

Assessing User Satisfaction for Anti-Social Behaviour Callers

There is a new PPAF Key Diagnostic Indicator Requirement for 2006/7:

Satisfaction of those reporting anti social behaviour to the police with respect to:

- (a) making contact with the police;
- (b) action taken by the police;
- (c) being kept informed of progress;
- (d) their treatment by staff; and
- (e) the overall service provided.

This survey guidance supplements the PPAF User Satisfaction Survey guidance for 2006/7, and sets out the new requirements on anti-social behaviour.

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The original intention of the user satisfaction measures within PPAF was to capture feedback from as broad a cross-section of users as possible. At the recommendation of the PPAF citizen focus project board work has been undertaken to extend the coverage of users whose views are reflected in PPAF. This has resulted in a new requirement to run a user survey for those who report incidents of anti-social behaviour directly to the police.
- 1.2 Responsibility for dealing with ASB issues sits with a number of agencies – including the police. The aim of this new survey is to identify police performance in dealing with anti-social behaviour, distinct from the performance of partners. There is some scope to develop the survey so that the feedback on ASB can be cross-cutting, and we will use the opportunities presented by the first year of data collection to explore further the relationship between police and partner activity on ASB.
- 1.3 In addition, the appropriate response to ASB issues may involve several agencies, and/or local action teams, and be a slow-time rather than rapid response. The survey attempts to recognise these issues – whilst still obtaining feedback on satisfaction with the police contribution to the resolution, and how well callers have been informed about subsequent action.
- 1.4 Research evidence which has been used to inform the development of these proposals is included as Annex A.
- 1.5 The development of the Single Non-Emergency Number (SNEN) project, and the potential it brings for closer working between police and other agencies in responding to issues of ASB may lead to the further development of these proposals in future. The requirement at this stage is to establish user satisfaction feedback which can inform the delivery of services by the police. As SNEN develops we will look to develop user satisfaction mechanisms which can take account of demand and response handled through the SNEN

route. One way in which this might be done could be to develop additional ASB survey questions with the SNEN Wave 1 sites during 2006/7. We will agree specific additional guidance with the Wave 1 SNEN sites before the first SNEN implementation, and then take this further with those forces involved in SNEN Wave 2.

2. The piloting process

- 2.1 This work has been developed with the assistance of a number of pilot forces, including Devon and Cornwall, Staffordshire, Kent, Merseyside, the Met, Sussex and Norfolk. The pilot work has tested postal and telephone approaches using two different sampling options. Devon and Cornwall, Sussex and Norfolk have sampled from across the whole range of ASB codes, Staffs, Kent and Merseyside have identified the most commonly reported incidents in their areas to sample.
- 2.2 The pilot work has been progressed in consultation with the Anti-Social Behaviour Unit and the NSIR project team. It has produced a survey format which can be used to obtain user feedback from ASB callers, covering aspects of call handling, incident response and longer term issues of information provision and problem resolution.
- 2.3 The initial findings of the pilot work are that for most forces ASB callers tend to report lower levels of satisfaction than other groups being surveyed for the PPAF measures. We need to see if this is the case across all forces and, if so, to consider the impact which integrating this new group would have on the existing PPAF user satisfaction measures. For this reason it has been agreed that **the ASB survey will be baselined during 2006/7, with all forces being required to introduce the survey, and report data to the Home Office.** Once six months data have been obtained, we will make recommendations about whether for 2007/8 ASB should be integrated with the SPI 1a-e data, or replace one of the existing user groups, or remain as a stand-alone element within PPAF (e.g as SPI1f).

3. Survey structure and format

- 3.1 **Although this is a new and distinct survey, it follows the same overall structure as the existing PPAF template, and includes the same 5 core satisfaction questions.** The survey recognises that not all callers will have had a police response, and not all will have progressed to the “follow-up” stage. Responses will be filtered so that these questions are only reported in relevant cases – for example, respondents dealt with by other agencies will only report results on the questions about access to police services.
- 3.2 The survey deals with call handling and incident response for all callers, and with follow-up where appropriate (and required). There is also the opportunity to explore longer term problem solving with those callers involved in reporting more than one incident.

4 KDI Status

- 4.1 The ASB survey data is being introduced into PPAF as a set of five Key Diagnostic Indicators (KDIs) for 2006/7. This means that the requirement becomes part of the Annual Data Return requirement for forces. All forces must supply data for these indicators for 2006/7. The results will be available for use locally and by the Police Performance Steering Group (PPSG) to understand and explore differing levels of performance between user groups and between forces on SPIs 1a-e, 2a and 3a,b. The results will also be considered as part of the HMIC baseline assessment. But the new ASB survey results will not be published as part of the PPAF assessment for 2006/7. Nor will forces be required to publish results locally.
- 4.2 However, 2006/7 will be used as a baseline year – and as long as the ASB survey requirement does not need to be substantially amended for 2007/8, then the 2006/7 data could be used as a baseline for comparison and improvement if the indicator is given SPI status in 2007/8.

5 SAMPLING

5.1 The new user groups to be surveyed and rules for exclusion

For 2006/7 there is an additional group of users whose views are to be reported:

- Those who report incidents of anti-social behaviour.

The sample for the ASB user group must be drawn from the sample base described below.

To include those reporting incidents of anti-social behaviour, as defined by the National Incident Category List closing code classifications (details in Annex B).

The following incidents must be excluded from the ASB sample:

- Hoax calls to emergency services
- Hate incidents (since the majority of these will be coded elsewhere under NICL, and views of some of these victims will be captured through the racist incidents survey).

[Note: during consultation we sought views on whether it was desirable and possible that “Only one person should be surveyed for each incident”. Responses were evenly split – with a number of forces identifying that their incident recording systems would not enable them to identify whether different callers were involved in the same incident. It has therefore been agreed that there will be NO REQUIREMENT to sample just one person from each incident.]

Include those who report as victims, witnesses or informants of ASB.

In all cases the sample should exclude those

- Under 16 years of age – either by excluding them at the point the sample is drawn, or at the opening of the survey.

Do not exclude members of the police service and members of the police authority from the sample.

5.2 It is recommended that (where possible) the sample should also exclude those

- where the offender was another family member e.g. sibling/parent/child,
- who have indicated that they are unwilling to be surveyed (where this is recorded) or where there is a note on the record that the case is unsuitable for research (where this is recorded). Some forces may choose to use “opposed publicity” as a proxy for cases unsuitable for survey contact.

5.3 A large proportion of those reporting anti-social behaviour have previously reported one or more incidents. Forces/authorities should not exclude repeat callers – it is important to hear the view of those who have called more than once, and to give them opportunities to express their views. However, forces and authorities should note that if a customer is subject to multiple surveys throughout the year (for ASB or any of the other PPAF user satisfaction surveys) they may feel burdened, and may complain, resulting in unnecessary dissatisfaction and reducing reassurance. Forces/authorities may choose to restrict the number of times a person can be contacted in any 12 month period (e.g. to no more than 3 contacts) or to specify a minimum period (e.g. 5 months) between contacts. This could be done at the point of sampling (on caller name or telephone number), if a system can be established to record the details of those who have already responded. Alternatively, potential respondents could be asked whether they have already replied, and whether they are prepared to participate again.

5.4 The sample should (where possible) exclude cases where

- the offender was a member of the police service or police authority

In all instances, a record should be kept of the reason for excluding someone from the sample. This record should contain the incident reference (or caller name) and the reason for exclusion.

Records of those included in, and excluded from, samples should be retained for verification purposes for 12 months after the year-end (i.e. until April 2008)¹.

Discretion in drawing the sample

- 5.5 Forces and authorities retain the discretion to exclude other victims where a survey is likely to cause distress. The information to identify cases for exclusion is usually gained from incident logs.
- 5.6 The following reasons might be considered for exclusion:
- people who have made a formal complaint against police regarding this incident
 - people who are considered vulnerable
 - people who have requested no further police action
 - people who will not co-operate with the police investigation
 - people already contacted several times in 12 months
- 5.7 Although a proportion of ASB incidents will relate to shop/office premises, and may be reported by employees who are then difficult to re-contact, it is not recommended that ASB incidents involving shops and businesses are routinely excluded. Steps should be taken to attempt to contact the person making the report, addressing postal surveys to the named individual, making an appointment to speak to the person at a convenient time etc.

Checklist:

- Does the sample include those reporting ASB incidents?
- Is the sample used for PPAF reporting restricted to the ASB incidents?
- Does the sample exclude those under 16?
- Does the sample exclude those involved in incidents recorded as “hoax calls to the emergency services” or “hate incidents”?
- Does the sample attempt to exclude cases involving family members as offenders and unsuitable/unwilling cases?
- What other criteria are being applied to exclude cases?
- Is there a record of those included and excluded from the sample (reference number (or name) and reason)?

¹ Where standard search criteria (e.g. under 16, no contact name, no contact address (for postal surveys) or telephone number (for telephone surveys)) are applied to exclude cases these criteria should be recorded. Once a list of potential respondents has been obtained, records should be kept of the reasons for any additional exclusions from this list. These records can be manual or electronic.

6. Ensuring a representative sample

Force Level

- 6.1 Forces and authorities should obtain responses from a sample of individuals whose views can be taken to be representative of the ASB user population. The sample should be selected randomly across all eligible ASB codes, all BCUs and all months of the year.
- 6.2 It is important to obtain views from a sufficiently large number of people to be representative at the force level for those reporting ASB every 12 months, with 95% confidence of +/- 4%.
- 6.3 It is not possible – in most cases – to profile those reporting ASB by age, gender and ethnicity. The random sampling required for the ASB group should produce a representative group to whom the surveys will be directed. Steps to maximise response rates (set out on the main PPAF survey guidance) should help to ensure that the respondent profile matches the reporting profile as far as possible. The sample should be a mix of all the ASB incident types. Taken randomly, this should reflect the relative incidence of the different types of ASB.
- 6.4 In order that the responses can be taken as representative of the total population, forces should ensure that response rates are sufficiently high. If response rates are low, and the required number of responses is obtained only by targeting an increasingly large proportion of the population, the views of those who have responded cannot necessarily be taken to be representative, since those who have selected themselves out of the sample may have different views from those who have chosen to respond. (Experience from the postal pilot suggested that response rates to the ASB survey were on a par with those for the burglary survey, and higher than the response rate from violent crime victims.)
- 6.5 For most (if not all) forces the number of eligible ASB incidents will exceed 12,000. It is therefore recommended that all forces ensure they obtain survey responses from at least 600 ASB reporters each year. If a force has fewer than 12,000 reported ASB incidents eligible for surveying, they should take their required number of responses from the table below.

Population Size:	Required sample size at 50:50 variability and 95% confidence	Required sample size at 60:40 variability and 95% confidence	Required sample size at 70:30 variability and 95% confidence
500	273	268	251
600	300	294	274
700	323	316	293
800	343	335	309
900	360	351	323
1000	375	366	335
1500	429	416	377
2000	462	447	403
3000	500	483	432
4000	522	504	448
5000	536	517	458
6000	546	526	465
8000	558	538	474
10000	566	545	480
12000+	572	550	484

Checklist:

- Has the force set a required number of responses for ASB?
- Does this required number provide sufficient data to report the results at 95% confidence +/- 4% for ASB at Force level?
- If this force is not requiring 600 responses, does the required sample number take account of the estimated number of exclusions within the population? And are details of how these required numbers were calculated retained for audit purposes?
- Are details of how the sample has been drawn retained for audit purposes?

7 SURVEY PROCESSES**Timing of the surveys**

7.1

Surveys should be conducted within 4 to 8 weeks* of the report of the incident.

[The pilot process identified that to assist respondent recall, and reduce confusion over subsequent incidents, the preferred survey interval was 4-8 weeks after the incident was reported. However, we recognise that not all forces will be able to adjust their survey processes to accommodate this requirement. It is therefore acceptable (although not recommended) to carry out surveys 6-12 weeks after the incident was reported.*

- 7.2 This gives time for follow-up action to have been taken, but also to ensure that the incident and subsequent service received is relatively fresh in the respondent's mind.
- 7.3 It is recommended that surveys for ASB reporters be conducted regularly throughout the year, with forces aiming to achieve 25% of the required sample each quarter.
- 7.4 The survey results will be compiled by the Home Office after three months of data collection, and updated quarterly thereafter on a rolling 12-month basis. Forces and authorities are asked to submit quarterly returns during 2006/7. The new ASB data will be submitted as additional rows in the ADR 443 workbook.

7.5

Each quarter, forces should complete the ADR form (ref ADR 443), and return this to the Home Office Data Collection Group.

The ADR 443 will be updated to include the additional reporting requirement for ASB.

The quarterly return should provide the results for surveys conducted during that quarter (i.e. the time at which the questionnaire/interview was carried out, rather than the time at which the service was received by the victim).

The returns are due 40 days after the quarter ends:

25th August 06
28th November 06
23rd February 07
26th May 07

Returns should be submitted each quarter.

The sample details, and the completed surveys, should be retained for audit purposes for 12 months after year end (i.e. the details for 2006/7 should be retained until April 2008). Retained surveys can be in paper or scanned electronic format.

- 7.6 Any late returns of survey responses for the quarter should not be discarded, but should be included within the figures for the next quarter.

Checklist:

- Are surveys conducted within 4-8* weeks of the incident being reported?
- Are ASB callers surveyed each quarter?
- Are the quarterly results reporting the findings of the surveys carried out that quarter?
- Are the returns submitted on time?
- Are details of samples and completed surveys retained for audit purposes?

** The recommended survey interval is 4-8 weeks after the incident was reported. It is acceptable (although not recommended) to carry out surveys 6-12 weeks after the incident was reported.*

8. Survey Methodology

- 8.1 The nature and complexity of the survey requirements for ASB strongly suggest that these surveys should be carried out over the telephone, rather than by post. However, in recognition of the fact that some forces will not be in the position to undertake telephone surveying during 2006/7, a simplified survey has been produced in postal format. This limits the opportunity for diagnostics, and for exploring the role of partners. It is offered only as an interim step to the full telephone delivery of this requirement from 2007/8.

9. THE QUESTIONNAIRE**Questionnaire framework**

9.1

Surveys to provide the PPAF user satisfaction measures need to be structured on a standard framework in order to ensure that the results obtained are comparable between forces.

This framework is based around a set of core satisfaction questions, with standard wording and a standard range of response options. The ordering of the core questions is fixed.

There are a number of standard diagnostic questions which need to be included, in the order and position described.

There is a standard set of demographic questions which also needs to be

included.

These form the minimum standard for ASB user satisfaction surveys.

Copies of the survey formats being used should be retained for audit purposes for 12 months after year-end (i.e. until April 2008).

A copy of the ASB survey format should also be forwarded to Maria Sobers in the Police Reform Unit (maria.sobers@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk) as soon as possible after the beginning of the financial year.

- 9.2 The mandatory questions will give forces information to take action to improve the services delivered. It is expected that forces/authorities will also use freetext questions to further explore the reasons for satisfaction and dissatisfaction.
- 9.3 Example survey structures, using the standard framework and recommended diagnostics are included as Annex C (telephone script) and Annex D (postal format).
- 9.4 The core satisfaction question on access to services “Are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the ease of contacting the police?” is not the same in this survey as in the other PPAF surveys, which ask about “...ease of contacting someone who could assist you?” This is a deliberate change – and aims to ensure that the results of the new ASB survey can be attributed to the work of the police rather than, at this stage, reflecting a multi-agency response. We will keep this under review, particularly in light of the SNEN project.

Checklist:

- Does the ASB survey format meet the minimum standard outlined in Annex C/D?
- Do all surveys include the core satisfaction questions, following the standard wording and in the required order?
- Do all surveys include the standard response options, in the required order, for all core satisfaction questions?
- Do all surveys contain the three standard demographic questions, and the standard response options?
- Do all surveys explore the service behind the expressed levels of satisfaction, by including diagnostic questions in the required areas and in the correct positions?
- Do the surveys include the required diagnostic questions on actions and treatment?
- Are respondents invited to give free-text responses to issues not covered by the core and diagnostic questions?
- Has a copy of the ASB survey format been forwarded to the Police Reform Unit?
- Are copies of the survey formats retained for audit purposes?
- Do the surveys seek contact details for further contact and consultation?
- Do the surveys follow the recommended examples?

9.5 There are some routing instructions, which will mean that not all respondents are in a position to answer all questions. These are illustrated in the sample surveys.

Required diagnostic questions

9.6 In order to understand the reasons for users' expressed levels of satisfaction, the core satisfaction questions should be supported with a series of diagnostic and free- text questions. These can explore the presence and absence of particular elements of service, and help to identify new influences on satisfaction.

9.7 Each stage of the user contact (first contact, response, follow-up, treatment and the whole experience) should be explored further with diagnostic questions. These questions provide an opportunity to identify the presence or absence of known satisfiers and dis-satisfiers. They can also help to explore the circumstances of the incident and its impact on the respondent.

9.8

It is required that forces/authorities use diagnostic questions to better understand the satisfaction levels generated by the core satisfaction questions. These diagnostic questions should be asked before the core

satisfaction questions.

For core questions on Access and Follow-up guidance is given on the topics which forces should explore with diagnostic questions. Forces/authorities may design their own questions, or use the recommendations given here, and in the sample survey formats.

There are some minimum diagnostics to precede the core question on Actions and Treatment which are given below. These are required of all forces and reflect aspects of the Quality of Service Commitment.

Required Diagnostic Question Area - Access

Before the question about satisfaction with ease of contacting the police –
To aid understanding about the levels of satisfaction with ease of first contact forces should explore:

How people contacted the police about the incident and about the speed and efficiency of the processes to take details of the incident.

Required Diagnostic Question Area - Actions

Before the question about satisfaction with the actions taken by the police –
To aid understanding about the levels of satisfaction with actions taken by the police forces/authorities are required to ask the following questions:

Did the police

- Explain what was going to happen and why?
- Provide you with a reference number?
- Provide you with a contact number to call?

In addition, they should explore:

What the respondent was told would happen, the involvement of other agencies, what explanation was given, how the incident was dealt with, what actions the police took and the impact of their actions.

Required Diagnostic Question Area – Follow Up

Before the question C about satisfaction with how well you were kept informed –

To aid understanding of the levels of satisfaction about how well people felt they were kept informed forces/authorities should explore:

Expectations of further contact and what further contact there has been.

Required Diagnostic Question Area - Treatment

Before the question about satisfaction with the way you were treated –
To aid understanding about the levels of satisfaction with the way people were treated by police officers and other staff, forces/authorities are required to ask

the following questions:

Did the police officers and staff who dealt with you

- Listen to what you had to say?
- Deal with you sympathetically?
- Treat you politely?
- Make the effort to understand the issue?
- Appear to take the matter seriously?

In addition, respondents should be invited to give free-text responses, allowing them to identify other issues that have affected their levels of satisfaction.

Required Diagnostic Question Area - Resolution

AFTER the question about satisfaction with service provided by the police in this case –

To aid understanding about the extent of repeat incidents and on-going problems, and any problem solving to resolve issues, forces/authorities should explore:

Whether the respondent has reported previous incidents of ASB, what outcomes are they aware of, and whether the problem has been resolved.

- 9.9 The required and recommended diagnostic questions have been developed and refined through testing. The questions are included in the recommended standard questionnaires at Annex C (telephone) and D (postal).

Optional diagnostic questions

- 9.10 Throughout the development and piloting process a number of additional questions have been tested and considered. Forces/authorities may wish to include some of the following, or to add their own additional questions to explore particular local priorities, or the delivery of local policies.

As an option when asking about the initial call or visit to the police station:

Did you have to give your details more than once?

and for those who have made contact by the 999 system:

Why did you use 999?

As an alternative to response lists for the questions about “What did they say would happen?” And “What did happen next?”, respondents could provide

free-text responses which are coded later. However, this would limited opportunities to route respondents through the survey.

The ASB survey provides an opportunity to gather additional feedback about feelings of safety and about neighbourhood policing.

Some of these optional questions may be useful to get a force-level picture.

Note - the ASB report may not have related to their home address – could have been business or town centre etc. Unless there is additional surveying there will not be sufficient post-code-level data to compare these results with general public surveys.

How safe do you feel walking alone in your local area after dark? (If you never go out alone try to consider how safe you would feel)

Very Safe
Fairly Safe
A bit unsafe
Very unsafe
Don't know

Do you avoid any particular areas in your neighbourhood because of worry about crime or anti-social behaviour?

Yes – all the time
Yes - only at night
No

How likely do you think you are...

- **To have your house burgled in the next year?**
- **To have your car/van stolen in the next year?**
- **To have things stolen from your car/van in the next year?**
- **To be mugged and robbed in the next year?**
- **To be physically attacked or assaulted by a stranger in the next year?**

Very likely
Fairly likely
Fairly unlikely
Very unlikely
Don't know/ N/A

Are you satisfied or dissatisfied with the way your neighbourhood is policed?

Completely Satisfied
Very Satisfied
Fairly Satisfied
Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
Fairly Dissatisfied

Very Dissatisfied
Completely Dissatisfied
Don't Know

Why do you say that?**To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the police in this area...?**

1. They (the police in this area) can be relied on to be there when you need them
2. They (the police in this area) would treat you with respect if you had contact with them for any reason
3. The police in this area treat everyone fairly regardless of who they are
4. They (the police in this area) can be relied on to deal with minor crimes
5. They (the police in this area) understand the issues that affect this community
6. They (the police in this area) are dealing with the things that matter to people in this community.
7. Taking everything into account I have confidence in the police in this area

Strongly agree
Tend to agree
Neither agree nor disagree
Tend to disagree
Strongly disagree
Don't know

Do you know any of the local neighbourhood police officers or police community support officers by name or by sight?

Yes – both (by name and sight)
Yes – by name only
Yes – by sight only
No

Do you know how to contact any of the local neighbourhood police officers or police community support officers by phone or e-mail?

Yes – both (by phone and e-mail)
Yes – by phone only
Yes – by e-mail only
No

RESEARCH BASE

The following summary of research evidence has been compiled by the Citizen Focused Policing Research Team, RDS (CRCSG), and sets out what we already know about public confidence and user satisfaction for callers involved in reporting ASB issues.

Public contact with the police - measuring its importance for citizen focus

- Public initiated contact with the police is associated with public confidence – the perception that police in the local area are doing a good job. (77% for those with no contact compared to 71% of those that had initiated contact with the police²; BCS 2003/4)
- Ratings of contact were linked to the overall perceptions of the police of those interviewed for a MORI survey on policing (2003).³ Those surveyed who had positive perceptions of their contact with the police were more likely to have a more favourable impression of the police's performance in their local area (85%) than those who were dissatisfied with their police contact (38%).

User satisfaction

- The following factors are measured in the BCS and have been drawn on for the user satisfaction survey design: reasonable length of wait, showed enough interest, showed enough effort, kept fairly or very well informed. These factors were first identified as important for both crime and disorder callers in Ekblom and Heal's 1982 study of the police response to calls from the public.⁴ Similar factors have been identified as most important to overall satisfaction in international research over the last twenty years.⁵
- The majority of callers in the 1982 study (for crime and for disorder) tended to be satisfied if they received reassurance and sympathy from police patrol attendance, regardless of the eventual outcome, and these features of contact have also been shown to be important for satisfaction with a sole telephone response.⁶
- Analysis on the most polarised views of those surveyed for the MORI survey – i.e. those who were either very satisfied or very dissatisfied – reinforces these findings and showed that perceptions of police treatment, how quickly the police responded and information provision were the key factors underlying the strongest views of those surveyed. However, while each factor seemed to be equally important in making respondents very

2 Main categories: to report a crime to report a suspicious person or circumstance, noise nuisance or other problem, to report an accident or other emergency to report a missing person or property or to give information.

⁴ E

⁵

⁶ G

satisfied, dissatisfaction around police treatment was most strongly associated with feelings of dissatisfaction overall.

- Satisfaction with the outcome is nonetheless important in overall public confidence. Victims who are satisfied with the outcome of their incident are more likely to say that local police are doing a good job (BCS 2003/4). Findings from the Ekblom and Heal study and more recent research in the USA⁷ suggest that ASB users' satisfaction with the initial call and response can decline if they become repeat callers, and/or if they perceive that there has been no action and/or the problem is not resolved.

Research References

ⁱ MORI (2003) Contacting the Police – Customer Satisfaction Survey. www.pm.gov.uk/opsr

ⁱⁱ Ekblom, P. and Heal. K. (1982) The Police Response to Calls from the Public. Research and Planning Unit Paper 9. London, Home Office.

ⁱⁱⁱ Sced, M. (2004) Public Satisfaction With Police Contact – Part II: self initiated contacts. Australasian Centre for Policing Research.
Brown, B. and Benedict, W. (2002) Perceptions of the Police: past findings, methodological issues, conceptual issues and policy implications. Policing: an international journal of police strategies and management. Vol 25, No 3, pp 543-580.

Skogan, W. (1994) Contacts between Police and Public: findings from the 1992 British Crime Survey. Home Office Research Study 134. London. Home Office.

^{iv} Glauser, M and Tullar, W. (1985) Citizen Satisfaction with Police Officer/Citizen Interaction: implications for the changing role of police organizations. Journal of Applied Psychology. Vol 70 No 3 pp 514-527

^v Cheurprakobkit, S. (2000) Police-citizen contact and police performance: attitudinal differences between Hispanics and non-Hispanics. Journal of Criminal Justice. Vol.28, pp325-336. Cited in Brown and Benedict (2002) op cit.

⁷c

Annex B

Anti-Social Behaviour codes on the National Incident Category List (NICL):**The following ASB codes should be INCLUDED in the sample:**

Abandoned vehicles (not stolen/causing obstruction)
Animal problems
Begging/vagrancy
Inappropriate use/sale/possession of Fireworks
Malicious communications
Noise
Prostitution related activity
Rowdy / nuisance - Environmental damage / littering
Rowdy / nuisance – Neighbours
Rowdy / nuisance - Rowdy or inconsiderate behaviour
Street drinking
Substance misuse
Trespass
Vehicle nuisance / inappropriate vehicle use

The following ASB codes should be EXCLUDED from the sample:

Hate incident (only to be used by forces unable to use the qualifiers)
Hoax calls to emergency services

If forces have introduced sub-level codes for any of the categories of ASB to be included in the sample, these sub-levels should also be included within the sample.

If the Race qualifier has been applied to any ASB incidents, these should be considered eligible for the Racist Incidents sample, rather than be included within the ASB sample.

Note: although almost all forces will be using NSIR from the beginning of 2006/7, we recognise that the standard will take some time to stabilise. This is another reason why the new ASB indicator will not take SPI status before 2007/8.

Forces who have not fully adopted NSIR from the beginning of 2006/7 are asked to draw a sample based on their existing incident codes, taking those which can be most closely aligned to the list here.