the type of damage that was done.

Figure 53: Type of damage

Damage to plants, garden furniture and gates were most commonly reported, followed by graffiti. Gouges or scratches to brickwork were reported in 12% of incidents, as was damage to windows. Damage to doors or door locks was reported in a similar proportion of incidents. This suggests that some of these incidents may have been attempted burglaries but have not been recognised as such by the respondent. Soiling was reported in 7% of incidents, this mainly consisted of urinating on gates or doors.
Damage to other items outside of the property was reported in 12% of incidents. This mainly involved damage to pipes, garage doors, electricity meters and lights.

6.3 Reporting, satisfaction and non-reporting

This sub-section analyses whether victims reported the incidents of criminal damage to police or some other body and, if they had reported to the police, whether they were satisfied with the outcome. It further provides an analysis of victims’ reasons for not reporting the incident in question to the police.

6.3.1 Reporting

All victims were asked if they had reported the incident to the police or any other body such as insurers.

The majority of victims had not reported the incident to the police or any other body. Only 38% (27) of incidents were reported to the police and 12% (8) of incidents were reported to another body. From the victims comments this was mainly the council or other organisation responsible for repairs.

6.3.2 Satisfaction with outcome

A total of 31 incidents were reported to the police and/or another body. Victims indicated that they were satisfied with the outcome in 58% of incidents.

Of those who were satisfied, six stated the case was handled well and five others mentioned the council were helpful. Six were satisfied because the situation was resolved – usually through repairs – whereas two stated they did not expect anything could be done and one was happy that the perpetrator was caught.

In contrast, 11 were unsatisfied with the handling of the case by the police. The reasons given were that they did not attend or were too slow and two people said that they found them impolite. Four others found the council unhelpful (property remained unrepaird). Nine were unsatisfied as the perpetrator was not caught and one because of lack of evidence. Three stated that they were still distressed/felt unsafe.

Generally, dealing with this issue is straightforward as the damage is either repaired or it is not. However, catching the perpetrator may depend on willingness of the community to speak out:

“If I made a statement I would have had to live in the same area as him”
(White British Woman, 25-34. Council rented property in Junction)

The outstanding characteristic in this category is that this is a problem where people may be repeated victims and/or particularly vulnerable:

“They did not consider this a crime because they said you don’t have witnesses. I am disabled so I am vulnerable”
(White British Woman, 55-64. Council rented property in Mildmay)
“I want to move from here but the council is not doing anything. I am a single mother and scared”

(White British Woman, 65-74. Private rented property in Finsbury Park)

“The Council put a gate but no fence. There is no privacy where I live with people defecating and urinating outside my door.”

(Asian Woman, 35-44. Council rented property in Finsbury Park)

“I still see the person in the area. He still tries to cause me problems."

(White British Man, 45-54. Council rented property in Caledonian - Permanently Sick and Disabled)

Experiences of criminal damage can be disturbing for witnesses:

“It took 45 minutes to get here. The police were too slow. We were highly traumatised. The council told me to call the police but then the police advised me to call the council. There should be more police presence in this area, especially at night”

(White British Man, 35-44. Council rented property in Junction)

This response suggests that in this incidence there was no clear path of action for a victim to follow and both points of contact did not feel it was within their jurisdiction. Further, it suggests that a greater police presence is wanted in high crime areas.

6.3.3 Non reporting

Victims who had not reported an incident of criminal damage were asked to give their reasons. Figure 54 below illustrates.

Figure 54: Why not report?
The main reason for not reporting was that victims said they had dealt with the matter themselves (35%), followed by a presumption that the police would not be interested and that the incident was too trivial. A fifth (19%) regarded the incident as a personal or private family matter.

Other reasons included: a presumption that the police would not be able to catch the offender, the respondent did not think to report it, and the incident was considered a matter for the council.

6.4 Knowledge of offender

This final sub-section considers whether, following a report to police, the offender had been apprehended and then what, if anything, victims knew of the offender.

6.4.1 Apprehension of offenders

Where incidents had been reported to the police (27), the offenders were caught in only 8% of cases (5).

6.4.2 Victims' knowledge of offender

Victims were asked what, if anything, they knew about the offenders in each incident. Figure 55 below shows their responses.

**Figure 55: What known about offender?**
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Nothing was known about the offenders in two thirds of incidents. Where some details were known (34% of incidents) the responses suggest that they either lived locally or were regularly present in the local area (16% known by sight).
7 Vehicle crime

This section considers vehicle crime. It analyses the characteristics of respondents victimized by various types of vehicle crime, looking at where vehicles were parked at the time of the incident in question, whether the vehicles had any security measures, reporting patterns and satisfaction with outcome. It provides further analyses of how offenders accessed the vehicle and what, if anything, respondents knew about the offender.

7.1 Victim characteristics

There is no all-encompassing definition of vehicle crime. However, the most typical offences associated with vehicle crime are theft and criminal damage. Theft may include theft of the vehicle itself or theft of some item from the vehicle. In both instances the offence occurs when one person dishonestly appropriates the property of another with the intention of permanently depriving the other of it. Similarly, the offence of criminal damage occurs when a person without lawful excuse intentionally damages or destroys the property of another or is reckless as to whether the property will be damaged or destroyed.

From all those reporting at least one victimisation experience since the beginning of 2015 13% (187 respondents) experienced at least one incident. The majority experienced one incident (161), 18 experienced two, 7 experienced three and one respondent experienced five or more.

Detailed information was collected about up to two incidents of vehicle crime. In total, information about 213 vehicle crime incidents was captured, reported by 187 individuals.

Using the threefold categorisation of ethnicity separating White British from White Other, two fifths were White British (42%), 24% were White Other and 34% were BME.

The majority were employed (68%), followed by those who were economically inactive (25%). 5% were unemployed and 2% students.

The majority were in public rented accommodation (52%), with 9% in private rented accommodation and 38% homeowners.

7.2 Type of vehicle

Respondents were asked where the vehicle in question was located at the time of the incident and type of vehicle involved.

Respondents were then asked to identify which type of vehicle was involved in the incident.
Cars were most commonly affected (94%). Other vehicles included vans (4), motorcycles or mopeds (8) and a taxi (1).

7.3 Nature and location of incident

Bearing in mind the most common forms of vehicle crime identified above, respondents were first asked to identify the general nature of the incident.

Damage to the vehicle was most common accounting for two thirds of all vehicle crime incidents. Something was stolen (or attempts to steal items) in a third of cases. Theft of the vehicle itself accounted for only 4% (8) of cases.

Figures 58 and 59 below show the locations in the Borough that the different types of crime occurred. As can be seen, a cluster of vehicle thefts were near Arsenal station. Theft from a vehicle occurred mainly in North Islington with a high concentration around Tufnell Park, Upper Holloway.
and Arsenal. Damage to a vehicle was scattered more evenly with clusters around King’s Cross, Upper Holloway, Arsenal, and Upper Street.

Figure 58: Vehicle Crime North Islington
Respondents were then asked a series of questions about each of the above types of offence. The theft of vehicles was examined separately from theft from vehicles and damage to vehicles.

7.3.1 Stolen vehicles

Of the eight vehicles stolen, seven were cars and one was a van. The make and models of the vehicles were as follows:

- 2x Ford Fiesta
- 1x Ford Mondeo
- 1x Ford Transit
- 1x Honda Accord
- 1x Mercedes c class
- 1x Vauxhall sports car

One respondent did not know the make and model of their vehicle.
**Age of vehicle**

Half the vehicles stolen were three years old or less. The oldest vehicle was 10 years old.

**Value of vehicle**

The estimated value of the vehicles ranged from £700 (for the oldest vehicle) through to £20,000 (two vehicles) but most were valued at £13,000 or above (5).

**Location of vehicle**

All were parked on the street outside the respondent’s home at the time of the theft.

**Security measures**

Only one vehicle (the van) did not have any security measures. Seven vehicles had an alarm, and three also had a mechanical immobiliser and three an electronic immobiliser. None had a tracking device.

**Access to vehicle**

Respondents were asked if they knew how the offenders gained access to the vehicle.

Two respondents did not know, a further two stated the vehicle had been hotwired, one that the door lock had been forced and one stated that they had inadvertently left the keys in the vehicle (this was the oldest vehicle valued at £700). One stated that they used a device to open the door and another that they swapped the keys.

**Reporting**

All reported the theft to the police and seven also reported to their insurer. No offenders were caught, but two did recover their vehicle (the £700 vehicle and one of the £20,000 vehicles).

(Note: It is difficult to reconcile respondents’ statements with respect to how offenders obtained access to their vehicles with the fact that only two of the vehicles were recovered.)

**Satisfaction with outcome**

Four out of nine respondents were satisfied with the outcome because they either did not expect anything could be done (1) or because the case was handled well (3). The remaining respondents were unsatisfied because of the loss they incurred (3) or because there was not enough evidence to do anything about it (2).

One person described now being more aware and putting security measures (CCTV) in place, they were satisfied with the police response but continued to be worried.

**Knowledge of offenders**

None of the respondents had any knowledge of the offender in question.
7.3.2 Theft from the vehicle

Where the incident involved items stolen from their vehicles, respondents were again asked a number of questions.

Location

Figure 60: Where vehicle was parked

As can be seen, the majority of vehicles were parked on the street outside the respondent’s home (77%). Vehicles were parked in a different street in 9%, and on the respondent’s driveway in 8% of incidents.

Items stolen

Figure 61: What was stolen?
Cash was stolen in just under one quarter of incidents, followed by clothing, handbags or wallets, and mobile phones. However, most respondents cited ‘other’ items.

The ‘other’ category was generally made up of small, low value items – these included work items (2), cash, a disabled badge, CDs (2), pens, perfume, clothing (6), and food and drink (3). Bulkier items were also taken including tools (2), a case, golf clubs, a ladder, and a motorcycle helmet as well as car parts (a number plate, a car tyre, and wing mirrors). Nine small electrical items were taken including six chargers. Seven satellite navigation systems were stolen. 14 respondents stated that nothing was taken, indicating that people are breaking in just to rifle through and see what they can find.

Security measures

Respondents were asked what, if any, security measures their vehicles had.

**Figure 62: Security measures**
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Of those that had security measures the majority had alarms (65%), followed by those who had an electronic immobiliser (31%), while 12% had tracking devices and 8% had a mechanical immobiliser.

Access to vehicle

Respondents were asked how the offender had gained access to their vehicle. Figure 63 shows their responses.
Just under 10% indicated they did not know, or refused to indicate, how offenders had gained access. Equal proportions stated that a window had been broken or that doors and windows had been left unlocked, while a further 12% stated that a door lock had been forced. Overall, 11% cited other means of access, including forcing the boot open (2) and other means of entry (5). Respondents described the following methods for accessing the vehicle:

- Managing to get through the electronic locking system and causing no damage to the car (5)
- Taking advantage of the alarm not being on (1)
- Use of force (1)
- Use of a screwdriver in the lock (2)

**Reporting and apprehension of offenders**

Respondents were asked if they had reported the incident and, where it had been reported to police, whether the offender had been apprehended. Figure 64 (see next page) shows their responses.
Two fifths of incidents where items were stolen from vehicles were reported to the police and three quarters were reported to another body such as insurers. Of those reported to the police (28), the offenders were caught in only one incident.

**Satisfaction with outcome**

Of those respondents who had reported to the police, just over half (57%) said they were satisfied with the outcome. In general, satisfaction depended upon whether the loss could be recovered (seven were satisfied and seven were not satisfied). It is striking that some respondents mentioned repeat incidents, which meant that they did not want to report it and gain an increase in insurance premiums (two people mentioned this):

“I had this crime last year and the year before. My insurance goes up each year and the police can’t track every criminal”

(White British Man, 45-54. Property owner in Hillrise)

Others were unsatisfied because of a lack of evidence (8) or the feeling that the police do not take an interest in following the cases up or that they don’t have the resources to (17). One mentioned the police being unsympathetic. Nine people were unsatisfied because the perpetrator was not punished and two people they still feel distressed that their car had been broken into and were worried about safety.

Aside from being satisfied because they recovered the loss (either through insurance or recovering the vehicle itself), people were also satisfied because the case was handled well (6), the perpetrator was caught/punished (2) or because they had simply moved past it (1). Whether satisfied or not, people mentioned that very little could be done. In contrast, two people report feeling very distressed, which suggests that although a ‘minor’ crime it can affect people significantly.
**Knowledge of offenders**

Very few respondents had any knowledge of the offenders. The three respondents who cited ‘other’, stated that it looked like a crowd of boys late at night checking car doors.

**Non-reporting**

Respondents who had not reported the incident to police were asked for their reasons. Figure 65 shows their responses.

**Figure 65: Why not report?**

![Figure 65: Why not report?](image)

Equal proportions of respondents (41%) cited ‘too trivial’ or ‘other’ reasons for not reporting the incident. A quarter of respondents said they had dealt with the incident themselves, 14% thought the police would not be interested (1% had reported to the police and confirmed they were not interested), while 8% said it would be too much trouble to report and 1% were afraid of reprisals.

In the category of ‘other’, six respondents felt it had been their fault for not securing the car properly, Two did not think the police could do anything, four said nothing had been taken, and two stated that it is a repeated problem:

**7.3.3 Damage to vehicle**

As in the previous sub-sections, where incidents involved damage to vehicles, respondents were asked a series of questions. They were first asked to identify the location of the vehicle when the incident occurred.
As can be seen, in incidents where vehicles sustained some type of damage (139), the majority were parked in the street outside the respondent’s home (77%).

**Type of damage**

Respondents were asked to identify the type of damage that had been done to their vehicles.

The most common types of damage consisted of scratches or dents (27%) or broken windows or windshields (24%).

Where respondents stated ‘other’ (17), the type of damage was as follows. Four incidents involved setting fire to vehicles, cars were pushed over in three incidents and exterior or interior parts were
damaged or broken in a further eight incidents. Respondents were also asked if they thought the damage was part of an attempt to steal the vehicle. The majority said no (82%).

**Reporting and apprehension of offenders**

Figure 68 below shows reporting patterns and, where reports were made to police, whether the offender had been apprehended.

**Figure 68: Reporting and apprehension of offenders**
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As can be seen, over half of respondents reported the incident to police but only a very small proportion of offenders had been apprehended. Fewer respondents reported the incident to another body, such as an insurer (37%).

**Satisfaction with outcome**

Overall, one third of respondents stated they were satisfied with the outcome of the police process. In general, people had low expectations that the offender would be found whether they reported that they were satisfied or not (five people stated this, four of whom were satisfied as they did not expect anything could be done). For this reason, satisfaction centred more on whether the case had been handled well (9) or badly (6). One respondent described feeling frustrated that evidence was not followed up. Seven respondents were unsatisfied as the perpetrator was not punished, whereas no-one mentioned the perpetrator being caught. One respondent was frustrated at the lack of evidence as CCTV was not working.

**Knowledge of offender**

As can be seen from Figure 69 below, few respondents had knowledge of the offender.
Where respondents had some knowledge, this was typically that the offender was known to the respondent by sight (9%), or that the offender lived locally (8%).

Non-reporting

Where respondents had not reported the incident to police, they were asked to give their reasons. An equal proportion of respondents thought the matter was too trivial or that the police would not be interested. Over one quarter of respondents said that they had dealt with the matter themselves but nearly one third cited ‘other’ reasons.

Figure 70: Why not report?
8 Violence Against The Person

This section provides an overview of the demographic composition of respondents who had been victims of violence since the beginning of 2015. It details where, when and what kind of violence was used, including any use of a weapon. It continues with an analysis of physical or psychological harm sustained and, in more detail, how respondents were affected by the incident in question. It provides an analysis of who, if anyone, the respondents were with at the time of the incident and what, if anything, they knew about the offender, together with their view of why they thought the incident had occurred. The following sub-sections then look at whether respondents had reported the incident to police, with an analysis of why some respondents had not done so. Where respondents had reported their victimization to the police, an analysis is provided of how satisfied they were with the outcome of the police process. The final sub-section considers whether respondents had also had contact with Victim Support.

8.1 Definition and Demographics

Violence is deemed to comprise physical or verbal behaviour intended to threaten, injure or kill another person. Respondents were asked if they had experienced any violence or threats of violence, including robbery. Sexual assaults or threats, or incidents that respondents classified as ‘hate crime’ (i.e. motivated by race, disability or sexual orientation etc.) were excluded from this category.

From all those reporting at least one victimisation experience 6% (82 respondents) experienced at least one incident of violence. The majority reported one incident (81) and one respondent reported two incidents.

Given that the police generated data indicates an increase in violence in the borough over the past two years the number of incidents recorded in this survey appear relatively low. This may be a function of the respondents understanding or interpretation of what constitutes ‘violence’ or the exclusion of sexual harassment and hate crime (see sections below).

Detailed information was then collected about up to two incidents of violence. In total, information about 83 incidents was captured, reported by 82 individuals.

The demographics of these 82 individuals were as follows:

Victims were most commonly aged 45 to 54 years (23%), followed by 35 to 44 year olds (21%). Very few aged 16 to 24 (10%) or 75 plus years were victims (4%).

There were significant differences between women’s and men’s experience of violence.

Using the threefold categorisation of ethnicity separating White British from White Other, two fifths were White British (44%), 32% were White Other and 24% were BME respondents.

There was little difference between those who were economically inactive (43%), and economically active (40%). 13% were unemployed and 5% were students.
The majority lived in public rented accommodation (65%), 14% were in private rental and 21% were homeowners.

8.2 Location of incidents

The category ‘at home’ refers to incidents that occurred either inside the home or in the immediate vicinity of the home. This category included domestic incidents, incidents involving neighbours, and incidents where strangers threatened violence.

The majority of the incidents occurred in one of two specific locations either on the street (45%) or at home (42%). Of the street based incidents, 33 specific locations were given in Islington, of which just under half were in the Archway and Finsbury Park areas:

Archway Area (7)
- Archway Station (3)
- Junction Road (2)
- Hazelville Road outside my flat
- Salisbury Walk

Finsbury Park Area (9)
- Seven Sisters Road
- Williamson St (2)
- St Thomas Rd

Highbury Area (3)
- Essex Rd
- Highbury Fields
- Upper St

Highbury Area (3)
- Caledonian Road and King’s Cross (4)
- Bemerton St
- Caledonian Rd
- Pentonville Rd
8.3 Time and nature of incident

8.3.1 Time of incident

Respondents were also asked about the time when the incident occurred and its nature, that is, the type of offence that was involved. Figure 72 below shows the time of the incidents.

**Figure 72: Time of incidents**

The majority of the incidents occurred in the afternoon between noon and 6pm (43%), followed by the evening (36%).
8.4 Nature of violence and its effects

Respondents were asked what type of violence was used during the offence, including the use of a weapon, what injuries they had sustained and the psychological effects of the violence. They were also asked if anyone was with them at the time of the incident.

8.4.1 Nature of violence

Figure 73 below indicates the type of force used against respondents.

Figure 73: Type of force used
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Threats to harm featured in two thirds of incidents (63%):

“Neighbour threatened me that she will rip me up with a blade”

(Maltese Woman, 55-64, Council Rented property in Finsbury Park)

Just under a fifth (18%) of incidents involved grabbing or pushing the victim and 8% each involved pushing or slapping or kicking the victim. In another 2% victims were choked or strangled and in 1% of incidents they were scratched or bitten. Other forms of force were included things being thrown (plastic bottles, stones), being hit by something, being bottled, being beaten up and being mugged at knife point.

8.4.2 Use of a weapon

A weapon was used in 13% of incidents (11). The most common type of weapon was a knife, which was used in seven incidents. The remaining type of weapons included: a drinking glass, a bottle, a screwdriver or other sharp instrument, a stick or club, an air rifle, and another type of gun (unknown what type).

8.4.3 Physical and psychological injuries sustained

No injuries were sustained in two thirds of incidents (57). Where injuries were sustained these included: Reports of minor (4) or severe bruising (1) or scratches (5). Cuts were sustained in three
incidents, as was a nosebleed. One respondent sustained broken bones, another a broken nose and one sustained a concussion. In two incidents, respondents suffered broken or lost teeth. Respondents reported psychological trauma in four incidents.

Where injuries were sustained, respondents were asked if they had sought medical assistance. Medical assistance had been sought in 14% of incidents. Those who had not sought medical help (65) were asked why. The majority had not sought medical assistance because they were not injured in any way (53). Nine considered that the injury was not serious enough and one did not want to waste NHS time because they had only experienced shock.

8.4.4 Effect of incident on respondents

All respondents who had experienced a violent incident were asked to describe in their own words how they had been affected by it. The following is illustrative of their responses:

Sixteen said that they were now more vigilant and aware;

“*I am a lot more careful and vigilant. I don’t make eye contact*”
(White British Woman, 65-74. Property owner in Junction)

Four said that they keep out of the way of people that may be threatening or of specific groups;

“*I keep out of their way if I see them in the street*”
(White Irish Woman, 55-64. Property owner in Junction)

Similarly, 3 stated that they avoid certain locations or restrict their movements in some way;

“*I regularly go to the same pub but different route*”
(White British Man, 65-74. Council rented property in Caledonian)

Four people stated that they are now planning on moving and one said that they would be changing their job;

Medical issues were raised. One person described physical symptoms of losing a tooth, high blood pressure and knee twitches. Three others described mental health issues (two cases of depression and one person who self harms);

Eight people stated that they now live in fear or feel unsettled/traumatised. Relatedly, five others described feeling scared to go outside or to open their door to people;

Three people stated that they had lost faith in the authorities, however, three others stated that they actually felt better having the police involved;

Seven people stated that their feeling is unchanged, either because they tried to not let it affect them or because it did not have a strong impact in the first place.
8.4.5 Who was with respondents at the time of the incident?

Finally, respondents were also asked if they were alone or with someone at the time of the incident and, if so, the nature of the relationship they had with the person who was there.

Figure 74: Others present at the time of the incident

Respondents were alone in the majority of incidents (64%). Where others were present it was most commonly other family members including children (12%), friends only (8%) or family members excluding children (5%). Other people included work colleagues, strangers and a caretaker.

8.5 Respondents’ knowledge of offender and why the incident had occurred

Respondents were asked what, if anything, they knew about the offender in question and why they thought the incident had occurred.

8.5.1 Knowledge of offender

Figure 75 (see next page) illustrates what knowledge, if any, respondents had about the offender.
As can be seen, respondents knew something about the offenders in the majority of incidents (69%). In a fifth (21%) of incidents the offender(s) were personally known to the victim (15% were neighbours, housemates or landlords and 6% were current/ex-partners and other family members). Where more general details were known, the offender(s) were known by sight in just over a quarter of incidents (27%) and lived locally in at least 13% of incidents.

8.5.2 Respondents perceptions of why the incident had happened

As previously indicated, respondents were asked why they thought the incident had happened. Figure 76 below shows their responses.

Of the 83 incidents, nine were incidents of violence relating to robberies or attempted robbery (11%). Items stolen include: mobile phones (3), cash (2), credit cards in one incident, handbag and/or wallet in three incidents and a bicycle in one incident. The remaining incidents involved the use of force for motivations other than theft (see below for the reason incidents occurred).
Drugs and alcohol were thought to be a contributing factor in a third of incidents (33%). In just under one fifth of incidents (18%), respondents thought that the offender was opportunistic and took advantage of them. An ongoing dispute was cited as the reason in a further fifth (18%) of incidents. Other reasons given were mistaken identity and people intervening in situations (dogs fighting, someone going through bins) and then violence escalating in response.

Many of the incidents described had some link to anti-social behaviour (for example, groups of young people hanging around, people associated with drug dealing and drug use, and people perceived to be homeless) or to interactions with strangers in public spaces. For example, the following incidents were described:

“*I told him off for going through the bins looking for junk to sell... He was a druggie*”

(African Woman, 35-44. Council rented property in Highbury West)

“They tried to steal my son’s laptop, I told them off and they attacked me”

(African Caribbean Woman. Council rented property in Mildmay)

### 8.6 Police involvement

This section considers whether or not respondents had reported the incident in which they had been victimised to police and, if so, how satisfied they were with the outcome of the police process. It also provides an analysis of respondents’ reasons for not reporting the incident to police.

#### 8.6.1 Reporting to police

Respondents were asked whether they had reported their victimisation to police. Figure 77 below illustrates together with details of whether the offender in question had been caught.

**Figure 77: Reporting and apprehension**

![Bar chart showing reporting and apprehension data.]

Just over half of the incidents were reported to the police (45). Of these incidents almost two thirds of the offenders had been caught (57%).
8.6.2 Satisfaction with outcome

Respondents were then asked if they were satisfied with the outcome of the police process. Figure 78 below shows their responses.

Figure 78: Respondent satisfaction with outcome

As can be seen, of those respondents who had reported the incident to police and expressed a view on the outcome of police process, just over half were satisfied (56%), while two fifths were dissatisfied and 2% of respondents said they did not know.

In terms of satisfaction, 13 people were satisfied with the handling of the case by the police - one respondent stated that the police were willing to go as far as possible to help and increased patrols. One was happy that the council had intervened in the case of someone with mental health issues. Two others found the police polite and sympathetic in contrast to three who found them not to be, including one describing them as judgemental, and six who claimed that the police handled the case badly.

Four were satisfied because they recovered their items, whereas three were unsatisfied because they did not. Six were satisfied as the perpetrator was caught whereas seven were unsatisfied because they were not. One respondent stated that they were still upset by what happened and therefore dissatisfied.

Interestingly, female respondents made very positive comments about the handling of domestic violence. Of the few respondents who gave details regarding this, these situations were satisfactorily and sensitively resolved:

“The police were fantastic and they banned him from London and from contacting me at all”

(Turkish Woman, 16-24. Council rented property in Hillrise)
“The police are being very supportive and now my ex only has supervised access”
(Cypriot Woman, 35-44. Housing Association rented property in Hillrise)

“The police were really understanding. This was a domestic violence case from my ex who is an alcoholic”
(White British Woman, 45-54. Council rented property in Junction)

8.6.3 Reasons for not reporting
Where respondents had not reported a violent incident to police, they were asked to state their reasons. Figure 79 below illustrates.

Figure 79: Reasons for not reporting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too trivial</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police wouldn’t be interested</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear/distrust the police</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear reprisals</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tried but police were not interested</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much trouble</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private/personal/family matter</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealt with it ourselves</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen, the main reason cited by respondents for not reporting was a perception that the incident was too trivial (32%). In addition, just under one third (29%) of respondents said they had dealt with the incident themselves.

In the ‘other’ category, six reported to someone other than the police (social services, someone on the premises, the council, housing management). Two stated that there was no harm caused. One felt that the perpetrator was just drunk and would have regretted it. One other respondent stated that they reported it after it happened more than once.

8.6.4 Contact with Victim Support
Respondents were also asked if they had any contact with Victim Support as a result of the incident. Only 7% had contact with Victim Support (6), but of these the majority (5) reported that Victim Support had been either ‘very’ or ‘fairly useful’ in meeting their needs.
9 Sexual Assault and Harassment

This section provides details of the rates of sexual assault and harassment as well as the demographic composition of respondents who had experienced these offences, including when and where they had occurred and details of the nature of the incident. It further addresses what, if anything, respondents knew about the offender, whether they had reported the incident to anyone and, if so, whether they were satisfied with the outcome. Finally, where respondents did not report the incident, it considers the reasons they cited for non-reporting. Given the very small number of incidents percentages are provided only as a guide.

9.1 Definition and Demographics

Sexual assault is a statutory offence in England and Wales and occurs when one person intentionally touches another in a sexual manner and the other person does not consent to this. Similarly, harassment is defined as a course of action intended to cause alarm or distress to another person.

From all those respondents who reported at least one victimisation experience since the beginning of 2015, 1% (18) had experienced at least one incident of sexual assault and harassment. Of these, majority reported one (11), two reported two incidents, one reported three, and three reported five or more.

Detailed information was collected about up to two incidents. In total, information about 24 incidents was captured, reported by 18 individuals. The demographic composition of those individuals was as follows:

One third (33%) of victims were aged between 25 and 34 years old and nearly one quarter (22%) between 35 and 44 years old. Very few victims were young people (aged 16 to 24) or in the 55 to 64 year bracket (11%). One respondent was aged 65 to 74 years.

All were female.

Using the 5+1 ethnicity classification the majority were White (72%), with 6% Black, and 6% Asian.

Using the threefold categorisation of ethnicity separating White British from White Other, one third were White British (33%), 39% were White Other and 28% were BME.

Sexual victimisation levels were higher for females who were ‘economically inactive’ (39%) than for women in employment (28%), students 22% and the unemployed (11%).

Females living in public rented accommodation (61%) showed a higher rate of victimisation than those women in private rented accommodation (22%) or homeowners (17%).

9.2 Location, nature of incident

9.2.1 Location of incidents

All incidents occurred in the borough of Islington and most happened in the street (46%) or at home (42%). Where the incident occurred in the street, respondents were asked to name the street.
For those incidents that took place in the street, a small number of respondents named specific locations. These were:

- Blackstock Road (2),
- Essex Road,
- George Street,
- Griddlestone Walk,
- Ormond Road,
- Upper Street,
- York Way,
- Near Mount Carmel School.

9.2.2 Nature of incident

Respondents were asked to provide details of the incident (see Figure 26). Over half of the incidents (54%) were unsolicited verbal comments with sexual overtones generally known as ‘catcalling’. A quarter (25%) of the incidents recorded involved ‘wolf-whistling’, reported as ‘whistling or noises made with sexual overtones’. Among those incidents reported as sexual assault or harassment one in five (21%) were situations where a victim had been followed, and 13% had experienced unwanted groping or touching.
Other forms of sexual victimisation and harassment were recorded in 13% of incidents, which included a case of indecent exposure where a man ‘showed his privates to me’ and one where a landlady voyeuristically filmed an intimate moment between her tenant and the tenant’s boyfriend.

9.2.3 The offenders

Over half (58%) of respondents reported that incidents involved a sole individual. Some 29% of incidents (29%) were perpetrated by a duo. Comparatively, incidents committed by three perpetrators were low at 13%.
In a third of incidents (8) the victim knew by sight one or more of the offenders. Where further information on offenders was recorded, two were the victim’s partner/spouse, two were neighbours, one was a friend, one a family member and one was the respondent’s landlord.

9.2.4 Reporting of incidents

Respondents were asked whether they had discussed the incident(s) with anyone else or reported to the police. Figure 83 below shows their responses.

**Figure 83: Reporting of incidents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incident</th>
<th>Reported to Police</th>
<th>Reported to Someone Else</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Half of the incidents were reported to the police, and just under half (46%) were reported to someone else (11). Where incidents were reported to someone else, this was most commonly boyfriends (4), family members (3) or friends (3). Two incidents were reported to social services.

Where the incidents had been reported to the police (12), respondents were asked if the offender(s) had been caught. The offenders had been caught in half of all incidents reported to the police (6).

9.2.5 Satisfaction with Outcome

Where respondents had reported the incident to the police or someone else, they were asked whether they were satisfied with the outcome. Two thirds of respondents said they were satisfied.

Two were satisfied with the handling of the case by the police and two stated that they were sympathetic as opposed to three who were unsatisfied with how the case was handled. Two were satisfied because the situation was resolved – in one case this included simply changing route to avoid the perpetrators - whereas three were unsatisfied as there was no satisfactory resolution. Four people simply said that they had moved on from it, whereas one continued to feel unsafe and therefore unsatisfied. This person no longer went out at night.

Those respondents who had not reported the incident to the police were asked why they had not done so. Figure 84 below itemises their reasons. Given the small numbers involved percentages have not been provided. Respondents could select more than one option.
Figure 84: Why not report to the police?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>No. of incidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private/personal/family matter</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealt ourselves</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear reprisals</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police wouldn’t be interested</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too trivial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some respondents felt the police would not be able to intervene anyway and so they adopted practical solutions such as changing their route. This calls into question whether people are aware of the support on offer or whether they really conceptualise these incidents as crimes:

“I didn’t contact the police, I though they might not help. I was so angry with what happened but I did not think it was serious enough”

(Italian Woman, 25-34. Private rented property in Caledonian)
10  Hate Crime

This section provides an analysis of incidents of hate crime, the characteristics of respondents who were victimised, the general and more specific location where the incident took place and the nature of the incidents in question. It considers whether victims were alone when the incident occurred or with someone else and what, if anything, they knew about the offender. It further analyses victims’ responses to the incidents, including whether they reported details to the police and, if so, whether they were satisfied with the outcome of the police process; alternatively, it examines victims’ reasons for not reporting to the police.

10.1 Definition and victim characteristics

The Crown Prosecution Service of England and Wales defines a Hate Incident is any incident which the victim, or anyone else, thinks is based on someone’s prejudice towards them because of their race, religion, sexual orientation, disability or because they are transgender.

From all those reporting at least one victimisation experience since the beginning of 2015, 6% (85 respondents) had experienced at least one hate crime incident. The majority reported one (71), four reported two incidents, three reported three, three reported four, and four reported five or more incidents of hate crime.

Detailed information was collected about up to two incidents of hate crime. In total, information about 99 incidents was captured, reported by 85 individuals. Their characteristics are as follows:

Hate crime victims were most commonly aged 55 to 64 years (27%), followed by 45 to 54 year olds (19%). Very few respondents aged 16 to 24 or 75 plus years were victims (6% each).

Two thirds (64%) of victims were women.

Using the threefold categorisation of ethnicity separating White British from White Other, a third were White British, 24% were White Other and almost half (47%) were BME.

The majority of victims were economically inactive (51%), followed by those who were employed (36%). Only 7% were unemployed and 6% were students.

The majority were in public sector rented accommodation (75%), 8% in private rent and 17% homeowners.

10.2 Location of incident

Respondents were then asked for the location of the incident.
The majority of incidents occurred at or very close to the victim’s home (42%). A third occurred on the street (32%). The remaining incidents largely occurred in public spaces such as on public transport, in parks or at stations (26%).

When in public spaces, the following locations were identified:

**Holloway Road Area:**
- Holloway Road (4)

**Upper Holloway and Archway Area:**
- Bavaria Road (2)
- St John’s Way (2)

**Caledonian Road Area:**
- Caledonian Road (2)

**Essex/Liverpool Road Area:**
- Essex Road
- Elmore St
- Liverpool Road
- Madras Place
- Upper St
10.3 Nature of the incident and knowledge of offender

Respondents were asked about the nature of the incident, whether they were alone or with someone else when it occurred and what, if anything, they knew about the offender.

10.3.1 Nature of incident

The majority of responses (34 out of 50) involved incidents of verbal abuse – often neighbours or strangers from cars or on public transport. The following incidents were described:

**General Racist Abuse (20)**

“As it struck midnight for my birthday we went out to sing happy birthday for my 18th, then from next door we heard a racist remark shouting at me, it was about my colour. I started crying, my mum took me out of the area to remember my birthday in a better way.”

(African Caribbean Woman, 16-24. Council rented property in Caledonian)

**Against Muslim People (7)**

“I was bringing my children from school some stranger called me Muslim terrorists, ISIS etc.”

(Turkish Muslim Woman, 35-44. Housing Association rented property in Holloway)

“Somebody shouted and swearing at me to leave the country and take my headscarf off on the bus”

(Muslim Woman, 25-34. Council rented property in Tollington)

**Against Black People (2)**

**Against White People (2)**

**Homophobia (3)**

**Disability Bullying (3)**

In relation to disability, three of the responses described feeling targeted for harassment and bullying due to their disability:

“I have been victimised by a group of youth outside the college. I am a victim of disability hate crime. It has been continuous for over a year and I’ve had bad name calling, ridiculing me and talking as if I am not a human being”

(Asian Woman, 55-64., Property owner in Holloway)

**Assault (7) and threats and intimidation (4)** were also discussed. In relation to assault, a range of incidents were described, all minor but distressing:

“A woman threw water on me because she heard me speaking on the phone in Turkish”
Interestingly, each of these examples of intimidation involved neighbours and further illustrates the vulnerability people can feel in relation to the people who surround them. Relatedly, two people described attempts from others to exclude them by refusing a seat on a bus as they were not the same race or telling a woman she should not use a communal lift because she was wearing a headscarf.

### 10.3.2 Were victims alone or with someone?

**Figure 86: Victim alone or with someone**

Respondents were alone in the majority of incidents (59%). Where others were present (41%), family were present in 26% of incidents, friends in 12% and work colleagues in 1%.

### 10.3.3 Knowledge of Offender

Victims were asked to indicate whether they had any knowledge of the offender. Figure 87 illustrates.
The offenders were strangers in over half of all incidents (57%). In incidents where the offender(s) were known to the respondent in some way (39), the majority were neighbours (33). The remaining 15% of known offenders were: partner/ex-partner in three incidents, another relative, a friend and a work client, each in one further incident.

10.4 Victims’ responses

Victims were asked how the had responded to the incident in question and whether they had reported it to the police and, if so, whether they were satisfied with the outcome. Those who had not reported to the police were asked why they had not done so.

10.4.1 Response

Figure 88: Victim’s immediate response to the incident
Victims did nothing or ignored it in the majority of incidents (64%). In just over a quarter of incidents the victim either told the offender off or defended themselves verbally (27%). Victims immediately called the police in 5% of incidents (although many more called the police at other times – in other words, this 5% represents the main/first response of the victim), while others stepped in to help in 2% of incidents.

10.4.2 Reporting to police

As can be seen from Figure 89 below, overall, 40% of incidents were reported later to the police.

Figure 89: Reporting to the police

In the incidents reported to the police, just over half of the offenders were caught.

10.4.3 Satisfaction with the outcome

Victims were asked if they were satisfied with the outcome of their report. Two fifths were satisfied (43%), just over half were not (53%) and 4% didn’t know.

Five respondents stated that the police handled the case well and two said the same of the council. Of these, one respondent mentioned now having stronger security measures such as CCTV. Three stated the situation was resolved satisfactorily and six were satisfied as the perpetrators were caught or punished.

In contrast, ten felt that the case had been handled badly by the police and one by the council. Three of these respondents stated that they could identify the perpetrators or had other evidence but that still nothing could be/was done. Three were unsatisfied as the issue was not resolved, including one woman who felt the person should have been warned instead of just moved. Six were unsatisfied as the perpetrator was not caught and one because there was not enough evidence. One other stated the situation was ongoing.

10.4.4 Non reporting

Finally, victims were asked why they did not choose to report the incident to the police.
The main reason for not reporting was the presumption that the police would not be interested (in 42% of unreported incidents).

Victims felt that the incident was too trivial in just over a fifth of incidents (22%) and they dealt with it themselves in the same proportion.

Where ‘other’ was the response (16 incidents), the majority (7) felt there was no point in reporting. This was because of feeling that the police would be unable to catch the offender. One respondent did not want to waste police time and another just wanted to forget about it. This respondent stated that he is used to it:

“I am used to hate crimes against my race from when I lived in Spain. It’s so sad that I am used to being a victim of hatred but that’s what it is”

(French Man, 16-24. Private rented property in Hillrise)
11 Fraud

This section deals with fraud, including online fraud. It provides analysis of the characteristics of victims and the nature of the incidents or attempted incidents to which they fell victim. Here, reference is made to the four-fold categorisation of offences developed in the Crime Survey England and Wales (CSEW March 2016), following work conducted in 2015 to extend the main victimisation module to cover elements of fraud and cyber-crime (CSEW June 2015). The section continues with analysis of reporting by victims and whether they were satisfied with the outcome. Alternatively, why they chose not to report the incident. It concludes by considering what, if anything, victims knew of the offenders.

11.1 Definition and victim characteristics

The offence of fraud comprises a number of actual or attempted actions, notably, misrepresentation, failure to disclose information or fraud by abuse of position. Most typically it involves fraud by misrepresentation whereby one person dishonestly makes a false representation with the intention of making a gain or causing loss to another.

From all those reporting at least one victimisation experience since the beginning of 2015 the majority reported one (655), 45 reported two incidents, seven reported three, four reported four incidents and 112 reported five or more.

Detailed information was collected about up to two incidents of fraud. In total, information about 1,011 fraud incidents was captured, reported by 833 individuals.

Just under three fifths (58%) were female.

Using the 5+1 ethnicity classification: the majority were White (67%), with 19% Black, and 6% Asian.

The majority were employed (50%), followed by economically inactive (34%). 9% were students and 7% unemployed.

The majority rented their accommodation from a public landlord (60%), 26% were homeowners and 15% rented from a private landlord.

11.2 Details of the incidents

This sub-section analyses the nature of the incidents or attempted incidents by reference to the four-fold categorisation of offences developed in CSEW (2016). These are as follows.

Bank and credit account fraud includes fraudulent access to, or attempts to access bank details, bank accounts, as well as fraudulent use of credit or debit cards. Two pre-defined categories were offered to respondents to choose from in this category:

- You discover that money has been taken from your bank or building society account without your permission
- Someone makes online or phone contact and tries to extract bank details or passwords
• Advance fee fraud includes incidents where some form of communication is received that is attempting to solicit money in some way, such as romance fraud or inheritance fraud.
• An email offers you a future fortune in exchange for a small immediate loan
• Non-investment fraud includes incidents where individuals have engaged with fraudsters. This could be when items are purchased online that never arrive, telephone scams, bogus callers and ticketing frauds.
• Someone comes to your door and offers to do work on your home that you believe to be unnecessary.
• Someone works on your home and overcharges.
• Someone takes cash in advance for work that is never done.
• Goods you have ordered do not arrive.
• Goods you have ordered arrive but are defective.
• Other fraud includes other types not included in the above such as charity fraud. From the responses provided to this survey, more general identity theft or fraud is also included in this category.
• Unauthorised access to/use of personal data (e.g. banking information or social media/email account)
• Loss of money through responding to communication (e.g. fraudulent emails or online messages).

Figure 91: Proportion of incidents by category

As can be seen, the majority of incidents involved some form of bank and credit account fraud (67%), followed by types of advance fee fraud (19%). Non-investment fraud and other fraud each comprised 7% of incidents.

11.2.1 Bank and credit account fraud

Of the bank and credit account fraud, the majority of incidents involved someone making contact and attempting to extract bank details (86%). In some cases respondents had provided further
details about the nature of these attempts. Fake emails from Her Majesty’s Revenue and Customs (HMRC) asking for bank details to pay a tax refund featured prominently.

Some 14% of incidents involved the respondent discovering that money had been taken, or attempts had been made to take money, from their bank/building society account without permission. Where further details were available about some of these incidents, several respondents reported that their card had been cloned and this was how money had been taken from their account.

11.2.2 Advance fee fraud

For the 190 incidents that could be categorised as advance fee fraud the majority involved an email that offers you a future fortune in exchange for a small immediate loan. The other incidents involved situations such as dating website scams, fake emails from alleged friends stranded abroad and asking for money to get home, as well as bogus loan companies charging upfront fees.

11.2.3 Non-investment fraud

The 7% of incidents categorised as non-investment fraud (68) included: offers of unnecessary work, overcharging for work done on the home and cash paid in advance for work that was never done. These types of incidents comprised just under half (47%) of all non-investment fraud. Goods that had been ordered but did not arrive and defective goods accounted for a further 37% of incidents. Other incidents in this category included Ebay scams, telephone calls that charged the recipient at a premium rate, purchased travel tickets that turned out to be fake or certificates for online learning courses that never arrived.

11.2.4 Other fraud

A further 7% of incidents could be categorised as other fraud. Here, unauthorised use of or access to personal data comprised the majority of incidents (72%). In some cases this involved forms of identity theft. Most common was the use of respondent’s details to either set up bank accounts, purchase goods or to avoid fines.

For the remaining incidents in this category, some were bogus callers claiming to collect money for charity. Others involved respondents receiving communications claiming they had bought goods that they had not in fact purchased.

11.3 Reporting, satisfaction with outcome and non-reporting

Respondents were asked whether they had reported the fraud or attempted fraud to any organization, including the police and, if so, whether they were satisfied with the outcome. Alternatively, they were asked why they had chosen not to report the incident.

11.3.1 Reporting

Figure 92 below details whether respondents had reported the incident and, if so, to which body or organisation they had reported it to.
Overall, one fifth of incidents were reported to the police or another body/organisation (219).

Of those reported, half were reported to the bank or building society and a quarter were reported to the police. Fewer incidents were reported to Action Fraud.

In just under a fifth (34) of reported incidents, respondents indicated that another organisation had been contacted. HMRC (8) and Paypal (6) were most commonly contacted, followed by workplace IT departments (4) and mobile phone providers (3).

11.3.2 Satisfaction with outcome

Offenders were caught in just 1% of incidents reported to either the police or action fraud. It was unknown if the offender had been caught in 16% of reported incidents. Figure 93 below illustrates respondents’ satisfaction with the outcome.
As can be seen, despite the low apprehension rate, respondents were satisfied with the outcome in the majority of reported incidents (83%).

The vast majority of respondents were satisfied because the bank or other service provider was able to resolve the issue and refund any lost money (114). This means that these issues were addressed without the victim having to report to the police as it became a matter for the companies themselves. At other times, the respondents said that they had reported suspicious activity to the police and had simply been advised how to avoid any harm. As such, direct policing of these issues in a way that required engagement with the victims was not as necessary as with other crimes. Avoidance behaviours and awareness of what to do to resolve the issue and recover any losses were of more importance.

Other reasons for satisfaction were the sympathetic police response (3) and the good handling of the case by the police (21) and others such as retailers/providers (2), including giving advice on what to do if the situation arose again. In six of the cases the respondent was satisfied as the perpetrator was caught or punished.

In the rare cases where people were unsatisfied, this was mainly due to the fact that they had been unable to recover their loss (17), for example because they paid cash, or because it is difficult for the perpetrator to be caught and punished (7). Some frustration was directed both at service providers and the police, with 3 explicitly stating that the case was handled badly by the police and 1 stating there was not enough evidence. Notably, in one case where the respondent expressed dissatisfaction, the case was not a conventional bank fraud case and had an on-going effect on her life. As such, combined with the knowledge that the vast majority are happy when the bank simply clears up the issue, this could indicate that fraud is more distressing when there is a stronger sense of violation/it feels more personal:
“A lady in her 30s is using my name and address and phone number by travelling without tickets. She gave my name and address for TFL Penalties. They are still not able to punish her but since she has been caught three times they should have a system to catch and punish these kinds of people. I am really worried about it as I live alone.”

(White British Woman, 55-64. Council rented property in Barnsbury)

Another reason for dissatisfaction was that the providers/retailers were unhelpful (7).

11.3.3 Non-reporting

Where respondents did not report an incident of fraud or attempted fraud, they were asked for their reasons. Figure 94 below illustrates.

**Figure 94: Why not report?**

The most common reason for not reporting the incident was that the respondent deemed it too trivial (57%), followed by ‘dealt with it ourselves’ (48%). Just over a quarter thought the police wouldn’t be interested (27%) and 10% felt reporting would be too much trouble.

In the case of fraud, the vast majority of respondents in the ‘other’ category did not report because the situation was being dealt with by banks and service providers (51). Others felt that the situation couldn’t be resolved by the police (15). Some of these responses included people who felt overwhelmed by the number of attempts at fraud that were being directed at them – for example, repeated phone calls or emails. In addition, 16 respondents stated that they simply did not think reporting was necessary or even think about it. This was often because no harm was done, reflecting the fact that many cases were resolved through the banks or other service providers.

Finally, 13 respondents stated that they did not know that they could report it or that help was available – for example, the existence of Action Fraud.
11.4 Knowledge of offender

Respondents were asked what, if anything, they knew of the offender.

Nothing was known about the offenders in 94% (951) of incidents. In the category ‘other’, 14 people knew the location of the perpetrator by country or town (10 of them were in foreign countries), five knew the sex of the offender, one could identify the person as the local postman, two had contact details of the perpetrator, and nine could identify a particular company, although some of these were fake companies set up as scams.
12 Other Online Crime

This section analyses other online crime, detailing the characteristics of those who were victimized by it and the nature of such crime. It provides further analysis of reporting of other online crime and, if reported, respondents’ satisfaction with the outcome; alternatively, it illustrates respondents’ reasons for not reporting incidents of other online crime. The final section then analyses what, if anything, respondents knew of the offenders.

12.1 Definition and victim characteristics

There is no single definition of online crime other than fraud. Under the Misuse of Computers Act 1990, cyber-crime involves offences against computer systems and data, as well as ‘traditional’ offences committed using new technology where networked computers and other devices are used to facilitate the commission of a crime. Offences against computer systems and data include hacking and breaking into computer systems to steal or alter data. The offences under consideration here include computer viruses and general website hacking and, therefore, fall within the first part of this definition. The other offences under consideration here, online harassment and so-called revenge pornography, also fall within the latter part of this definition.

From those reporting at least one victimisation experience since the beginning of 2015 8% (154) reported at least one incident. The majority reported one (119), two reported two incidents, five reported three incidents, two reported four incidents and 24 reported five or more.

Detailed information was collected about two incidents of online crime. In total, information about 185 incidents was captured, reported by 154 individuals. Their characteristics are as follows.

Other online crime victims were most commonly aged 25 to 34 years (25%), followed by 16 to 24 years (24%). Very few of those aged 55 to 64 years (8%), 65 to 74 years (4%) and 75 years above (7%) were victims.

Using the 5+1 ethnicity classification: the majority were White (65%), with 15% Black, and 11% Asian.

Just under a half were employed (49%), 11% unemployed and 14% students. economically inactive constituted 25%.

The majority were in public rented accommodation (56%), 21% in private rented accommodation and 23% were homeowners.

12.2 Nature of the incidents

Bearing in mind the specific offences identified above, namely computer viruses, general website hacking, online harassment and revenge pornography, Figure 95 below illustrates their distribution.
As can be seen, three quarters (73%) of the incidents were computer viruses (one was a hacking incident). Online harassment comprised a quarter of the incidents and one incident was so called ‘revenge porn’.

12.3 Reporting, satisfaction with outcome and non-reporting

Respondents were asked whether they had reported the incident in question to police or some other organisation and, if so, whether they were satisfied with the outcome. Alternatively, respondents were asked their reasons for choosing not to report the incident in question.

12.3.1 Reporting

Figure 96: Reporting of incidents

Overall, only 7% (13) of incidents were reported by respondents. As might be expected given the proportion of virus attacks, when incidents were reported this was most commonly to Internet Service Providers (ISPs) and anti-virus software companies (four each). Three of the harassment incidents were reported to the police. None of the offenders were apprehended.
12.3.2 Satisfaction with outcome

Respondents were given the opportunity to comment on their satisfaction with the outcome of the case. Responses were mixed. Eight were satisfied and four unsatisfied. For the most part, the biggest concern for respondents was to ensure that their electronic items were repaired and protected, which made up half the responses (three satisfied and one unsatisfied due to the loss of the laptop). Three felt unaffected and one of these respondents stated that they are simply more careful with junk email now. One was still distressed by what happened. Two were satisfied with the support they had received from Internet service providers. One felt the case was handled badly by the police as the online threats they receive have not been stopped. One situation remained unresolved.

12.3.3 Non-reporting

Figure 97: Why not report?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too trivial</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police wouldn’t be interested</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tried but police were not interested</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much trouble</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear distrust the police</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear reprisals</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private/personal/family matter</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealt with it ourselves</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Attempts had been made to report a minority of incidents (2%) but the police had not been interested.

12.4 Knowledge of offender

Given the nature of most incidents, namely computer viruses/hacking, the findings are unsurprising. Nothing was known about the offenders in 96% of incidents. Where some details were known this tended to be only either the online name of the perpetrator.
13. Concluding Observations

13.1. Crime victimisation by ethnicity

Figure 98: Crime victimisation by ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White British</th>
<th>White Other</th>
<th>BME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+10</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle crime</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Damage</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual assault/harassment</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+17</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hate Crime</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other online</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the table above the variations in victimisation by different ethnic groups is summarised. A threefold category of ethnicity is used which includes White British, BME and White Other. The category of ‘White Other’ is diverse, encompassing people from a wide range of countries and spanning a number of continents including Europe, the Americas and Australasia. Many of this group are not visually identifiable as non-White British, which may influence their experiences based on race and ethnicity in a way that is different from BME respondents. However, there were certainly incidences of hate crime within this category, whether based on being/appearing to be Muslim, or because of their difference:

Whereas the vast majority of BME and White British respondents had been in the borough for over two years (the majority of these over five years) at 85% and 81% respectively, only 58% of the White Other population had been resident for this long. White Other makes up over half of the population resident in Islington for less than two years with BME and White British each making up less than a quarter of this group of respondents. A strong link between a short length of residency in the borough and White Other respondents can therefore be made. This is reflected in the findings that White Other respondents have a different set of expectations and a different perspective on crime. This may be due to a number of factors – weaker ties to their community, less attachment to the area, or a lack of historical association.
White Other respondents make up the majority of the privately rented population at 63% compared to 28% White British and 19% BME. They are far less likely to publicly rent or own homes. This is unsurprising as shorter residency in the borough makes it less likely to have access to public accommodation or to have made a permanent commitment through purchasing a property. The ability to rent privately in the area also indicates that the respondents are likely to be able to afford higher rent and may therefore be working professionals.

White Other respondents were less concerned with crime and other potential problems within their neighbourhood. They were more likely to state that neighbourhood concerns were ‘not a problem’ than White British and BME respondents with the exception of street lighting and housing costs. Private renters were also less likely to identify problems in their neighbourhood than homeowners. Issues relating to housing conditions, housing costs, and landlords were identified, as well as neighbour disputes:

White Other respondents were more likely to be more satisfied with their neighbourhood than other ethnic groups. This also extends to crime where these respondents were less likely at 48% to perceive crime as a major or minor problem, compared to BME respondents at 68% and White British at 57%. This also matches the results by tenure, with the lowest level of concern being private rented at 47% compared to 54% of public renters and homeowners at 64%.

In terms of victimisation, White Other and private renters were the least likely to express a fear of crime. A similar pattern applies in relation to anti-social behaviour. Residents who have lived in the borough for less than two years are far less likely to consider this a problem. Despite having less contact with the police, White Other respondents were most likely to have confidence in police fairness (96%).

White Other respondents were less likely to be victims of personal theft (24% compared to 34% BME and 42% White British). Similar patterns apply to criminal damage, vehicle crime, hate crime, fraud and other online crime. On the other hand, White Other respondents were more likely than BME respondents to be victims of personal violence and sexual assault and harassment. The overall picture, however, is of the majority of White Other respondents living in private rented accommodation for two years or less in the borough, and report that they are more satisfied with their neighbourhood and have fewer concerns about crime, victimisation or policing.

BME residents make up 29% of the survey population. In terms of tenure, they were far more likely to live in publicly rented rather than privately rented accommodation and they were just as likely as White British respondents to have lived in the borough for a period of longer than five years. BME respondents were more likely to perceive race relations and unfriendliness as a problem in their area. They were also nearly twice as likely to be victims of hate crime than the other two ethnic groups (47% compared to 24% White Other and 29% White British). However, in relation to violence against the person and sexual assault and harassment, ‘BME’ respondents were least likely to be victims.

BME respondents were less likely than White British respondents to have had contact with the police. However, they were less likely to perceive the police as fair with a minority of respondents
expressing concerns relating to racial profiling. Although the low numbers of stop and search victims identified do not suggest any disparity by race.

13.5. Cybercrime

Some 41% of the survey population reported that they had experienced online fraud or attempted fraud. This mainly involved bank and credit account fraud and non-investment fraud. It should be noted that the survey included a purposive strategy and oversampled victims therefore direct comparisons to the CSEW findings are not appropriate. The breakdown of the different forms of online fraud in the Islington survey is as follows:

Figure 99: Percentage of survey population as victims of fraud and online crime

Fraud and online crime are overtaking other areas of criminality in the borough, yet the lack of a visible perpetrator and the private nature of the crime means that it does not have a high profile in relation to community or neighbourhood concerns. In other words, it is not a ‘social’ issue in the same way that gang violence, muggings, and other forms of crime are perceived to be. Nevertheless, it affects a large percentage of the population. Offences such as phishing (tricking people into handing over their personal details), identity theft, hacking, and online harassment are becoming more prevalent. It is the case that there may be an element of under-reporting of this offence since it has for many people become a regular event.

From all those reporting at least one victimisation experience since the beginning of 2015 (just over half (833 respondents) experienced at least one fraud or attempted fraud incident. The majority reported one (655), 45 reported two incidents, seven reported three, four reported four incidents and 112 reported five or more.

Detailed information was collected about up to two incidents of fraud. In total, information about 1,011 fraud incidents was captured, reported by 833 individuals.
From those reporting at least one victimisation experience since the beginning of 2015 9% (154) reported at least one incident. The majority reported one (119), two reported two incidents, five reported three incidents, two reported four incidents and 24 reported five or more. Detailed information was collected about two incidents of online crime. In total, information about 185 incidents was captured, reported by 154 individuals.

13.6. Women and victimisation

One of the prominent features of both the First and Second Islington Crime Surveys was a focus on women and victimisation. Consequently we summarise below some of the main findings from the current survey relating to women. It should be noted, however, that both police generated data and victimisation surveys tend to underestimate the number of sexual offences (see ONS 2016)

The current survey revealed that women were more likely than men to believe that there had been an increase in crime and also more likely than men to think that they were likely to be victimised in the future. One in five women said that they avoided certain areas and that they felt less safe at night.

Nearly two thirds of the victims of hate crime were women and just under half of these were BME. Women living in public rented accommodation reported a higher level of victimisation than other groups. Women were more likely to experience and perceive threat of violence, particularly sexual assault. Correspondingly, women reported a higher fear of crime than men.

Experiences of personal violence occurred both in the home and on the street, including domestic violence in the home. However, all the cases of sexual assault took place on the street. Women in the 25 to 34 age group experienced sexual harassment most frequently. In the case of personal violence, in a third of incidents the victim knew the offender and in 15% the offender was a neighbour or a housemate. Most cases of violence involved threats to harm but in seven of the 11 cases in which a weapon was used the victim was a woman. The most common type of weapon was a knife.

Whereas for males the highest level of violent victimisation was for White Other, for women the number of White British victims is similar to White Other. In relation to the causes of violence the most common reason given by women was that the offender was either drunk or on drugs. In a significant number of violent incidents involving male victims this was also the case. The second most common reason given was that the incidence was opportunistic.

The survey looked at violence against women in particular and although noting that much of the violence experienced by women was in the home we did not distinguish between domestic violence incidents and other incidents involving flatmates. However, it is evident from the replies that at least some of these cases involved domestic abuse. In most of these cases the victim called the police. The police response was generally seen as positive.
13.7. Neighbours

Neighbours were a source of concern for a number of respondents and particularly in relation to anti-social behaviour and violence, including intimidation. Issues with neighbours had the potential to significantly to affect the wellbeing and quality of life of residents:

Nineteen respondents cited specific issues relating to neighbours, including noise, people running up and down stairs, and intimidation such as blocking entrances. This includes two incidents of aggression, including an “attack” and one case of erratic behaviour linked to mental illness. One of these respondents reported that their neighbour had also damaged their vehicle.

Two respondents reported having been burgled by neighbours but for unknown reasons the neighbours were never caught or punished. In eight cases there were reports of hate crime, particularly in the form of racial slurs. Five respondents mentioned having fights with their neighbours and ten mentioned threats or aggression. Three respondents stated that they had been attacked and two women described situations in which male neighbours tried to gain forcible entry into their property

Incidents were reported of criminal damage and burglary in which the victim claimed that the offender was a neighbour. In some cases the victims were less than satisfied with the police response. There were also a number of reported incidents of hate crime involving neighbours.

Nuisance and anti-social behavior issues were frequently raised, including incidents reported involving neighbours banging on doors, engaging in heated arguments, fights and other forms of intimidation. In one case:

“My neighbour has been doing a campaign of hatred towards me for the last 30 years. It started when I saw him sexually molesting his child. He had his hands in the girl’s rectum and I saw the girl crying with poo coming out and the dad kept on saying they were playing. He was working in a primary school. The social services intervened and they let it slip that it was I calling them. Nothing was done back then but he was investigated after many, many years. He began with hammering and damaging my entire ceiling. Day and night none stop banging on my ceiling and I have been unable to live a normal life. My wife died of cancer and I was blamed for this. The deviousness of them knows no limit, and now the matter is being investigated by the local MP.”

(British Arab Man, 55-64. Housing Association rented property in Junction)

In another case:

“They are neighbours and it appears they are running the estate and what they say goes in the estate. They are witnesses against us in court claiming that after the death of my sister in law we have no right to live here and there is no evidence we did not live here the full year. One of the brothers met me by the lift and wanted to stab me, his brother stopped him from attacking me. I am deeply unhappy with the police.”
In most cases the victims reported the incident to either the police or the Council. In general, however, in the majority of cases they were dissatisfied with the response and felt that more could have been done to solve these disputes and deter offenders.

13.8. Vulnerable and disabled respondents

There appears to have been a significant increase in hate crime towards disabled people in recent years across the country. The level of illegal activity directed towards disabled people in central London boroughs like Islington is seriously underestimated according to the St. John Street News (Esposito 2016). It is suggested that hate crimes directed toward disabled people are routinely recorded as simple assaults. Disabled people are also seen to experience high levels of fear as well as a reluctance to report incidents to the police.

In the course of the survey there were a number of respondents who raised issues specifically in relation to disability, vulnerability or old age. Some respondents mentioned that they do not go out by themselves because they feel they are targeted due to their disability. A number of respondents raised issues relating to their general concerns about the neighbourhood, including hazards such as uneven pavements and inconveniences such as a bus stop that blocks wheelchairs and rubbish bins being located far from their property. A related concern was with deception burglaries and scams that involve knocking on people’s doors. It was felt that vulnerable people are targeted for this offence:

Some disabled people stated that they felt vulnerable due to their disability. Others felt that they were a target of crime because of their age. A number of disabled respondents said that they were scared to go out day or night.
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Appendix A

Figure 100: Comparison of offences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence Type</th>
<th>Number of incidents</th>
<th>% of all incidents</th>
<th>Number of victims</th>
<th>% all victims</th>
<th>Number incidents reported to police</th>
<th>% reported</th>
<th>Number caught</th>
<th>% caught (out of 632 reported)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All offence types</td>
<td>2,010</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,501</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property offences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Theft</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Damage</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle crime</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crimes against the person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual assault &amp; Harassment</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hate Crime</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>1,011</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other online crime</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Figure 101: Comparison of satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Across Categories</th>
<th>Property Offences</th>
<th>Crimes Against the Person</th>
<th>Fraud and Online</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>Personal Theft</td>
<td>Criminal Damage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police handled case well</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police were sympathetic/polite</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council/others were helpful</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation resolved/loss recovered</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Nothing Could Be Done</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perpetrator caught/punished</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved on/Unaffected</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police handled case badly</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police unsympathetic/impolite</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council/others unhelpful</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation unresolved/loss not recovered</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough/no evidence</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perpetrator not caught/punished</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distressed/feel unsafe</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Cross-tabulations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How safe do you feel walking alone in this area during the day?</th>
<th>Have you personally witnessed a crime in Islington during the past 12 months?</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very safe</td>
<td>Count: 199; % within: 76.0%</td>
<td>1032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes: 199; No: 833; % within: 47.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly safe</td>
<td>Count: 59; % within: 22.5%</td>
<td>961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes: 59; No: 902; % within: 51.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A bit unsafe</td>
<td>Count: 1; % within: 0.4%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes: 1; No: 19; % within: 1.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unsafe</td>
<td>Count: 3; % within: 1.1%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes: 3; No: 2; % within: 0.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It all depends</td>
<td>Count: 0; % within: 0.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes: 0; No: 6; % within: 0.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count: 262; % within: 100.0%</td>
<td>2024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How safe do you feel walking alone in this area after dark?</th>
<th>Have you personally witnessed a crime in Islington during the past 12 months?</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very safe</td>
<td>Count: 58; % within: 22.1%</td>
<td>458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes: 58; No: 400; % within: 22.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly safe</td>
<td>Count: 118; % within: 44.9%</td>
<td>1179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes: 118; No: 1061; % within: 60.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A bit unsafe</td>
<td>Count: 73; % within: 27.8%</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes: 73; No: 243; % within: 13.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unsafe</td>
<td>Count: 14; % within: 5.3%</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes: 14; No: 47; % within: 2.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It all depends</td>
<td>Count: 0; % within: 0.0%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes: 0; No: 10; % within: 0.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count: 263; % within: 100.0%</td>
<td>2024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Have you personally witnessed a crime in Islington during the past 12 months?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safe day Safe day and night</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% within Have you personally witnessed a crime in Islington during the past 12 months?</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
<td>80.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safe day only</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% within Have you personally witnessed a crime in Islington during the past 12 months?</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unsafe day and night</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% within Have you personally witnessed a crime in Islington during the past 12 months?</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% within Have you personally witnessed a crime in Islington during the past 12 months?</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### How safe do you feel walking alone in this area during the day?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How old were you at your last birthday? (BANDS)</th>
<th>16 to 24</th>
<th>25 to 34</th>
<th>35 to 44</th>
<th>45 to 54</th>
<th>55 to 64</th>
<th>65 to 74</th>
<th>75 or above</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very safe</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within How old were you at your last birthday? (BANDS)</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Fairly safe | Count | 131 | 292 | 188 | 158 | 87 | 57 | 40 | 953 |
| % within How old were you at your last birthday? (BANDS) | 40.7% | 48.3% | 49.6% | 50.6% | 44.8% | 47.9% | 46.5% | 47.3% |

| A bit unsafe | Count | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 20 |
| % within How old were you at your last birthday? (BANDS) | 0.0% | 0.0% | 1.6% | 1.6% | 1.5% | 4.2% | 1.2% | 1.0% |

| Very unsafe | Count | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| % within How old were you at your last birthday? (BANDS) | 0.9% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.8% | 0.0% | 0.2% |

| It all depends | Count | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| % within How old were you at your last birthday? (BANDS) | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.3% | 0.0% | 2.6% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.3% |

<p>| Total | Count | 322 | 604 | 379 | 312 | 194 | 119 | 86 | 2016 |
| % within How old were you at your last birthday? (BANDS) | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How safe do you feel walking alone in this area after dark?</th>
<th>Very safe</th>
<th>Fairly safe</th>
<th>A bit unsafe</th>
<th>Very unsafe</th>
<th>It all depends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% within How old were you at your last birthday? (BANDS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>25 to 34</td>
<td>35 to 44</td>
<td>45 to 54</td>
<td>55 to 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 to 24</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 54</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>59.9%</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 64</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 to 74</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 or above</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within How old were you at your last birthday? (BANDS)</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How old were you at your last birthday? (BANDS)</th>
<th>Very safe</th>
<th>Fairly safe</th>
<th>A bit unsafe</th>
<th>Very unsafe</th>
<th>It all depends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% within How old were you at your last birthday? (BANDS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>25 to 34</td>
<td>35 to 44</td>
<td>45 to 54</td>
<td>55 to 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 to 24</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 54</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 64</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 to 74</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 or above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within How old were you at your last birthday? (BANDS)</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How safe do you feel walking alone in this area during the day?</th>
<th>Gender?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very safe</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>1033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Gender</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly safe</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>961</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### How safe do you feel walking alone in this area after dark?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feeling</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Gender?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>1022</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2026</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very safe</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td>457</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>299</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>158</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>457</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fairly safe</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td>1180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>592</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>588</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1180</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A bit unsafe</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td>316</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>223</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>316</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very unsafe</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>It all depends</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2026</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Safe day and night

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safe/Unsafe</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Gender?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td>1625</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>883</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>742</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safe day only</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td>368</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>107</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>261</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>368</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unsafe day and night</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Safe day only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safe/Unsafe</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Gender?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td>1016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>996</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>1016</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unsafe day and night

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safe/Unsafe</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Gender?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td>2026</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>1022</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2026</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

For each of the crimes, reporting and apprehension rates can be determined. Figure 103 below demonstrates this. Fraud and other online crime have remarkably lower reporting rates than other crimes, with criminal damage, vehicle and hate crime 10% or more below the reporting rates for crimes that have an element of more direct violation/assault – violence against the person, sexual harassment/assault and personal theft (often associated with use of force). The known apprehension rates for fraud, online crime, personal theft, vehicle crime and criminal damage are low, possibly due to the fact that the perpetrators are less easily identifiable. The more direct – what could be seen as ‘face-to-face’ - crimes of violence against the person, sexual assault and harassment, and hate crime had rates of 50% or above.

Figure 102: Reporting and apprehension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Personal Theft</th>
<th>Criminal Damage</th>
<th>Vehicle Damage</th>
<th>Violence Against the Person</th>
<th>Sexual Assault/Harassment</th>
<th>Hate Crime</th>
<th>Fraud</th>
<th>Other Online</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reported: Police</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>- 100%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 44%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported: Other</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>- 87%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 37%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprehended</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>- 0%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- 4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Technical Summary

Overview of survey design and methodology

1. Introducing the survey

The First Islington Crime Survey (ICS) that was carried out in 1985/6 was a landmark piece of research that provided a detailed account of crime and victimisation in an inner city borough.

In 2015 the University of Kent commissioned Opinion Research Services (ORS) to undertake a new survey with recent victims of crime living in Islington, as well as a smaller number of non-victims living in the borough.

The aim of the current research is to carry out a study similar to the original survey in order to determine how the distribution of crime has changed in the borough over time, and to identify residents’ current concerns and priorities.

To qualify as a ‘victim’ for the purposes of the study, a respondent needed to have experienced one of the particular crime types that were in scope for the study, and to have done so in the period between the start of 2015 and the time of the interview.

The survey was undertaken using a face-to-face CAPI (Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing) methodology, with interviews being conducted in respondents’ homes.

2. Questionnaire Design

The questionnaire was designed by researchers working on behalf of the University of Kent. ORS reviewed the questionnaire and provided some suggestions, particularly in relation to the practicalities of administering the survey and concerns about the number of questions and the length of the script.

The following sections were asked of all respondents:

Perceptions of crime;

A ‘screener’ section to record the overall number of incidents experienced for each type of crime that was within the scope of the study (which, in turn, confirmed whether the respondent was to be classified as a victim or a non-victim);

A demographics section at the end of the survey;

In addition, all victims of crime were asked one or more follow-up sections relevant to the specific type of crime(s) they had experienced. The following types of incidents were deemed to be within the scope of the study, and therefore had their own survey sections:

Burglary;

Violence;

Theft;
Vehicle crime;

Criminal damage;

Sexual assault and harassment;

Hate crime (including racist incidents);

Fraud;

Online crime.

If more than one incident of the same type had been experienced, then the relevant follow-up section was asked twice to cover the two most recent incidents (for practical reasons e.g. concerns about the length of the script, even if more than two incidents had been experienced, respondents were only asked to give details of the two most recent occurrences).

The follow up sections varied slightly for different crime types, but typically covered similar areas e.g. questions about the general nature of the incident, when and where the incident occurred, whether the incident was reported, and what (if anything) was known about the offender.

3. Survey design

3.1 Overview

One of the research objectives was to better understand patterns of victimisation, analysing the incidence of certain types of crime within the overall population; but a secondary objective was to gather large volumes of qualitative data about specific incidents in order to explore individuals’ specific experiences. As such it was necessary to capture information from a large number of recent victims of crime – the target for the number of victims was placed at 1,500.

Initially the time limit for victimisation was set to be the most recent 12 months, but after consultation with the researchers working on the project, the time period was extended back to the start of 2015.

There was also a further objective to consider the views of non-victims of crime, although fewer interviews were required with this group, and a target of 500 was agreed.

When conducting population surveys there are different sampling options to consider. A pre-selected approach, which is often considered the most robust and representative, was initially considered. However, it quickly became apparent that this would not be feasible, due to a combination of the large number of victim interviews required, and the low incidence of victims in the population relative to non-victims. As such, to achieve enough interviews with victims, this approach would require an overall number of interviews, which was far outside the scope of the project.

It was therefore decided that the survey would seek to oversample victims of crime using a quota controlled sampling approach, targeting 2,000 interviews in total (1,500 interviews with victims and 500 interviewers with non-victims).
As the demographic characteristics of the overall population of victims were unknown, it was not possible to set additional sample controls on any other characteristics such as age, gender or ethnicity, so these were left to fall out ‘naturally’.

3.2 Different question types

The vast majority of questions were pre-coded, meaning that a list of answer categories appeared on the computer tablet screen and the interviewers selected the appropriate code.

Questions were either single response (i.e. only one code could be entered) or multi-response (i.e. more than one code could be entered). Many pre-coded questions had an Other – please specify option, and where respondents selected this option, the interviewer would simply type in the answer given. In all these questions, the answers were later reviewed to see if the Other answer could be back coded into one of the original pre-coded options.

Almost every question had a Don’t Know and Refused option that the interviewer could use, but for most questions they did not appear on show cards to try to ensure that respondents did not over-use these options. In the computer interview script, Don’t Know and Refused options were separated from other response options and shown at the bottom of screen.

4. Fieldwork management

4.1 CAPI Interviews

Survey interviews were administered through CAPI by ORS’ IQCS (Interviewer Quality Control Scheme) trained interviewers, and all interviewers attended a comprehensive briefing in advance of the survey.

There are significant benefits of using CAPI systems from the point of view of implementing complex routing on the survey, and ensuring data accuracy and data security.

4.2 Sample Controls

To ensure a suitable spread of victims and non-victims across Islington, the borough was divided into sample points or ‘clusters’ based on Lower Super Output Areas, with around 16 interviews to be conducted at each point (based on 2,000 interviews in total divided between 123 sample points). Each interviewer was allocated a selection of sample points, and instructed to interview a mixture of victims and non-victims within each of these areas.

As outlined above, a pre-selected approach had initially been considered, which would have involved sending an advance or ‘pre-alert’ letter to every address in the initial sample. In order to encourage participation (particularly given the sensitivity of the survey topics and uncertainties over the likely level of response\(^1\)) it was decided that ORS should still send pre-alert letters to a random sample of 10,000 addresses. The sample was disproportionately stratified by LSOA to deliberately over-sample

\(^1\) The letters were intended to increase participation by providing a ‘foot in the door’ and helping to reassure respondents that the survey was a genuine piece of work. The letters also outlined the reasons for the survey and provided contact details for respondents to arrange an interview appointment or request further information.
areas with higher rates of certain types of recorded crime\(^2\), with the intention that this would help generate more interviews with victims. Interviewers were given information about the sampled addresses within each sample point and encouraged to visit them when they were in that area, to help them achieve the required number of interviews.

Because the cluster targets for non-victims were ‘easier’ to achieve than those for victims (due to a combination of the targets being smaller, non-victims being more prevalent in the population, and a shorter interview length for non-victims), interviewers were set a maximum target of 2 non-victim interviews per sample point per day. This was done as a further effort to ensure a reasonable spread of non-victims in different areas across the whole of the borough.

Victims were identified by screening on the doorstep, with interviewers offering respondents a show card listing the crime types that were in scope in order to determine their eligibility.

5. **Survey response and data processing**

The interviews began on 1\(^{st}\) March 2016 and ended on 16\(^{th}\) May 2016.

In total, 2,025 interviews were achieved: 1,501 were with individuals who had been victims of crime since the start of 2015, and 524 were with non-victims.

The initial number of victims was slightly higher than described above (and, correspondingly, the number of non-victims slightly lower). This is because a small number of cases (<1% of the overall achieved sample) were reclassified as non-victims following ORS' quality control checks (mostly because their incidents appeared to relate to generalised ASB in the local area, rather than being specific incidents of crime types falling within the scope of the study).

It was agreed that the researchers working on behalf of the University of Kent would analyse the verbatim text comments from the survey.

6. **Weighting the data**

6.1 **Reasons for weighting**

The extent to which results can be generalised from a sample depends on how well the sample represents the population from which it is drawn.

However, in this case the *survey design* intentionally over-represented individuals who had recently fallen victim to a crime and intentionally under-represented non-victims of crime (by doing three-quarters of interviews with victims of crime, even though they are a minority in the population at large).

Furthermore, as for all surveys of this type, the achieved sample was affected by *response bias* i.e. varying levels of response between different socio-demographic groups.

---

\(^2\) Based on LSOA-level Recorded Crime Summary Data provided by the Greater London Authority (GLA):
http://data.london.gov.uk/dataset/recorded-crime-summary-data-london-lsoa-level
Statistical weights were therefore derived for each case in order to compensate for both of these factors i.e. the sample design and the response bias.

A brief overview of the process by which these weights were calculated is outlined below.

6.2 Deriving the weights

Firstly, although sample controls were included at LSOA level to ensure a broad distribution of interviews across Islington, some wards were slightly over- or under-represented in the returned sample (relative to the size of their populations). Using comparative data, each case was weighted to make the overall sample fully representative by area at ward level.

It was also necessary to adjust - as far as estimates allow - for the over-representation of victims in the survey design. ORS accepts that there are various difficulties in reliably estimating the true incidence of victimisation e.g. because the varying extent to which victims are either willing or reluctant to disclose information about their experiences of crime, as well as nuances around what different respondents may class as a crime, and how consistently respondents understand the distinctions between different types of crime etc.

Nonetheless, by using other available and representative survey data\(^3\) ORS was able to obtain a reasonable estimate for the incidence of victims in the wider Islington population for certain comparable crimes (i.e. property crime, violent crime, hate crime, harassment, credit/debit card fraud and others) and over a similar time period\(^4\).

Further weights were then derived to correct for the intentional oversampling of victims and ensure that the proportion of victims in the achieved sample broadly matched that estimated to occur in the overall Islington population.

Finally, the characteristics of the achieved sample were compared against information about the entire Islington population (from Census 2011, the English Housing Survey, and Greater London Authority estimates 2015) to establish where the sample had under- or over-represented particular socio-demographic groups. Following this, the sample was weighted by age, gender, ethnicity, working status and tenure, in order to make it broadly representative of the entire Islington population.

The table overleaf shows the weighted and un-weighted profiles of respondents to the survey, alongside the comparative data for the population.

---

\(^3\) The data used was from the Public Attitude Survey, a longstanding and continuous face-to-face London-wide survey commissioned by the Mayor’s Office for Policing and Crime, and administered by ORS since 2014. ORS used the most recent available data (for the first Quarter of 2016-17), not least because the fieldwork period (April to June 2016) corresponded reasonably closely to that of the Islington survey (March to May 2016).

\(^4\) In the PAS, the interviewer asks the respondent whether he or she has experienced any crime or ASB in the last 12 months. If the answer is ‘yes’, a follow-up question is asked to determine the nature of the most recent incident. In the Islington survey, however, ASB was not used to establish victimisation; therefore, to derive an estimate from the PAS that more closely aligned with the definition used in the Islington study, ORS excluded cases where the respondent’s most recent incident was ASB. It is therefore likely that this result slightly under-estimated levels of victimisation, because it is probable that a proportion of those who had most recently experienced ASB would also have experienced another (valid) type of incident within the previous 12 months. However, ORS applied modelling techniques to suggest that the overall proportion of victims in the population was unlikely to have been significantly under-estimated.
Survey responses (unweighted and weighted) and Resident Population by Victimisation, Ward, Age, Gender, Ethnic Group, Working Status and Tenure (Note: Percentages may not sum due to rounding)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Unweighted Count</th>
<th>Unweighted Valid %</th>
<th>Weighted Valid %</th>
<th>Resident Population %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BY VICTIM OF CRIME SINCE 2015</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,509</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
<td>89.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total valid responses</td>
<td>2,025</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BY WARD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnsbury</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunhill</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledonian</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canonbury</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerkenwell</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finsbury Park</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highbury East</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highbury West</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillrise</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holloway</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junction</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildmay</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St George’s</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mary’s</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Peter’s</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tollington</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total valid responses</td>
<td>2,024</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristic</td>
<td>Unweighted Count</td>
<td>Unweighted Valid %</td>
<td>Weighted Valid %</td>
<td>Resident Population %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BY AGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Unweighted Valid %</th>
<th>Weighted Valid %</th>
<th>Resident Population %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 to 24</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 54</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 64</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 to 74</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 or above</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total valid responses</td>
<td>2,015</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BY GENDER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Unweighted Valid %</th>
<th>Weighted Valid %</th>
<th>Resident Population %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1,168</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total valid responses</td>
<td>2,025</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BY ETHNIC GROUP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Unweighted Valid %</th>
<th>Weighted Valid %</th>
<th>Resident Population %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,346</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total valid responses</td>
<td>1,995</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BY WORKING STATUS**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Unweighted Count</th>
<th>Unweighted Valid %</th>
<th>Weighted Valid %</th>
<th>Resident Population %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otherwise not working</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total valid responses</td>
<td>1,977</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BY TENURE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure Type</th>
<th>Unweighted Count</th>
<th>Unweighted Valid %</th>
<th>Weighted Valid %</th>
<th>Resident Population %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owned Outright</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned with a mortgage or loan or shared ownership</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private rent</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social rent</td>
<td>1,182</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total valid responses</td>
<td>1,985</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>