



Garda Research Unit
Research Report No. 12/07

GARDA PUBLIC ATTITUDES SURVEY 2007

Sergeant Patrick Kennedy and Garda Colm Browne

For further information contact:

**Garda Research Unit
Garda Síochána College
Templemore
Co. Tipperary**

Tel: (0504) 35428

Fax: (0504) 35455

Email: gru@iol.ie

Table of contents

List of tables	i
Executive Summary	v
Introduction	1
Overall satisfaction with Garda service	3
Experience of crime	7
Contact with the Gardaí	13
Emergency Garda response	19
Garda approachability	22
Unacceptable behaviour by Garda members	25
Racist incidents	27
Garda visibility and activity	28
Road traffic collisions	33
Policing priorities	34
Further views on the Garda Síochána	40
Public safety and fear of crime	43
Views on crime and the criminal justice system	51
Neighbourhood Watch and Community Alert	54
List of tables	
Table 1 Survey Methodologies: 2002-2007	2
Table 2 Overall satisfaction with Garda service to the community and year of survey	3
Table 3 Overall satisfaction with Garda service to the community: variation between highest and lowest Division rankings	3
Table 4 Overall satisfaction with Garda service to the community and Garda Division	4
Table 5 Overall satisfaction with Garda service: changes by Garda Division (percentage “very satisfied” or “satisfied”)	5
Table 6 Overall satisfaction with Garda service and gender	5
Table 7 Overall satisfaction with Garda service and age category	6
Table 8 Overall satisfaction with Garda service and housing tenure	6

Table 9	Overall satisfaction with Garda service and social class	7
Table 10	Crime victimisation in preceding calendar year	7
Table 11	Crime victimisation in 2006 and gender and age category	7
Table 12	Crime victimisation in 2006: incidents and crime types	8
Table 13	Crime victimisation in 2006 and Garda Division	8
Table 14	Type of crime in previous calendar year	9
Table 15	Was the crime (most recent) reported to the Gardaí?	9
Table 16	Reasons for not reporting crime	10
Table 17	Receipt of Garda letter about the crime	10
Table 18	Helpfulness of letter	10
Table 19	Victim informed of Garda name by other means?	10
Table 20	Contact by Gardaí about significant developments?	11
Table 21	Helpfulness of update letter	11
Table 22	Informed of significant developments by other means?	11
Table 23	Satisfaction with being kept informed of progress	11
Table 24	Satisfaction with being kept informed of progress and Garda Division	12
Table 25	Contact with Gardaí in preceding calendar year?	13
Table 26	Number of contacts with Gardaí in 2006	13
Table 27	Type of contact with Gardaí	14
Table 28	Frequency of contact and type of contact in 2006	15
Table 29	Form of most recent contact	15
Table 30	How quickly were you dealt with on visiting a Garda Station?	16
Table 31	How quickly was your telephone call answered?	16
Table 32	Was Garda station identified when telephone call was answered?	17
Table 33	Garda manner	17
Table 34	Follow-up contact by Gardaí (percentages reporting “yes”)	18
Table 35	Follow-up contact by Gardaí regarding outcome	18
Table 36	Dialled 999 or 112 for an emergency Garda response in previous calendar year	19
Table 37	Speed of answering telephone	19
Table 38	Response time to call out to respondent	20
Table 39	Satisfaction with the emergency Garda service received	20
Table 40	Satisfaction with overall contact with the Garda Síochána	20
Table 41	Satisfaction with overall contact with the Garda Síochána and Division	21
Table 42	Suggested improvements to Garda service	22
Table 43	Approachability of Gardaí at local station	22
Table 44	Approachability of Gardaí at local station: 2007 - 2002	22
Table 45	Approachability of Gardaí at local station and Division	23
Table 46	Approachability of Gardaí at local station and Division: 2007–2006	24
Table 47	Reasons for approachability or inapproachability	25
Table 48	Do you know any Garda member by name at your local station?	25
Table 49	Nature of any unacceptable behaviour	26
Table 50	Unacceptable behaviour and Garda Division (percentage of respondents who said that a Garda had ever behaved towards them in a way that they considered unacceptable)	27
Table 51	Garda visibility	28

Table 52	Satisfaction with the level of Garda visibility in the locality	29
Table 53	Satisfaction with the level of Garda visibility in the locality and Division	29
Table 54	Perceived changes in Garda activity in the locality in the last year	30
Table 55	Garda performance in the locality	31
Table 56	Garda performance in the locality and Division	32
Table 57	Local Garda performance by housing tenure 2007 and 2006	33
Table 58	Satisfaction with the Garda investigation of road traffic collisions	33
Table 59	Dissatisfaction with Garda investigation of road traffic collisions	33
Table 60	Respondents' policing priorities	35
Table 61	Respondents' perceptions of Garda priorities, ranked by mean score	36
Table 62	Comparison of respondents' priorities and their perception of Garda priorities – rankings	37
Table 63	Comparison of respondents' priorities and their perception of Garda priorities – mean scores	38
Table 64	Respondents' priorities: 2007 - 2002	39
Table 65	Relationship between the Gardaí and the community	40
Table 66	Relationship between the Gardaí and the community: 2007 - 2002	42
Table 67	How safe do you feel walking in your neighbourhood after dark?	43
Table 68	How safe do you feel alone in your home at night?	43
Table 69	Feelings of safety and Garda Division	44
Table 70	Feelings of safety and Garda Division: 2007, 2006, 2005 and 2002 surveys	45
Table 71	Do you feel more safe or less safe out walking in your area now than before?	46
Table 72	Do you worry that you or a family member or friend might become a victim of crime?	47
Table 73	Do you worry that you or a family member or friend might become a victim of personal injury or property theft/damage?	47
Table 74	Worry about crime victimisation and Garda Division (percentage "yes")	48
Table 75	How worried are you about the following crimes?	49
Table 76	How much did the fear of crime reduce your quality of life?	49
Table 77	Do you believe that crime is increasing, decreasing or staying the same?	50
Table 78	How would you describe crime in Ireland today?	50
Table 79	Do you think the following are a major, minor or no problem?	51
Table 80	What do you believe to be the main cause of crime in Ireland today?	52
Table 81	Do you believe that juvenile/teenage crime and drug abuse should be combated predominantly by punishment or rehabilitation/counselling?	52
Table 82	Criminal justice system treatment of offenders	53
Table 83	Views on the criminal justice system and public safety	53
Table 84	Is your household in a Neighbourhood Watch/Community Alert scheme?	54

Table 85	Do your scheme co-ordinators keep residents informed about criminal activity in your area?	54
Table 86	Do you know who your scheme co-ordinator(s) are?	54
Table 87	How successful do you think such schemes are in preventing crime? (all respondents)	55
Table 88	How successful do you think such schemes are in preventing crime?	55
Appendix 1	Questionnaire	56
Appendix 2	Survey methodology	71
Appendix 3	Social class definitions	75
Appendix 4	Sample profile	81

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the findings from the 2007 Garda Public Attitudes Survey. The main focus of the survey is on satisfaction with Garda service, policing priorities and experiences and fear of crime.

The survey is the sixth since 2002. This 2007 edition involved a sample of 10,000, essentially comprising a survey of 400 in each of the 25 Garda Divisions. Similar large-scale surveys were conducted in 2002, 2005 and 2006. The intervening surveys involved national samples of 1,000.

The survey was carried out by Millward Brown IMS by means of in-home, face-to-face interviews. Interviewing took place between 12 March and 26 June 2007. Respondents were selected according to quotas based on age, gender and social class. Results were subsequently weighted to ensure a match with national populations. The sampling methodology is biased towards the settled community and is likely to under-represent certain hard-to-reach groups. As with previous surveys, participants were aged 18 years or over.

Results in respect of key indicators, such as satisfaction with overall service, satisfaction with contact with the Gardaí, Garda approachability and overall performance at local level, have been consistent over the recent surveys despite the use of different survey companies and methodologies.

The survey findings are presented as point estimates and the true population figures are likely to lie within a margin of $\pm 1\%$ of the point estimate at the national level, and $\pm 4.9\%$ at the Divisional level. Wider margins apply in comparisons between years and between Divisions and for smaller sub-groups within the sample.

Satisfaction with overall Garda service to the community was 81 per cent, compared with 79 per cent in 2006, 83 per cent in 2005, 85 per cent in 2004, 81 per cent in 2003 and 87 per cent in 2002. Rates ranged within Garda Divisions from 68 to 89 per cent. Compared with 2006, satisfaction rates increased in 15 Divisions and declined in ten.

Satisfaction was lowest among those in local authority housing compared with other housing tenure categories.

Crime victimisation rates were similar to previous years, with 9.8 per cent saying they or a member of their household had been a victim of a crime in 2006 (down by 0.3 of a percentage point compared with the 2006 report). Divisional rates ranged from three to 22 per cent. The most prevalent crimes were domestic burglary, criminal damage to vehicle, physical assault, criminal damage to home or other property, and theft from vehicle.

As regards **crime reporting**, 87 per cent of those victimised said that they reported the most recent crime to the Gardaí, a similar rate to the 2006 survey (up by one percentage point). Fewer than half (45%) expressed satisfaction with **being kept informed of progress**. Divisional satisfaction rates ranged between ten and 68 per cent.

Forty per cent of respondents had **contact with the Gardaí** in 2006. The most common forms of respondent-initiated contact were to have a passport signed or to report a crime or a nuisance/disturbance. The most common forms of Garda-initiated contact were to carry out a routine vehicle check (on street) or to request the production of documents. Service quality aspects such as speed of service, speed of answering telephone call, identification of station, Garda helpfulness, competence, sensitivity, politeness and interest were broadly on a par with previous surveys.

Four per cent of respondents requested an **emergency Garda response** in 2006. In 82 per cent of cases their phone call was answered within 10 seconds; higher than in 2006 and 2005, but lower than in the surveys prior to 2005. Response time was within 15 minutes for 50 per cent of respondents. Seventy per cent expressed satisfaction with the service received, identical to the 2006 survey.

Satisfaction with overall contact with the Gardaí was 80 per cent, similar to the 2006 survey. Divisional satisfaction rates ranged between 69 and 86 per cent. Three-quarters (75%) felt that the Garda service needed to be improved. The most frequent suggestions were for greater manpower, more foot patrols, more contact with the community and longer station opening hours.

Asked about **Garda approachability**, 90 per cent of respondents described Gardaí at their local station as either very approachable or approachable. Divisional rates ranged between 81 and 96 per cent (excluding “don’t know” responses). Four out of ten (41%) respondents knew a member of the Force at their local station by name, similar to the 2006 report (40%).

As regards **unacceptable behaviour**, eight per cent of respondents said that a member of the Garda Síochána had, at some time, acted in an unacceptable way towards them, down on previous years. Divisional rates ranged between three and 13 per cent. The most frequent type of unacceptable behaviour was that a Garda was, “disrespectful or impolite” (four per cent of respondents).

Only 2.1 per cent of respondents said that they had ever been subjected to a **racist incident**, 18 per cent of whom said that they had reported the most recent incident to the Gardaí. The rate for non-nationals is significantly higher, rising to 26 per cent of the 245 respondents in the survey who were from outside the European Union. The survey is likely to under-represent certain minority groups and therefore understate racist incidents.

As regards **Garda visibility**, 53 per cent reported seeing a Garda in their locality in the previous week. The proportion who remembered seeing a Garda on the day of their interview was the same as in 2006 (eight per cent). Sixty-two per cent of respondents were satisfied with the level of Garda visibility in their locality. Divisional rates ranged between 44 and 79 per cent. Compared with 2006, improvements were registered in 16 Divisions, disimprovements in seven, while rates remained the same in two.

Ratings for **how good a job the Gardaí do in the locality** were at 82 per cent, up by two percentage points on 2006. Satisfaction rates were lower among local authority tenants compared with other housing tenure categories. Divisional ratings ranged from 62 to 88 per cent (“very good” or “fairly good”). Compared with 2006, 16 Divisions showed an increase in satisfaction ratings. Ratings for how good a job the Gardaí do in the locality **as regards road safety** were at 76 per cent, up by six percentage points on 2006. Divisional ratings ranged from 54 to 86 per cent, with 21 Divisions showing an increase in satisfaction ratings.

Four per cent of respondents had been involved in a **road traffic collision** in 2006. The level of satisfaction with the Garda investigation (80%) was higher than in the 2006 survey (78%).

Respondents were asked about their **policing priorities** and their perceptions of Garda priorities. The public's top priorities were, in rank order, ensuring an immediate emergency response, enforcing drug laws, targeting of organised crime, investigation of crime, dealing with crimes of sexual violence and enforcing drink driving laws. With a small number of exceptions, the public's rankings have been very consistent in recent surveys.

The perceived Garda priority ranking is generally different from respondents' own ranking. The more significant mismatches arise in respect to the sale of alcohol to those under age, underage drinking, youths racing around in cars (to which the public attaches a higher priority than they perceive the Gardaí do), State security and immigration (to which the public attaches a lower significance than they perceive the Gardaí do). It should be noted that regardless of rank positioning, the public attaches higher levels of priority to all activities than they perceive the Gardaí do.

Responses about the **relationship between the Gardaí and the community** showed, among other things, high degrees of confidence that anyone in Garda custody would have their rights fully respected, that the Gardaí would help if a person's rights were being infringed, and that the Gardaí carry out their role in a fair and impartial manner. Majorities disagreed that, *"the Gardaí discriminate against immigrants"* and that, *"the people around here have a real say in deciding what is important for the Gardaí to attend to"*.

Feelings of safety walking in the neighbourhood after dark were lowest in cities other than Dublin (Cork, Galway, Limerick and Waterford) and highest in Dublin and villages and rural areas. Overall, 75 per cent of respondents said that they felt safe out walking, four percentage points higher than in the 2006 survey. Divisional rates ranged from 65 to 88 per cent. The proportion that felt safe alone at home at night was 87 per cent, similar to the 2006 survey (86%). Divisional rates ranged from 76 to 94 per cent.

Regarding **fear of crime**, 37 per cent of respondents worried about becoming a victim of crime themselves while 44 per cent were worried about other family members and friends becoming victims. These figures represent improvements on the 2006 survey. Divisional rates for personal fear of becoming a victim ranged from 18 to 53 per cent while the range for fear for a family member or friend was 26 to 66 per cent.

Considerably more respondents thought crime and offending behaviour were major problems in the country as a whole than thought they were major problems in their own area. Drug crime featured highest in both categories.

Responses about **crime and the criminal justice system** showed, among other things, support for responding to juvenile offending and drug abuse primarily with treatment rather than punishment. At the same time, a majority of respondents considered that the criminal justice system was too lenient on offenders (78%), and disagreed that penalties for possession of cannabis and ecstasy should be more lenient (64%). Just fewer than half of respondents (49%) felt that victims get a raw deal from the criminal justice system.

Just over a quarter of respondents (27%) said they were in **Neighbourhood Watch/Community Alert** schemes, down on previous surveys. The activity levels of the schemes were higher than was reported in the 2006, 2005 and 2002 surveys, with 19 per cent of those in schemes saying that they were regularly informed about criminal activity in their area. Forty per cent believed that such schemes were successful in preventing crime, down on previous studies.

GARDA PUBLIC ATTITUDES SURVEY 2007

INTRODUCTION

This report presents the findings from the *Garda Public Attitudes Survey 2007*, the ninth in a series of national surveys commissioned by the Garda Síochána. The main focus of the survey is on satisfaction with Garda service, policing priorities and experiences and fear of crime. The results inform Garda policy and planning and form an important part of the Garda performance management system. The survey provides information on key performance indicators which are reported on in the Garda Annual Report. A copy of the survey questionnaire is presented in Appendix 1.

The survey fieldwork was carried out by Millward Brown IMS, who were commissioned following a competitive public tendering process. The survey was conducted by means of in-home face-to-face interviews, with respondents selected on the basis of quotas in each Garda Division. Interviewing took place between 12 March and 26 June 2007. Just over 10,000 interviews were completed across the 25 Garda Divisions, generating a representative sample of approximately 400 in each Division. Quotas were imposed by gender, age and social class based on known demographics of the adult population aged 18 years or over. Results were subsequently weighted at national level in order to adjust for differences between the known population and the sample. It should be noted that the sampling methodology is biased towards the settled community and is likely to under-represent members of the travelling community and certain other hard-to-reach groups such as non-English-speaking immigrants. Details of the methodology are presented in Appendix 2. A profile of respondents is provided in Appendix 4.

This year's survey was substantially larger than those carried out in 2003 and 2004 and of a similar size to those carried out in 2002, 2005 and 2006. The larger sample size allows assessment of Garda performance in each Division under key headings. Where relevant, results from these earlier surveys are presented in conjunction with the 2007 findings. Comparability between the surveys is maximised by retaining the exact wording in as many questions as possible.

Despite the use of different survey companies and methodologies over the years, the results are broadly consistent, at least at the national level.

A summary of methods used since 2002 is set out in Table 1. Earlier surveys occurred in 2000, 1998 and 1993/94 but are not reported on here.

Table 1 Survey Methodologies: 2002 - 2007

Year	Sample	Company	Methodology
2007	10,000	Millward Brown IMS	quota sampling, face-to face interviews
2006	10,000	Millward Brown IMS	quota sampling, face-to face interviews
2005	10,000	Millward Brown IMS	quota sampling, face-to face interviews
2004	1,000	RES	electoral register, telephone
2003	1,000	TNS/MRBI	telephone, random digit dialling
2002	10,000	RES	electoral register, telephone and postal

The survey results are presented in the report as point estimates and Millward Brown IMS state that the true population values are likely to lie within a range of ± 1 per cent of these point estimates at the national level and within a ± 4.9 per cent error margin at the Divisional level. Thus, for example, the true value of the national sample satisfaction rate of 80 per cent could vary between 79 and 81 per cent, while the true value of a similar Divisional satisfaction rate could lie between 75.1 and 84.9 per cent. Larger margins of error occur where questions were rotated and not asked of all respondents and for sub-categories of respondents where numbers were small. Comparisons with other surveys also need to take account of the error margins associated with those surveys. Multiple comparisons between Divisions widen the error margin further. Care should be taken, therefore, in drawing inferences from the survey results.

Results are presented under the following headings:

- Overall satisfaction with Garda service
- Experience of crime
- Contact with the Gardaí
- Emergency Garda response
- Garda approachability
- Unacceptable behaviour by Garda members
- Racist incidents
- Garda visibility and activity
- Road traffic collisions
- Policing priorities
- Further views on the Garda Síochána
- Public safety and fear of crime
- Views on crime and the criminal justice system
- Neighbourhood Watch and Community Alert.

OVERALL SATISFACTION WITH GARDA SERVICE

The 2007 survey found that 81 per cent of respondents were “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with overall Garda service to the community in 2006.¹

Table 2 Overall satisfaction with Garda service to the community and year of survey

Year	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Total
	%	%	%	%	n
2007	14	67	16	3	10000
2006	13	67	16	4	9976
2005	16	67	14	3	9999
2004	15	69	11	4	996
2003	17	64	15	4	982
2002	17	69	11	2	10045

Total respondent numbers are less than overall sample sizes due to exclusion of “don’t knows”.

The level of satisfaction varied substantially by Garda Division. In this study the range between the Divisions with the highest and lowest levels of satisfaction was 21 percentage points. In 2006 and 2005 this range had been 17 and 15 percentage points, respectively. See Table 3.

Table 3 Overall satisfaction with Garda service to the community: variation between highest and lowest Division rankings

Year	Division ranking	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Total
		%	%	%	%	n
2007	Highest	25	64	9	2	401
	Lowest	2	66	26	6	401
2006	Highest	24	61	14	1	401
	Lowest	4	64	27	6	391
2005	Highest	35	57	7	1	399
	Lowest	6	71	16	6	406

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

The highest level of satisfaction was in the Sligo/Leitrim Division where 89 per cent of respondents were “very satisfied” or “satisfied”. The lowest level of satisfaction was in Waterford/Kilkenny (68%). Results are presented in Table 4, with Divisions ranked on the basis of mean score.²

¹ There were n=1353 respondents in the “very satisfied category” and n=6734 in the “satisfied” category (total = 8087). Excluding respondents in the “don’t know” category (n=67), the calculation is $8087/10000 \times 100 = 80.9$ per cent. When “don’t know” responses are included, the percentage is 80.3. The corresponding figures for the 2006 report are 79.4 per cent and 78.9 per cent.

² Calculated on the basis of a score of 1 for “very satisfied”, 2 for “satisfied”, 3 for “dissatisfied” and 4 for “very dissatisfied” (“don’t knows” have been omitted). These scores are multiplied by the frequencies for each Division. Using the Sligo/Leitrim frequencies as an example $[(100 \times 1) + (256 \times 2) + (36 \times 3) + (6 \times 4)] / [100 + 512 + 108 + 24] = 744/398 = 1.87$. The lower the score, the higher the level of satisfaction.

Table 4 Overall satisfaction with Garda service to the community and Garda Division

Division	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
	%	%	%	%
Sligo/Leitrim	25	64	9	2
Kerry	23	60	15	2
Cork West	21	63	14	2
Tipperary	28	52	14	6
Roscommon/Galway East	17	70	10	3
Louth/Meath	17	67	14	2
Galway West	16	69	11	4
Limerick	19	64	14	4
Cork City	15	69	15	1
Mayo	11	76	12	2
Carlow/Kildare	15	67	15	3
Clare	16	64	18	3
Cavan/Monaghan	13	69	16	2
Wexford/Wicklow	8	77	13	2
Cork North	10	72	17	2
DMR South Central	16	62	18	5
DMR South	12	70	14	5
DMR East	10	71	16	4
DMR North Central	10	73	13	5
DMR North	9	69	20	2
Donegal	12	69	13	7
Longford/Westmeath	8	71	18	4
Laois/Offaly	5	68	23	5
DMR West	9	61	21	8
Waterford/Kilkenny	2	66	26	6
average	14	67	16	4

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Galway West and Limerick Divisions had the same mean scores (2.02), as had Cork North and DMR South Central (2.10), DMR East and DMR North Central (2.13) and DMR North and Donegal (2.15).

Compared with 2006, satisfaction levels were up in 15 Divisions and down in ten, based on the sum of those who were “very satisfied” and “satisfied”.³ Increases ranged from 8.4 to 0.5 percentage points, with decreases from 0.5 to 7.9 percentage points.

The largest decreases in satisfaction levels were in Laois/Offaly (-7.9) and DMR West (-5.2). The largest increase was in Wexford/Wicklow (+8.4), followed by Donegal (+7.8). See Table 5.

³ “Don’t knows” have been excluded from this calculation.

Table 5 Overall satisfaction with Garda service: changes by Garda Division (percentage “very satisfied” or “satisfied”)

Division	2007	2006	Change*	Division	2007	2006	Change
	%	%			%	%	
Sligo/Leitrim	89.4	84.5	+4.9	Carlow/Kildare	82.2	80.9	+1.3
Roscommon/Galway East	87.0	86.0	+1.0	DMR East	80.6	77.4	+3.2
Mayo	86.9	82.0	+4.9	Donegal	80.3	72.5	+7.8
Galway West	85.2	84.1	+1.1	DMR South	81.6	80.3	+1.3
Cork West	84.0	84.8	-0.8	Tipperary	79.8	81.7	-1.9
Cork City	83.8	81.4	+2.4	Clare	79.7	80.3	-0.6
Louth/Meath	84.0	77.5	+6.5	Longford/Westmeath	78.8	80.7	-1.9
Wexford/Wicklow	84.7	76.3	+8.4	DMR South Central	78.0	79.4	-1.4
Limerick	82.8	76.8	+6.0	DMR North	78.4	78.9	-0.5
Kerry	82.8	84.6	-1.8	Laois/Offaly	73.0	80.9	-7.9
DMR North Central	82.3	79.8	+2.5	DMR West	70.5	75.7	-5.2
Cavan/Monaghan	81.9	84.1	-2.2	Waterford/Kilkenny	68.0	67.5	+0.5
Cork North	81.5	76.3	+5.2	average	81.1	79.8	+1.3

*Change is given in percentage points.

There was little difference between genders for overall satisfaction (“very satisfied” or “satisfied”) with Garda service. Females reported slightly higher levels (82%) than males (80%). Females were up by two percentage points on 2006 levels, with males up by one point. See Table 6.

Table 6 Overall satisfaction with Garda service and gender

Year	Gender	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Total
		%	%	%	%	n
2007	male	14	66	16	4	4862
	female	14	68	15	3	5137
	average	14	67	16	4	9999
2006	male	13	66	17	4	4939
	female	13	67	16	4	5037
	average	13	67	16	4	9976

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Total respondent number is less than overall sample size due to the exclusion of “don’t knows”.

Older respondents (aged 65+) expressed greater satisfaction with service than their younger counterparts. The maximum variation (“very satisfied” and “satisfied” combined) between groups was four percentage points (between 45-64 years and 65+). There was an increase with age in the percentages saying they were “very satisfied” as opposed to “satisfied”. In each age category there was an increase in the percentage expressing satisfaction, compared with 2006. See Table 7.

Table 7 Overall satisfaction with Garda service and age category

Year	Age category	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Total
		%	%	%	%	n
2007	18-24	11	71	15	4	1380
	25-44	12	69	16	4	4166
	45-64	14	66	17	4	3062
	65+	21	63	14	3	1394
	average	15	67	16	4	10002
2006	18-24	10	68	16	5	1372
	25-44	10	69	17	4	4293
	45-64	14	65	16	4	2966
	65+	20	61	16	3	1345
	average	14	66	14	4	9976

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Total respondent numbers are less than overall sample size due to the exclusion of those in the category, "refused-not stated".

Those who privately rented their housing expressed the highest levels of satisfaction (85%) followed by owner-occupiers and "other" (81%), and than those in local authority housing (73%). Respondents in the "owner occupied", "rented privately" and "other" categories had identical rates of "very satisfied" respondents (14%).⁴ See Table 8.

Table 8 Overall satisfaction with Garda service and housing tenure

Housing tenure	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Total
	%	%	%	%	n
Owner occupied	14	67	16	3	7419
Local authority	10	63	19	8	1032
Rented privately	14	71	11	4	1085
Other	14	67	17	2	266
average	13	67	16	4	9802

Total respondent numbers are less than overall sample size due to the exclusion of those in the category, "refused-not stated".

Respondents in social class F (farmers) had the highest level of satisfaction (87%). Classes AB (upper middle class) and C1 (lower middle class) had the next highest rates at 83 per cent and 82 per cent, respectively. Categories C2 (skilled working class) and DE (other working class and lowest level of subsistence, respectively) had identical rates (79%). See Table 9. Compared with the 2006 findings, satisfaction levels were up in all classes.⁵

⁴ The "owner-occupied" category included those who own their house outright and those who own with a loan. The local authority category included those renting and purchasing their houses from the local authority.

⁵ A list of social class definitions can be found in Appendix 3.

Table 9 Overall satisfaction with Garda service and social class

Social class category	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Total
	%	%	%	%	n
AB	17	66	14	3	905
C1	13	69	16	3	3194
C2	13	66	16	4	2317
DE	13	66	17	4	2086
F	18	69	11	2	676
average	15	67	15	3	9178

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Total respondent number is less than overall sample size due to the exclusion of "don't knows".

EXPERIENCE OF CRIME

The level of crime victimisation was 9.8 per cent, down by 0.3 of a percentage point on last year. Over the last five years the rate ranged from 11.7 (2005 report) to 9.8 (2007 report). See Table 10.

Table 10 Crime victimisation in preceding calendar year

Year	2007	2006	2005	2004	2003
	%	%	%	%	%
respondent	6.1	5.7	6.9	6.3	5.8
household member	2.9	3.1	3.7	3.7	3.7
both	0.8	1.3	1.1	0.3	1.2
not a victim	90.1	89.8	88.3	89.9	89.3
total sample size (n)	10067	10046	10035	1000	1005

Some percentages do not sum to 100 due to the omission of the 'don't know' category.

For respondents who were personally a victim of crime in 2006, the breakdown by gender and age category is set out in Table 11. Males and those aged 25-44 years were somewhat over-represented among the victims, as seen in the respective ratios.

Table 11 Crime victimisation in 2006 and gender and age category

Status	Gender		Age			
	Male	Female	18-24	25-44	45-64	65+
	%	%	%	%	%	%
victims	53.2	46.8	12.2	46.8	29.9	11.1
full sample	48.6	51.4	13.8	41.6	30.6	14.0
ratio	1.09	0.91	0.88	1.13	0.98	0.79

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Victims only include respondents (not other household members).

The majority of victims experienced just one crime incident (84%) and one crime type (84%). Sixteen per cent were victims on more than one occasion, including three per cent who were victimised on four or more occasions. See Table 12.

Table 12 Crime victimisation in 2006: incidents and crime types

Category	1	2	3	4	5 or more	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	n
incidents	84	9	4	1	2	1069
crime type	84	12	2	1	1	979

Includes respondent and household victims.

There was considerable variation in Divisional rates of crime victimisation, as was the case in 2006. Mayo and Clare Divisions recorded the lowest rates, at less than half the national average; DMR Divisions South and South Central recorded the highest, with South Central over double the average. The average was 9.3 compared with 9.4 in the 2006 report. Rural Divisions that recorded higher than average victimisation rates were Laois/Offaly, Carlow/Kildare, Cavan/Monaghan, Longford/Westmeath, Wexford/Wicklow, Louth/Meath and Limerick. See Table 13.

Table 13 Crime victimisation in 2006 and Garda Division

Garda Division	%	Garda Division	%
Mayo	2.7	Carlow/Kildare	9.7
Clare	4.6	DMR North Central	9.8
Cork West	4.8	Cavan/Monaghan	10.4
Cork North	5.3	Longford/Westmeath	10.4
Roscommon/Galway East	6.0	Wexford/Wicklow	10.7
Tipperary	6.3	DMR North	10.8
Sligo/Leitrim	6.5	Louth/Meath	11.3
Cork City	6.8	DMR West	12.5
Galway West	7.1	DMR East	12.6
Waterford/Kilkenny	8.0	Limerick	12.8
Kerry	9.0	DMR South	14.5
Donegal	9.3	DMR South Central	22.2
Laois/Offaly	9.6	average	9.3

The most common crimes were domestic burglary (experienced by 26 per cent of victims) and criminal damage to car or other vehicle (18%). These had also been the most frequently cited crimes in the 2006 survey. The reported rate of burglary here was down by two percentage points on 2006, while the rate for physical assault was up by three percentage points on the 2006 rate. See Table 14.

Table 14 Type of crime in previous calendar year

Type of crime	Percentage victimised at least once	
	2007	2006
	%	%
burglary of home or outbuildings	26	28
burglary of business premises owned by respondent	4	5
theft of vehicle	9	12
theft from vehicle	10	10
theft of bicycle	4	5
criminal damage to car or other vehicle	18	15
criminal damage to home or other property	11	11
robbery involving force or threat (including mugging)	5	5
theft from person without force (e.g. pickpocket)	6	6
theft from home or outbuildings (other than burglary)	5	5
consumer fraud (e.g. swindling or false pretences)	2	1
physical assault (other than sexual or domestic)	14	11
sexual assault	1	1
domestic violence (physical)	1	1
other	5	8
total (n)	1175	1251

The majority of victims (87%) said that the most recent crime was reported to the Gardaí, which was consistent with previous surveys. See Table 15.

Table 15 Was the crime (most recent) reported to the Gardaí?

Survey	Yes	No	Total
	%	%	n
2007	87	13	978
2006	86	14	1006
2005	83	17	1167
2004	79	21	101
2003	81	19	107
2002	84	16	1292

Where crimes were not reported, it was mostly because the respondent felt that the Gardaí could not have done anything; thought there was no chance of recovering property or felt the crime was not serious enough or believed the Gardaí would not have been interested,. These were also the dominant reasons in the 2006 survey. See Table 16.

Table 16 Reasons for not reporting crime

Reason	2007	2006	2005
	%	%	%
not serious enough/no loss	28	19	27
no chance of recovering property	29	24	34
no insurance claim anticipated	4	7	5
believed Gardaí could not have done anything	38	38	42
believed Gardaí would not have been interested	20	25	29
felt the Gardaí would not believe you	6	4	5
no involvement wanted with the Gardaí	5	14	9
fear of reprisal	5	4	6
did not have time	1	2	1
other	12	18	9
number of respondents	132	130	198

Respondents could give more than one reason, so percentages do not sum to 100.

Over one in four victims (29%) who reported to the Gardaí indicated that they had received a letter acknowledging the report of the crime and giving the name of the Garda dealing with the case or other information. This finding was in keeping with the 2006 survey. See Table 17.

Table 17 Receipt of Garda letter about the crime

Receipt of letter		Yes	No	Total
		%	%	n
Survey	2007	29	71	773
	2006	27	73	807

Most recipients found the letter helpful. See Table 18.

Table 18 Helpfulness of letter

Year	Very helpful	Helpful	Not much help	No help	Total
	%	%	%	%	n
2007	30	44	21	6	224
2006	28	40	24	8	217

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Two-fifths (41%) of victims who did not receive or did not recall receiving a letter said that they had been given the name of the Garda dealing with the case by some other means. See Table 19.

Table 19 Victim informed of Garda name by other means?

Year	Yes	No	Total
	%	%	n
2007	41	59	741
2006	46	54	755

Twelve per cent of victims said that they received a letter reporting significant developments in their case, such as an arrest. See Table 20.

Table 20 Contact by Gardaí about significant developments?

Receipt of letter		Yes	No	Total
		%	%	n
Survey	2007	12	88	791
	2006	13	87	811

The majority found the update letter helpful. See Table 21.

Table 21 Helpfulness of update letter

Year	Very helpful	Helpful	Not much help	No help	Total
	%	%	%	%	n
2007	44	44	12	-	92
2006	34	50	12	5	104

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Just over a quarter (27%) of victims who did not receive or recall receiving an update letter reported that they had been informed by the Gardaí in some other way about significant developments in the case. See Table 22.

Table 22 Informed of significant developments by other means?

Year	Yes	No	Total
	%	%	n
2007	27	73	777
2006	25	75	802

Forty-five per cent of respondents expressed satisfaction with being kept informed of progress with their case. This level of satisfaction is up by three percentage points on the 2006 figure. See Table 23.

Table 23 Satisfaction with being kept informed of progress

Survey	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Total
	%	%	%	%	n
2007	11	34	35	21	824
2006	10	32	34	24	857
2005	12	37	31	21	956
2004	12	31	26	31	75
2003	9	28	37	26	82
2002	15	33	31	21	1045

Satisfaction with being kept informed of progress varied widely between Garda Divisions and compared with the 2006 survey. The level of variation is due in large part to the small sample sizes, as the question was confined to those in each Division who reported a crime to the Gardaí. Respondent numbers varied from just 10 in Mayo to 65 in DMR South Central (range was 15-59 in 2006). The results must therefore be interpreted with caution.

Table 24 Satisfaction with being kept informed of progress and Garda Division

Garda Division	Satisfied/very satisfied		
	2007	2006	Change
	%	%	percentage points
DMR East	65.1	39.6	+25.5
Galway West	32.0	38.2	-6.2
Roscommon/Galway East	42.9	39.1	+3.8
DMR South Central	67.7	45.3	+22.4
Cork North	47.4	26.9	+20.5
DMR South	44.2	55.9	-11.7
Laois/Offaly	37.5	43.5	-6.0
DMR West	30.8	45.5	-14.7
Cavan/Monaghan	51.4	47.2	+4.2
Waterford/Kilkenny	25.8	18.2	+7.6
Clare	25.0	59.1	-34.1
Cork West	42.1	46.7	-4.6
Cork City	51.9	52.0	-0.1
Longford/Westmeath	32.4	11.5	+20.9
Tipperary	45.8	47.8	-2.0
DMR North Central	50.0	50.9	-0.9
Limerick	45.2	44.7	+0.5
Mayo	10.0	33.3	-23.3
Carlow/Kildare	44.1	43.2	+0.9
Wexford/Wicklow/Wicklow	42.4	33.3	+9.1
Louth/Meath	44.7	34.0	+10.7
Sligo/Leitrim	44.0	37.9	+6.1
DMR North	36.8	47.5	-10.7
Kerry	43.8	23.5	+20.3
Donegal	45.2	22.2	+23.0
average	41.9	39.5	+2.4

Ranked in terms of the percentages that were “satisfied” or “very satisfied”, Divisional satisfaction rates ranged from 67.7 per cent in DMR South Central to ten per cent in Mayo. Compared with 2006, 14 Divisions recorded an increase in satisfaction and 11, a decrease. The largest increases occurred in DMR East (+25 percentage points), Donegal (+23) and DMR South Central (+22). The largest decreases were recorded in Clare (-34 percentage points), Mayo (-23) and DMR West (-15). See Table 24.

CONTACT WITH THE GARDAÍ

Forty per cent of respondents reported having had contact with the Gardaí in 2006, similar to the rate in the 2006 report (for year 2005). See Table 25.

Table 25 Contact with Gardaí in preceding calendar year?

Survey	Yes	No	Total
	%	%	n
2007	40.3	59.7	10067
2006	41.8	58.2	10046
2005	42.6	57.4	10046
2004	38.1	61.9	1016
2003	55.4	44.6	1007
2002	37.9	62.1	10405

Most had contact on one occasion only (67%). Six per cent had four or more contacts during the year. See Table 26.

Table 26 Number of contacts with Gardaí in 2006

Survey 2007	1	2	3	4	5 or more	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	n
Those who had contact	67	20	7	3	3	4058

The main reasons for respondent-initiated contact were to have passport forms signed or to report a crime or disturbance, similar to the pattern in 2006. The main type of Garda-initiated contact was to carry out a routine vehicle check or to request the production of documents. See Table 27.

Table 27 Type of contact with Gardaí

Type of contact	2007	2006	2005
	%	%	%
Respondent-initiated contact			
to report a crime	14	20	19
to report a disturbance/nuisance	8	13	12
to report a traffic accident	4	7	5
to report a suspicious activity	2	7	6
to report lost/found property	2	4	5
to make a general inquiry	5	10	11
to make a complaint	4	8	8
to enquire about a person in custody	1	1	1
to be a witness	1	3	2
signing passports	26	34	28
to avail of other services	9	12	14
Garda-initiated contact			
to produce documents	5	8	8
to ask about a crime	2	5	5
to investigate a traffic collision	1	2	2
to investigate noise/disturbance	1	2	2
to carry out a routine vehicle check (on-street)	6	11	12
to take a witness statement	1	2	2
alleged speeding offence	1	3	2
alleged drink driving offence	1	1	-
alleged other driving/traffic offence	1	1	1
arrested, detained for questioning or searched	1	1	1
to receive summons	1	1	1
total (at least one contact as % of total sample)	40	42	43
total (number with at least one contact)	4058	4201	4284

Respondents could indicate more than one type of contact.

Most respondents had only one contact per type of contact, but sizeable minorities had more than one contact in the same category. For example, 17 per cent of those who were in contact to report a crime had contact under this heading more than once (although not necessarily in connection with the same incident). See Table 28.

Table 28 Frequency of contact and type of contact in 2006

Type of contact	Number of contacts		
	1	2	3 or more
	%	%	%
Self-initiated contact			
to report a crime	83	9	8
to report a disturbance/nuisance	66	15	19
to report a traffic accident	91	5	4
to report a suspicious activity	73	12	15
to report lost/found property	91	8	1*
to make a general inquiry	83	12	5
to make a complaint	76	11	13
to enquire about a person in custody	58	18*	24*
to be a witness	91	6*	3*
signing passports	94	5	1
to avail of other services	91	6	3
Garda-initiated contact			
to produce documents	86	7	7
to ask about a crime	85	15	1*
to investigate a traffic collision	90	7*	3*
to investigate noise/disturbance	78	12*	11*
to carry out a routine vehicle check (on-street)	53	20	28
to take a witness statement	89	7*	5*
alleged speeding offence	94	5*	1*
alleged drink driving offence	93	7*	-
alleged other driving/traffic offence	88	8*	4*
arrested, detained for questioning or searched	74	18*	9*
to receive summons	88	8*	5*
other reason	78	9*	12

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. * Denotes that percentages are based on numbers fewer than 10.

The form of the most recent contact is reported in Table 29. By far the most common forms were a visit to a Garda station (61%) or a telephone call to the Gardaí (22%). These forms of contact had identical rates to the 2006 report. Visit to a station was higher in 2007 and 2006 than in 2005, while telephone call to the Gardaí was lower in 2007 and 2006 than it had been in 2005. Contact on the street (patrol or checkpoint) was at similar levels in 2007, 2006 and 2005.

Table 29 Form of most recent contact

Form of contact	2007	2006	2005
	%	%	%
visit to Garda station	61	61	58
telephone call to the Gardaí (excluding 999/112 calls)	22	22	24
telephone call from the Gardaí	1	2	1
letter from the Gardaí	1	1	0
electronic means (email etc.)	1	1	-
spoke to Garda on patrol	2	3	3
spoke to Garda at checkpoint/vehicle stop	8	7	7
Garda called to home or work	4	4	5
other	1	2	2
total (n)	4057	4151	4243

Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

A sizeable majority of visitors to stations were dealt with more quickly than expected or within the time expected. Results were on a par with previous years, although compared with earlier surveys there has been a decrease in the percentage that answered “quicker than expected” in 2007 and 2006. See Table 30.

Table 30 How quickly were you dealt with on visiting a Garda Station?

Survey	Quicker than expected	Within the time expected	Slower than expected	Total
	%	%	%	n
2007	28	60	12	2435
2006	28	61	11	2517
2005	33	56	11	2447
2004	41	48	11	171
2003	38	50	12	321
2002	34	57	9	1618

The vast majority (89%) of those who telephoned the Gardaí, other than by emergency number, said that their call was answered promptly or following a short delay. In each of the last five years there has been a decrease in the percentage answering “promptly”. See Table 31.

Table 31 How quickly was your telephone call answered?

Survey	Promptly	Following a short delay	After an unacceptable delay	Had to call more than once before getting through	Total
	%	%	%	%	n
2007	69	20	5	6	850
2006	70	21	3	5	876
2005	74	18	4	4	994
2004	77	8	5	10	123
2003	88	6	4	2	124
2002	79	11	3	7	1300

Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Just over three-quarters (76%) of telephone callers said that the Garda gave the station name when answering, while five per cent said that the station name was not given. The percentages were similar to earlier surveys other than the small-scale survey of 2003. See Table 32. Excluding “don’t know” answers, 93 per cent of respondents said that the Garda gave the station name.

Table 32 Was Garda station identified when telephone call was answered?

Survey	Yes	No	Don't know	Total
	%	%	%	n
2007	76	5	19	874
2006	77	6	17	894
2005	75	7	19	994
2004	73	12	15	124
2003	84	4	13	128
2002	76	8	16	1300

Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Respondents were asked about the helpfulness, competence, sensitivity, politeness and interest shown by the Garda with whom they spoke. The majority of respondents said that the Garda's manner met or exceeded their expectations, ranging from 91 per cent for politeness, to 87 per cent for interest. Compared with the previous survey, the percentages saying that Garda performance was better than expected was identical in three performance categories (helpfulness, competence, interest), and slightly increased in two (sensitivity, politeness). Compared with the last two large-scale surveys (2006 and 2005), percentages in the "worse than expected" category were almost identical across all performance categories (except for "competence" in 2007 where there was a slight increase). See Table 33.

Table 33 Garda manner

Service category	Performance category	2007	2006	2005	2004	2003
		%	%	%	%	%
Helpfulness	better than expected	21	21	25	30	31
	as expected	69	70	65	59	57
	worse than expected	10	10	10	10	11
Competence	better than expected	17	17	21	24	28
	as expected	73	74	70	63	64
	worse than expected	10	9	9	13	8
Sensitivity	better than expected	17	15	19	25	24
	as expected	72	74	70	65	66
	worse than expected	11	11	11	11	10
Politeness	better than expected	20	19	23	30	33
	as expected	71	72	69	66	60
	worse than expected	9	9	9	5	7
Interest	better than expected	17	17	21	24	27
	as expected	70	70	65	62	61
	worse than expected	14	14	14	14	12

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Table 34 presents the results for follow-up contact by Gardaí, focusing on the most recent contact by the respondent. Just under a fifth of those who made contact felt that a Garda should call to them (19%). In almost three-quarters (74%) of these cases (not in Table 34), they were told that a Garda would call, and in the majority of these cases a Garda actually called (72%). Percentages are similar or identical to 2006 as regards the Gardaí indicating that someone would call and calling where they said they would. There was a decrease of two percentage points in 2007 as regards respondents being told how long it would be before someone would call (50%), and an increase of two percentage points in relation to Gardaí calling within the time indicated (79%), compared with 2006.

Table 34 Follow-up contact by Gardaí (percentages reporting “yes”)

Aspect of follow-up contact	2007	2006	2005	2004	2003
	%	%	%	%	%
Do you think the matter required a Garda to call to your home (most recent contact)?	19	21	22	29	21
Did the Gardaí indicate that someone would call on you?	17	18	19	23	21
Did a Garda call on you?	85	85	86	76	78
Were you told how long it would be before someone would call on you?	50	52	53	40	52
Did a Garda call on you within the time indicated?	79	77	83	77	69

The Gardaí got in touch with just under one in five respondents about the outcome of their contact (18%). The majority of respondents who were not contacted did not think contact was necessary. See Table 35.

Table 35 Follow-up contact by Gardaí regarding outcome

Aspect of follow-up contact	2007	2006	2005	2004	2003
	%	%	%	%	%
Did the Garda Síochána get in touch later to inform you about the outcome of your contact?	18	22	19	15	17
Do you think you should have been contacted?	20	21	19	*	*

*Not reported in 2003 and 2004.

EMERGENCY GARDA RESPONSE

One in twenty-five respondents sought an emergency Garda response in 2006 by dialling 999 or 112, a rate similar to previous surveys. See Table 36.

Table 36 Dialled 999 or 112 for an emergency Garda response in previous calendar year

Survey	Yes	Total
	%	n
2007	4	10067
2006	5	10046
2005	5	10046
2004	3	1014
2003	5	999
2002	5	10405

Of those who did seek an emergency response, 82 per cent had their call answered within 10 seconds (excluding 14 per cent who couldn't remember). This rate was higher than in 2006 and 2005 but lower than the rates in 2004, 2003 and 2002. See Table 37.

Table 37 Speed of answering telephone

Survey	Including "not sure"				Excluding "not sure"		
	Within 10 seconds	Outside 10 seconds	Not sure	Total	Within 10 seconds	Outside 10 seconds	Total
	%	%	%	n	%	%	n
2007	70	16	14	395	82	18	338
2006	68	17	15	448	80	20	380
2005	66	20	14	456	76	24	391
2004	-	-	-	-	87	13	30
2003	-	-	-	-	90	10	43
2002	72	15	14	478	83	17	413

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Where an emergency response was provided, half the time it came within 15 minutes. No emergency response was provided in 13 per cent of cases (but one may not always have been needed). See Table 38. In the 128 cases where response took more than 15 minutes, 67 per cent were within 30 minutes (n=86), 86 per cent within one hour (n=110) and 95 per cent within two hours (n=121). Times longer than two hours were recorded in seven cases.

Table 38 Response time to call out to respondent

Survey	Including "did not respond"				Excluding "did not respond"		
	Within 15 minutes	Longer than 15 minutes	Did not respond	Total	Within 15 minutes	Longer than 15 minutes	Total
	%	%	%	n	%	%	n
2007	50	38	13	366	57	43	319
2006	53	36	12	400	59	41	353
2005	51	38	11	373	58	42	332
2002	47	36	17	415	57	43	344

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Not asked in 2003 and 2004.

A majority of respondents (70%) were satisfied with the emergency response received. This was similar to the finding in the 2006 report. See Table 39.

Table 39 Satisfaction with the emergency Garda service received

Survey	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Total
	%	%	%	%	n
2007	20	50	18	13	369
2006	25	45	17	13	412
2005	26	43	16	15	395
2004	34	35	12	20	30
2003	50	31	15	4	44
2002	32	31	22	15	453

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Thinking of their overall contact with the Gardaí, 80 per cent of respondents expressed satisfaction ("very satisfied" and "satisfied" combined) and 20 per cent, dissatisfaction. These rates are similar to those in 2006. See Table 40.

Table 40 Satisfaction with overall contact with the Garda Síochána

Survey	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Total
	%	%	%	%	n
2007	20	60	15	6	3829
2006	20	59	14	6	4068
2005	25	55	14	6	4128
2002	27	55	13	4	4012

Not asked in 2003, 2004. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Satisfaction levels ranged from 86 per cent in Tipperary to 69 per cent in Waterford/Kilkenny. Compared with results from the 2006 survey, increases were recorded in 17 Divisions, decreases in seven, and no change in another. The largest increase was in Sligo/Leitrim (10.1 percentage points); the largest decrease in Mayo (4.2 percentage points). The results have to be interpreted with caution as the sample sizes are small, restricted as they are to respondents who had contact with the Gardaí in the preceding calendar year. See Table 41.

Table 41 Satisfaction with overall contact with the Garda Síochána and Division

Garda Division	2007	2006	Change
	Satisfied/ Very satisfied	Satisfied/ Very satisfied	
	%	%	Percentage points
Carlow/Kildare	82.7	84.2	-1.5
Cavan/Monaghan	74.5	76.6	-2.1
Clare	82.3	74.8	+7.5
Cork City	81.2	77.6	+3.6
Cork North	85.0	78.8	+6.2
Cork West	82.2	76.0	+6.2
DMR East	80.7	76.3	+4.4
DMR North	81.7	77.8	+3.9
DMR North Central	74.5	75.6	-1.1
DMR South	80.6	73.4	+7.2
DMR South Central	78.5	76.4	+2.1
DMR West	75.0	74.8	+0.2
Donegal	70.4	73.1	-2.7
Galway West	84.8	80.4	+4.4
Kerry	84.2	86.8	-2.6
Laois/Offaly	78.0	71.6	+6.4
Limerick	79.7	83.2	-3.5
Longford/Westmeath	79.8	72.7	+7.1
Louth/Meath	76.1	75.9	+0.2
Mayo	78.0	82.2	-4.2
Roscommon/Galway East	80.3	80.3	0.0
Sligo/Leitrim	83.6	73.5	+10.1
Tipperary	86.2	78.2	+8.0
Waterford/Kilkenny	69.0	68.5	+0.5
Wexford/Wicklow/Wicklow	76.5	68.8	+7.7
average	79.4	76.7	+2.7

Divisional sample sizes ranged between 87 in Tipperary and 209 in DMR South Central.

Three-quarters of respondents (75%) felt that the Garda service needed to be improved (77%, 73% and 64% in 2006, 2005 and 2002, respectively). Respondents were invited to make unprompted suggestions for improvements. The suggestions most frequently mentioned were for more Gardaí, more Gardaí on foot patrol, more contact with the community and longer station opening hours. See Table 42.

Table 42 Suggested improvements to Garda service

Suggestion	Percentage of respondents		
	2007	2006	2005
greater manpower	54	60	56
more Garda foot patrols	54	54	52
more contact with the community	30	31	-
Garda stations open longer	27	24	21
enforce traffic laws more thoroughly	18	21	15
Gardaí to be friendlier	16	15	11
miscellaneous other	9	11	14

n=7475 in 2007, n=7720 in 2006 and n=7350 in 2005; unprompted answers.

GARDA APPROACHABILITY

Respondents were asked, “In general, how approachable do you think the Gardaí are at your local station?” Seventy-nine per cent said that they were approachable or very approachable, an identical rate to 2006. Just two per cent said that they were very unapproachable. See Table 43.

Table 43 Approachability of Gardaí at local station

Level of approachability	2007	2006
	%	%
very approachable	33	31
approachable	46	48
unapproachable	6	6
very unapproachable	2	2
don't know	13	13
total	10067	10046

For the purpose of comparison with previous years, categories have been amalgamated and “don't know” answers excluded in Table 44. The 2007 survey result is identical to that in 2006. Results for 2007 and 2006 represent a deterioration on earlier years, with one in ten respondents now describing local Gardaí as unapproachable.

Table 44 Approachability of Gardaí at local station: 2007- 2002

Year	Very approachable/ approachable	Very unapproachable/ unapproachable	Total
	%	%	n
2007	90	10	8771
2006	90	10	8792
2005	91	9	8969
2004	95	5	982
2003	94	6	959
2002	95	5	9618

In terms of age group and housing tenure, those in the 65+ cohort (95%) and those who owned their own houses (92%) reported the highest rates of Garda approachability. These rates were notably different from the lowest rates in each category, which were reported by those aged 18-24 (83%) and those in local authority housing (81%).

The number who considered the local Gardaí as “very approachable” varied from 51 per cent in Cork West and Tipperary to 18 per cent in Cavan/Monaghan. The number who considered the local Gardaí as “very unapproachable” varied from one per cent (in eight Divisions) to six per cent in DMR South, DMR West, and Waterford/Kilkenny Divisions. See Table 45. The table is not rank ordered because the wide variation in the number of “don’t knows” would distort the results.

Table 45 Approachability of Gardaí at local station and Division

Garda Division	Very approachable	Approachable	Unapproachable	Very unapproachable	Don't know
	%	%	%	%	%
Carlow/Kildare	36	47	4	2	11
Cavan/Monaghan	18	54	7	2	19
Clare	26	42	10	2	20
Cork City	30	39	5	1	25
Cork North	35	49	6	1	9
Cork West	51	34	6	2	7
DMR East	22	36	10	1	31
DMR North	34	53	3	1	9
DMR North Central	21	60	5	2	11
DMR South	29	50	7	6	9
DMR South Central	26	50	12	3	9
DMR West	26	45	11	6	12
Donegal	24	48	7	5	17
Galway West	31	45	3	3	18
Kerry	48	41	4	3	5
Laois/Offaly	38	45	6	3	8
Limerick	51	36	6	1	6
Longford/Westmeath	27	57	7	1	9
Louth/Meath	36	43	3	1	18
Mayo	33	54	2	1	9
Roscommon/Galway E.	38	43	6	3	10
Sligo/Leitrim	34	52	5	2	7
Tipperary	46	40	4	3	7
Waterford/Kilkenny	19	51	10	6	15
Wexford/Wicklow/Wicklow	39	39	4	3	15
average	33	46	6	3	13

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Comparisons with 2006 are complicated by the variations in “don’t know” answers. To simplify, “don’t knows” have been excluded and comparisons have been based on the percentage who rate the local Gardaí as “approachable” or “very approachable”. Using this measure, 14 Divisions showed an increase in perceived approachability compared with 2006. The largest increases were in the DMR North, Louth/Meath and Kerry Divisions (up by 8.4, 6.5 and 3.8 percentage points, respectively). The remaining 11 Divisions showed decreases in perceived approachability. The largest decreases were in DMR South Central, DMR West and DMR South (down by 7.7, 6.6 and 5.8 percentage points, respectively). See Table 46.

Table 46 Approachability of Gardaí at local station and Division: 2007–2006

Garda Division	Very approachable/ approachable			Garda Division	Very approachable/ approachable		
	2007	2006	change		2007	2006	change
	%	%	% points		%	%	% points
Carlow/Kildare	93.5	92.3	+1.2	Galway West	92.9	92.6	+0.3
Cavan/Monaghan	89.0	90.6	-1.6	Kerry	92.9	89.1	+3.8
Clare	85.3	88.0	-2.7	Laois/Offaly	90.1	88.9	+1.2
Cork City	92.4	89.8	+2.6	Limerick	92.6	93.0	-0.4
Cork North	92.3	89.3	+3.0	Longford/Westmth	92.3	91.7	+0.6
Cork West	91.6	91.2	+0.4	Louth/Meath	95.7	89.2	+6.5
DMR East	84.3	88.8	-4.5	Mayo	96.3	93.6	+2.7
DMR North	95.1	86.7	+8.4	Roscom./Galway E	90.3	95.2	-4.9
DMR Nth Central	91.5	88.0	+3.5	Sligo/Leitrim	92.7	93.7	-1.0
DMR South	86.3	92.1	-5.8	Tipperary	92.2	93.4	-1.2
DMR Sth Central	83.3	91.0	-7.7	Waterford/Kilkenny	81.6	84.3	-2.7
DMR West	80.8	87.4	-6.6	Wexford/Wicklow/ Wicklow	91.5	89.4	+2.1
Donegal	86.4	84.5	+1.9	average	90.1	90.2	-0.1

Percentages exclude “don’t know” responses.

Reasons why respondents thought the Gardaí were approachable or unapproachable are presented in Table 47. In answering, respondents were not prompted and could give more than one reason. For those who felt the Gardaí were approachable, by far the most frequently cited reason was that the Gardaí were friendly or helpful, followed by “they have time for you”, and “[you] can communicate with them”. Among those who considered the Gardaí unapproachable, the most frequently cited reasons were that they were “unfriendly/rude”, “just not interested” or “think they are superior/formal manner”.

Table 47 Reasons for approachability or inapproachability

Reason why Gardaí were considered approachable	n=7932
very friendly/helpful	59%
respondent knows them	16%
very reassuring	14%
they have time for you	23%
they are members of the community	18%
can communicate with them	21%
other	3%
Reason why Gardaí were considered unapproachable	n=839
unfriendly/rude	38%
not always there/station frequently closed	17%
just not interested	38%
think they are superior/formal manner	31%
minor complaints dealt with more seriously	8%
unhelpful	23%
distance themselves from community	20%
other	6%

Four out of ten respondents said that they knew a Garda by name at their local station. This is similar to the 2006 figure. See Table 48.

Table 48 Do you know any Garda member by name at your local station?

Survey	Yes	No	Total
	%	%	n
2007	41	59	10002
2006	40	60	9950
2005	46	54	9912
2004	48	52	1016
2003	54	46	997
2002	57	43	10255

UNACCEPTABLE BEHAVIOUR BY GARDA MEMBERS

Just over one in thirteen respondents (7.5%) reported that a Garda had ever behaved towards them in a way they considered unacceptable. This figure represented a decrease from the four previous years. The type of unacceptable behaviour cited most frequently was Garda being “disrespectful or impolite” (Table 49).

Table 49 Nature of any unacceptable behaviour

Nature of behaviour	2007	2006	2005	2004	2003
	%	%	%	%	%
was disrespectful or impolite	4.2	4.1	5.0	10.9	6.6
did not follow proper procedures	1.4	1.5	1.4	3.8	1.4
stopped or searched without reason	0.9	1.0	1.4	2.6	0.5
harassed	1.3	1.4	1.6	3.8	1.0
clearly was very lax in carrying out duty	0.8	1.2	1.4	5.3	1.1
used racist language	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.4	0
made wrongful accusation	0.1	1.4	1.5	4.5	1.7
behaved in a violent way (e.g. pushing)	0.9	0.7	0.9	2.6	0.9
discriminated due to age, gender, race or ethnicity	0.6	0.6	0.7	1.8	0.5
swore	0.8	0.6	0.8	3.3	0.9
searched house without reason	0.2	0.4	0.4	-	-
took an item of your property	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.5	0.2
other (incl. use of sexist or sectarian language)	0.5	1.2	1.2	2.9	0.4
any of the above	7.5	8.6	9.3	12.4	12.1

Rates of unacceptable behaviour ranged from 3.2 per cent in Mayo to 12.7 per cent in DMR West and Waterford/Kilkenny. Compared with the 2006 survey, the percentage of respondents answering that a Garda had ever behaved towards them in an unacceptable way was lower in 13 Divisions, higher in ten and the same in two.⁶ The biggest improvements were in Cork City (by 7.2 percentage points) and Tipperary (by 4.1 percentage points). Disimprovements were biggest in Kerry (by 4.7 percentage points) and Laois/Offaly (by 3.1 percentage points). The national average improved by 0.7 of a percentage point. See Table 50.

⁶ Note that a negative change in percentage points represents an improvement.

Table 50 Unacceptable behaviour and Garda Division (percentage of respondents who said that a Garda had ever behaved towards them in a way that they considered unacceptable)

Garda Division	2007	2006	Change
	%	%	% points
Carlow/Kildare	5.8	7.5	-1.7
Cavan/Monaghan	9.2	6.3	+2.9
Clare	3.9	7.5	-3.6
Cork City	4.8	12.0	-7.2
Cork North	5.6	4.1	+1.5
Cork West	4.5	5.9	-1.4
DMR East	9.6	8.6	+1.0
DMR North	9.0	10.2	-1.2
DMR North Central	11.3	14.8	-3.5
DMR South	10.3	11.0	-0.7
DMR South Central	10.2	12.9	-2.7
DMR West	12.7	12.0	+0.7
Donegal	9.0	8.4	+0.6
Galway West	6.4	7.6	-1.2
Kerry	7.8	3.1	+4.7
Laois/Offaly	8.6	5.5	+3.1
Limerick	6.0	8.5	-2.5
Longford/Westmeath	6.3	6.5	-0.2
Louth/Meath	5.1	8.6	-3.5
Mayo	3.2	3.1	+0.1
Roscommon/Galway East	6.3	6.3	0
Sligo/Leitrim	4.3	2.5	+1.8
Tipperary	3.6	7.7	-4.1
Waterford/Kilkenny	12.7	11.3	+1.4
Wexford/Wicklow/Wicklow	9.7	9.7	0
average	7.4	8.1	-0.7

RACIST INCIDENTS

A racist incident was defined as, “any incident which is perceived to be racist by the victim, a witness to the incident or the investigating Garda”.

Overall, 2.1 per cent of respondents said that they had ever been subjected to a racist incident (n=215). Eighteen per cent of these had reported the most recent incident to the Gardaí (n=39). Of these, just under half were satisfied (49%) with the way the incident was handled. In the 2006 survey, 2.6 per cent reported having experienced a racist incident (n=265); 17 per cent reported it to the Gardaí (n=46) and 53 per cent were satisfied with the way it was handled.

The exclusion of respondents of Irish nationality, the vast majority (92%), produces a different picture. The rates of experience of racist incidents by non-Irish nationals are as follows: UK (5%), EU (15%), and non-EU (26%). These represent decreases of one, three and two percentage points, respectively, compared with the 2006 rates.

Asked if they had ever been subjected to a racist incident by a Garda, 33 respondents said they had, compared with 22, 31 and 21 in 2006, 2005 and 2002, respectively. Fifteen non-Irish nationals are included in the 22.

It is of interest that 57 per cent of respondents agreed with a statement in another section of the survey that, “people who are different are likely to experience ridicule or personal attack on our streets”, while only 22 per cent disagreed.⁷

GARDA VISIBILITY AND ACTIVITY

As regards Garda visibility, 25 per cent of respondents reported seeing a Garda in their locality that day or the day before. More than half (53%) had seen a Garda in the previous week.

The proportion that remembered seeing a Garda on the day of their interview was the same as in 2006.

The proportion that remembered seeing a Garda in the previous week (53%) was one percentage point lower than in 2006. See Table 51.

Table 51 Garda visibility

Last sighting of Garda in locality	2007	2006	2005	2004	2003
	%	%	%	%	%
today	8	8	8	16	15
yesterday	17	17	16	13	17
3-7 days ago	28	29	28	26	27
1-4 weeks ago	20	19	19	15	14
longer ago	14	14	18	21	21
can't remember	13	14	12	8	6

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Sixty-two per cent of respondents were satisfied with the level of Garda visibility in their locality. This represents an increase of three percentage points on 2006 (where 59 per cent said they were satisfied or very satisfied).

The levels of satisfaction were higher than in the 2006, 2005, 2004 and 2002 surveys, but lower than in 2003. See Table 52.

⁷ The rest were undecided.

Table 52 Satisfaction with the level of Garda visibility in the locality

Survey	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Total
	%	%	%	%	n
2007	10	52	31	8	9937
2006	8	51	32	10	9915
2005	11	50	30	8	9979
2004	15	42	31	13	989
2003	15	49	29	7	987
2002	12	48	33	7	9798

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Satisfaction with the level of local Garda visibility ranged from 79 per cent in DMR South Central to 44 per cent in Waterford/Kilkenny. Compared with 2006, an improvement was registered in 16 Divisions; satisfaction rates decreased in seven, and remained the same in two.

Table 53 Satisfaction with the level of Garda visibility in the locality and Division

Garda Division	Satisfied/very satisfied		
	2007	2006	Change
	%	%	Percentage points
Cavan/Monaghan	73.2	73.8	-0.6
Mayo	77.9	73.5	+4.4
Kerry	60.6	69.3	-8.7
Sligo/Leitrim	77.6	67.3	+10.3
Roscommon/Galway East	68.2	67.1	+1.1
Clare	66.3	66.3	0.0
Donegal	69.2	64.5	+4.7
DMR South Central	79.0	63.4	+15.6
Tipperary	64.4	62.5	+1.9
Galway West	52.8	62.1	-9.3
DMR East	76.5	60.0	+16.5
DMR North Central	59.6	59.7	-0.1
DMR South	69.2	59.5	+9.7
Cork North	59.4	59.3	+0.1
Laois/Offaly	58.2	58.2	0.0
DMR West	46.4	58.2	-11.8
Cork West	67.3	58.2	+9.1
Cork City	56.3	55.0	+1.3
DMR North	47.5	54.4	-6.9
Limerick	61.5	54.1	+7.4
Carlow/Kildare	61.0	54.0	+7.0
Longford/Westmeath	58.6	53.6	+5.0
Louth/Meath	70.5	51.1	+19.4
Wexford/Wicklow/Wicklow	56.9	50.0	+6.9
Waterford/Kilkenny	44.0	44.2	-0.2
average	63.3	60.0	+3.3

The largest increases in satisfaction rates were achieved in Louth/Meath (+19.4 percentage points), DMR East (+16.5) and DMR South Central (+15.6). The largest decreases were recorded in DMR West (-11.8), Galway West (-9.3) and Kerry (-8.7). See Table 53.

The majority of respondents felt that the level of general Garda activity (57%) and the level of foot patrol (56%) in the locality had stayed the same in the previous year. This is generally consistent with results from the 2006, 2005, 2004 and 2003 surveys. Just over one-fifth (21%) felt that the level of general activity had increased, while 14 per cent felt that it had decreased. Eighteen per cent felt that the level of foot patrol had increased, while 15 per cent felt that it had decreased. See Table 54.

Table 54 Perceived changes in Garda activity in the locality in the last year

Activity	Change	2007	2006	2005	2004	2003
		%	%	%	%	%
General Garda activity	increased	21	15	17	22	24
	about same	57	60	60	60	60
	decreased	14	15	15	11	11
	don't know	8	9	9	8	5
Foot patrol	increased	18	12	14	19	15
	about same	56	61	60	59	57
	decreased	15	16	16	16	17
	don't know	11	11	11	6	11

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Over eight out of ten respondents (82%) rated the Garda performance in their locality as either “very good” (17%) or “fairly good” (65%). Compared with 2006, there was an increase in the proportion of respondents who rated the Gardaí as “very good” (+2 percentage points). The performance rating is consistent with the satisfaction level with overall Garda service to the community (80%) reported in Section 1.

Seventy-six per cent of respondents felt that the Gardaí were doing a “very good” or “fairly good” job in their locality as regards road safety. Compared with 2006, there was an increase in the proportion of respondents who rated the Gardaí as “very good” (+3 percentage points). See Table 55.

Table 55 Garda performance in the locality

Performance	Rating	2007	2006	2005	2004	2003
		%	%	%	%	%
All in all, how good a job do the Gardaí do in your locality?	very good	17	15	22	22	27
	fairly good	65	65	62	62	59
	fairly poor	15	16	13	12	10
	very poor	3	4	3	4	4
How good a job do the Gardaí do in your locality as regards road safety?	very good	15	12	21	20	26
	fairly good	61	58	58	50	51
	fairly poor	20	24	17	20	16
	very poor	5	7	5	10	7

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Male and female respondents expressed similar levels of satisfaction with Garda performance in road safety (76%, “very good” and “fairly good” combined), while females (83%) expressed slightly higher levels than males (81%) as regards local Garda performance. Those in the 65+ group expressed higher levels of satisfaction (84%) with local Garda performance than those in other age categories, while those in this group along with those aged 18-24 years had the highest levels of satisfaction with Garda performance in road safety (78%).⁸

Ratings for how good a job the Gardaí do in the locality ranged from 88 per cent (“very good” or “fairly good”) in Tipperary to 62 per cent in Waterford/Kilkenny. See Table 56.

Compared with 2006, 16 Divisions showed an increase in satisfaction ratings, with an average increase among these 16 of 5.2 percentage points. The largest increases occurred in Louth/Meath (+11.2 percentage points), DMR North (+10.3), Wexford/Wicklow (+8.6) and Sligo/Leitrim (+8.2). Among the 9 Divisions that showed decreases, the average was 3.3 percentage points. The largest decreases were in DMR West (-13.0 percentage points), Kerry (-4.2 percentage points) and DMR South Central (-4.1).

Ratings for how good a job the Gardaí do locally as regards road safety ranged from 86 per cent (“very good” or “fairly good”) in Tipperary to 54 per cent in Waterford/Kilkenny. Compared with 2006, 21 Divisions showed an increase in satisfaction ratings, with the average increase being 8.5 percentage points.

⁸ The exact percentages were 78.5% (18-24 years) and 78.3% (65+ years).

The largest increases occurred in Carlow/Kildare (+19.1 percentage points), Laois/Offaly (+17.5), DMR North (+14.4) and DMR East (+14.0). Cavan/Monaghan Division showed no change from 2006, while decreases in satisfaction were recorded in DMR West (-12.9 percentage points), DMR South Central (-4.9) and Kerry (-0.2).

Table 56 Garda performance in the locality and Division

Garda Division	Overall performance			Road safety		
	very good / fairly good			very good / fairly good		
	2007	2006	change	2007	2006	change
	%	%	% points	%	%	% points
Tipperary	88.4	87.2	+1.2	86.4	74.3	+12.1
Carlow/Kildare	88.0	83.5	+4.5	82.6	63.5	+19.1
Sligo/Leitrim	87.7	79.5	+8.2	78.0	69.8	+8.2
Cork West	87.6	87.1	+0.5	75.3	67.9	+7.4
Mayo	87.3	83.0	+4.3	82.3	68.5	+13.8
Roscommon/Galway East	86.6	88.4	-1.8	77.0	76.2	+0.8
DMR South	86.2	86.5	-0.3	83.6	82.6	+1.0
DMR East	85.6	79.4	+6.2	84.4	70.4	+14.0
Laois/Offaly	85.3	80.1	+5.2	84.8	67.3	+17.5
DMR North	84.7	74.4	+10.3	81.1	66.7	+14.4
Louth/Meath	84.6	73.4	+11.2	74.7	66.6	+8.1
Cavan/Monaghan	84.5	85.6	-1.1	80.1	80.1	0
Limerick	84.0	78.6	+5.4	76.1	72.1	+4
Wexford/Wicklow	83.7	75.1	+8.6	73.4	59.8	+13.6
Clare	83.3	82.2	+1.1	73.6	71.0	+2.6
Cork North	82.9	75.9	+7.0	71.1	63.3	+7.8
Donegal	81.8	76.4	+5.4	72.5	60.6	+11.9
DMR North Central	80.8	78.7	+2.1	78.7	75.8	+2.9
Galway West	80.2	81.1	-0.9	73.1	70.3	+2.8
Longford/Westmeath	79.8	78.4	+1.4	77.2	68.0	+9.2
Kerry	79.7	83.9	-4.2	72.0	72.2	-0.2
Cork City	78.8	81.3	-2.5	70.4	66.3	+4.1
DMR South Central	76.7	80.8	-4.1	66.4	71.3	-4.9
DMR West	68.4	81.4	-13.0	67.1	80.0	-12.9
Waterford/Kilkenny	61.9	63.3	-1.4	54.3	51.2	+3.1
average	82.3	80.2	+2.1	75.8	69.4	+6.4

Divisions ranked according to proportion rating the overall performance as very or fairly good.

In 2007, there was less variation in ratings of Garda performance locally according to housing type, than there had been in 2006. Ratings ranged from 83-76 per cent, compared with 68-82 per cent in 2006. In 2007, occupants of local authority housing gave a lower rating than other respondents, with 76 per cent saying they thought the Gardaí did a “very good” or “fairly good” job in their locality. Compared with 2006, rating of Garda performance locally was up in all housing types, with the biggest increase being for those in local authority housing (+8.3 percentage points). See Table 57.

Table 57 Local Garda performance by housing tenure 2007 and 2006

2007 Survey		2006 Survey	
Housing type	%	Housing type	%
owner occupied	82.9	owner occupied	81.5
local authority housing	75.8	local authority housing	67.5
rented privately	84.1	rented privately	81.5
other	82.6	other	77.9

ROAD TRAFFIC COLLISIONS

Four per cent of respondents said that they were involved in the previous year in road traffic collisions dealt with by the Gardaí, the same percentage as in 2006. The majority (65%) believed that the other party was at fault, while 15 per cent felt they themselves were at fault. Eighteen per cent felt that both parties were; two per cent did not know who was at fault. Levels of satisfaction with the service provided were slightly higher than in the 2006 survey, with 80 per cent expressing satisfaction compared with 78 per cent in 2006. Compared with 2006, there was a decrease in 2007 of eight percentage points in the “very satisfied” category, and an increase of ten percentage points in the “satisfied” category. See Table 58.

Table 58 Satisfaction with the Garda investigation of road traffic collisions

Survey	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Total
	%	%	%	%	n
2007	22	58	11	10	344
2006	30	48	13	8	358
2005	25	48	15	12	272
2002	39	40	12	9	465

Respondents who expressed dissatisfaction were invited to give a reason. The number of respondents was small. Responses were not prompted and the reasons that were cited are summarised in Table 59.

Table 59 Dissatisfaction with Garda investigation of road traffic collisions

Reason for dissatisfaction	Mentioned (n)
Garda withheld information	7
nothing was/has been done	23
nobody came to the scene	11
Garda took very long time to come to scene	20
Garda wrongfully charged the respondent	1
very bad service	21
were not interested in incident	25
other	8

POLICING PRIORITIES

As with previous Garda surveys, respondents were asked about the priority they would give to policing tasks and the priority they think the Gardaí actually give. The questions were preceded with the statement, “*The Garda Síochána has limited resources and is faced with a wide range of demands*” and respondents were then asked, “*In your opinion, what priority do you think the Garda should give to the following policing tasks?*” and then, “*In your opinion, what priority do you think the Garda actually give to the following policing tasks?*” A listing of 28 tasks was presented, with rotation of the starting point to avoid any position effect on responses.

The top priority for respondents was *ensuring an immediate response to emergencies*, followed by tasks related to drugs, organised crime, investigating crime and sexual violence. Crime prevention advice to businesses, advice on personal safety and home security, and supervision of licensed premises were the lowest ranked tasks. See Table 60.

Table 60 Respondents' policing priorities

Task	Very high priority	High priority	Low priority	Rank
	%	%	%	
ensure immediate response to emergencies	75	24	2	1
enforce laws relating to drugs	74	24	2	2
target organised crime	72	27	1	3
investigate crime	70	30	1	4
deal with crimes of sexual violence	67	31	2	5
enforce drink driving laws	66	32	3	6
deal with youths racing around in cars	65	32	3	7
enforce speed laws	64	33	3	8
deal with underage drinking on the streets	60	35	6	9
deal with domestic violence incidents	57	39	5	10
tackle the sale of alcohol to those under age	58	36	7	11
deal with underage drinking in pubs	54	38	8	12
enforce laws relating to wearing of seat belts	49	45	6	13
provide help and support to victims of crime	44	50	6	14
deal with vandalism	45	48	8	15
patrol by car/van	44	50	7	16
enforce laws relating to fraud and white collar crime	42	51	8	17
ensure State security	44	46	11	18
deal with public annoyances (e.g. loud music, fights)	39	52	9	19
ensure effective traffic management and flow	38	53	10	20
enforce other traffic laws	36	55	10	21
patrol on foot or bicycle	39	48	13	22
enforce immigration laws	38	49	14	23
work with community groups	33	55	12	24
patrol by motorcycle	36	50	15	25
advise on personal safety and home security	26	55	19	26
supervise licensed premises	29	50	22	27
advise businesses/shops on crime prevention	26	55	20	28

Percentages may not sum to 100 because of rounding. "Don't know" answers are excluded – they ranged from 0.6% to 1.6% of respondents. Tasks are ranked by mean scores, and these scores are shown in Table 63.

The majority of respondents assigned a "very high" or "high" priority to all tasks, even the lowest-ranked tasks. The percentages assigning these levels of priority ranged from 79 per cent for *supervision of licensed premises* to 99 per cent for *ensure immediate response to emergencies*, *target organised crime* and *investigate crime*. It should also be noted that differences in rank can reflect very small differences in levels of priority, especially for tasks that are ranked closely together. It would be unwise, therefore, to attach too much importance to, say, the first-ranked task over the second, or the second over the third, and so on, or to over-emphasise relatively minor changes from one year to the next.

The priority that respondents perceive that the Gardaí assign to tasks are presented in Table 61. In answering, respondents were allowed an additional option of "very low priority" that was not offered in relation to their own priorities.

The top ranked activity was *investigating crime*, which was followed by *ensuring immediate emergency response*, *ensuring State security*, *targeting organised crime* and *enforcing drink driving laws*.

Table 61 Respondents' perceptions of Garda priorities, ranked by mean score

Task	Very high priority	High priority	Low priority	Very low priority	Rank
	%	%	%	%	
investigate crime	28	56	14	2	1
ensure immediate response to emergencies	31	48	17	4	2
ensure State security	26	52	18	5	3
target organised crime	26	49	20	5	4
enforce drink driving laws	24	52	20	4	5
enforce laws relating to drugs	24	49	22	5	6
enforce speed laws	23	50	23	5	7
deal with crimes of sexual violence	22	51	23	5	8
enforce laws relating to wearing seat belts	19	47	28	6	9
deal with domestic violence incidents	16	47	29	8	10
enforce immigration laws	13	48	31	8	11
patrol by car/van	13	46	32	9	12
enforce other traffic laws	12	47	35	6	13
ensure effective traffic management and flow	12	43	37	7	14
enforce laws on fraud/white collar crime	11	43	36	9	15
provide help and support to victims of crime	11	41	38	10	16
deal with youths racing around in cars	13	37	37	14	17
deal with vandalism	11	40	38	11	18
deal with underage drinking on the streets	12	34	40	13	19
deal with public annoyances	9	39	41	11	20
deal with underage drinking in pubs	11	34	42	13	21
tackle the sale of alcohol to those under age	11	32	43	14	22
supervise licensed premises	9	35	43	13	23
work with community groups	7	34	45	14	24
patrol by motorcycle	8	29	41	22	25
advise businesses/shops crime prevention	7	31	45	17	26
advise on personal safety and home security	7	28	45	20	27
patrol on foot or bicycle	8	23	42	27	28

Percentages may not sum to 100 because of rounding. "Don't know" answers are excluded – they ranged from 1.1% to 3.1% of respondents. Tasks are ranked by mean scores, and these scores are shown in Table 63.

The perceived Garda priority order is generally different from respondents' own priorities. The rankings are the same for three activities: *dealing with domestic violence incidents*, *working with community groups* and *patrolling by motorcycle*. The difference in rankings is small for almost two thirds of the remainder, but the others differ by six or more ranking places. See Table 62.

The largest differences occur in respect of *ensuring State security* and *enforcing immigration laws* which the public rates 15 and 12 places, respectively, lower than it perceives the Gardaí do.

The next largest differences were for *tackling the sale of alcohol to those under age*, *dealing with underage drinking on the streets* and *dealing with youths racing around in cars*, which the public rates 11, 10 and 10 places, respectively, higher than it perceives the Gardaí do. Other significant mismatches arise in respect to *dealing with underage drinking in pubs* and *patrol on foot or bicycle* (to which the public attaches a higher ranking than they perceive the Gardaí do) and *enforcing other traffic laws* and *ensuring effective traffic management and flow* (to which the public attaches a lower ranking than they perceive the Gardaí do).

Table 62 Comparison of respondents' priorities and their perception of Garda priorities – rankings

Task	Desired rank	Perceived rank	Rank difference		
			Garda lower	Garda higher	Same
ensure immediate response to emergencies	1	2	1		
enforce laws relating to drugs	2	6	4		
target organised crime	3	4	1		
investigate crime	4	1		3	
deal with crimes of sexual violence	5	8	3		
enforce drink driving laws	6	5		1	
deal with youths racing around in cars	7	17	10		
enforce speed laws	8	7		1	
deal with underage drinking on the streets	9	19	10		
deal with domestic violence incidents	10	10			0
tackle the sale of alcohol to those under age	11	22	11		
deal with underage drinking in pubs	12	21	9		
enforce laws relating to wearing of seat belts	13	9		4	
provide help and support to victims of crime	14	16	2		
deal with vandalism	15	18	3		
patrol by car/van	16	12		4	
enforce laws relating to fraud/white collar crime	17	15		2	
ensure State security	18	3		15	
deal with public annoyances (e.g. loud music,...)	19	20	1		
ensure effective traffic management and flow	20	14		6	
enforce other traffic laws	21	13		8	
patrol on foot or bicycle	22	28	6		
enforce immigration laws	23	11		12	
work with community groups	24	24			0
patrol by motorcycle	25	25			0
advise on personal safety and home security	26	27	1		
supervise licensed premises	27	23		4	
advise businesses/shops on crime prevention	28	26		2	

Without exception, respondents assign a higher priority to activities than they perceive the Gardaí do. This is so even when an activity appears in the same ranking position in both respondent and Garda lists.

Table 63 Comparison of respondents' priorities and their perception of Garda priorities – mean scores

Task	Desired priority	Perceived Garda priority	Difference
	mean score	mean score	mean score
deal with youths racing around in cars	1.38	2.37	-0.99
tackle the sale of alcohol to those under age	1.49	2.46	-0.97
deal with underage drinking on the streets	1.46	2.41	-0.95
deal with underage drinking in pubs	1.54	2.44	-0.90
patrol on foot or bicycle	1.74	2.62	-0.88
deal with vandalism	1.63	2.39	-0.76
patrol by motorcycle	1.79	2.55	-0.76
provide help and support to victims of crime	1.62	2.37	-0.75
enforce laws relating to drugs	1.29	2.04	-0.75
work with community groups	1.78	2.52	-0.74
deal with domestic violence incidents	1.48	2.21	-0.73
deal with public annoyances (e.g. loud music, fights)	1.71	2.43	-0.72
deal with crimes of sexual violence	1.36	2.06	-0.70
enforce laws relating to fraud/white collar crime	1.65	2.34	-0.69
target organised crime	1.29	1.98	-0.69
advise on personal safety and home security	1.93	2.59	-0.66
enforce speed laws	1.40	2.05	-0.65
patrol by car/van	1.63	2.28	-0.65
ensure immediate response to emergencies	1.27	1.90	-0.63
enforce drink/driving laws	1.37	1.99	-0.62
advise businesses/shops on crime prevention	1.94	2.56	-0.62
ensure effective traffic management and flow	1.72	2.33	-0.61
enforce laws relating to wearing seat belts	1.57	2.14	-0.57
investigate crime	1.31	1.89	-0.58
enforce other traffic laws	1.74	2.29	-0.55
supervise licensed premises	1.93	2.47	-0.54
enforce immigration laws	1.76	2.26	-0.50
ensure State security	1.67	1.97	-0.30

Mean scores for desired priority are calculated on the basis of "very high priority" = 1, "high priority" = 2 and "low priority" = 3. For example, when asked what priority the Gardaí should give to tackling the sale of alcohol to those under age, 5798 said "very high", 3557 "high" and 649 "low", giving a mean score of $[(5798 \times 1) + (3557 \times 2) + (649 \times 3)] / [5798 + 3557 + 649] = 14859 / 10004 = 1.4853$. Mean scores for perceived Garda priority are calculated on the basis of "very high priority" = 1, "high priority" = 2, and "low priority" + "very low priority" = 3. The lower the mean score, the higher the priority. Mean scores are shown to two places of decimal. Ranking is based on four places of decimal.

The largest differences occur in respect of *dealing with youths racing around in cars*, *tackling the sale of alcohol to juveniles* and *dealing with underage drinking on the streets and in pubs*. Among the other sizeable differences were those relating to *patrolling by foot, bicycle or motorcycle* and *dealing with vandalism*. See Table 63.

With a small number of exceptions, the public's own rankings have been very consistent in the surveys since 2002, when the last large-scale survey was conducted. Comparing first with 2006, *provide help and support to victims of crime*, *ensure effective traffic management*, and *enforce immigration laws* achieved the greatest jumps in rankings, while *enforce drink/driving laws*, *enforce laws relating to fraud/white collar crime* and *patrol on foot or bicycle* recorded the largest falls.

In the light of frequent calls from the public for greater number of Gardaí on the beat, it is of interest that the task of *patrol on foot or bicycle* was ranked 22nd in 2007, 21st in 2002, and 20th in 2006 and 2005. This suggests that the public would like to see more Gardaí on the beat, but not at the expense of other tasks. See Table 64.

Table 64 Respondents' priorities: 2007 - 2002

Task	Year	2007	2006	2005	2002
	n	n ¹	n ²	n ³	n ⁴
ensure immediate response to emergencies		1	1	1	1
enforce laws relating to drugs		2	2	2	3
target organised crime		3	3	3	2
investigate crime		4	5	5	6
deal with crimes of sexual violence		5	6	4	-
enforce drink driving laws		6	4	8	3
deal with youths racing around in cars		7	8	6	3
enforce speed laws		8	7	12	7
deal with underage drinking on the streets		9	9	7	8
deal with domestic violence incidents		10	11	10	-
tackle the sale of alcohol to those under age		11	10	9	9
deal with underage drinking in pubs		12	12	11	11
enforce laws relating to wearing of seat belts		13	13	16	10
provide help and support to victims of crime		14	16	15	14
deal with vandalism		15	14	13	13
patrol by car/van		16	17	17	16
enforce laws relating to fraud and white collar crime		17	15	14	12
ensure State security		18	19	18	15
deal with public annoyances (e.g. loud music, ...)		19	18	19	17
ensure effective traffic management and flow		20	22	23	18
enforce other traffic laws		21	21	24	18
patrol on foot or bicycle		22	20	20	21
enforce immigration laws		23	25	25	23
work with community groups		24	23	22	22
patrol by motorcycle		25	24	21	20
advise on personal safety and home security		26	26	26	26
supervise licensed premises		27	27	27	24
advise businesses/shops on crime prevention		28	28	28	25

Table includes two tasks, "*deal with crimes of sexual violence*" added in 2004, and "*deal with domestic violence incidents*", added in 2005.

Sample size - n¹ = 10,000; n² = 10,000; n³ = 10,000; and n⁴ = 10,000. Rankings prior to 2005 were based on mean scores to two places of decimal and joint rankings occurred in several instances.

FURTHER VIEWS ON THE GARDA SÍOCHÁNA

The survey sought the public's views about other aspects of the relationship between the Gardaí and the community and attempted to gauge the degree of public confidence in the Gardaí. Respondents were asked to indicate if they agreed or disagreed with various statements using a five-point scale from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree”.

Table 65 Relationship between the Gardaí and the community

Statement	Agree	Neither	Disagree
	%	%	%
Anyone in Garda custody would have their rights fully respected	72	15	13
If my rights were infringed, I could rely on the Gardaí to help me	71	14	15
I would encourage a friend or relative to join the Gardaí	68	18	14
The Gardaí carry out their role in a fair and impartial manner	67	19	14
People like me would be welcome in the Gardaí as a member	64	16	20
The Garda organisation is made up of honest/honourable people	60	24	16
Gardaí are representative of the communities they serve	61	20	19
Gardaí are sensitive to the needs of vulnerable people	59	23	19
Anyone in Garda custody would be well treated	51	31	18
Garda management fully support community policing (e.g. assigning Community Guards to area)	52	26	22
The local Gardaí reflect the make-up of my local community	50	24	27
The local Gardaí are fully answerable to the people for their actions and conduct	50	18	32
The Gardaí provide good leadership in the guidance and direction of our young people	48	24	28
The Gardaí never blame victims of crime	43	32	26
The Gardaí serve the interests of the rich more than the poor	35	21	44
When people are dissatisfied with what the Gardaí do, it is easy to have the matter corrected	34	22	44
The people around here have a real say in deciding what is important for the Gardaí to attend to	23	25	53
The Gardaí discriminate against immigrants	16	28	57
Domestic Violence is a private matter, not a Garda matter	13	14	73

Questions were rotated in four groups and sample sizes ranged from 2411 to 2534. Percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.

The results are summarised in Table 65 showing simply agreement (strongly agree and agree combined), disagreement (disagree and strongly disagree combined) or neither.⁹

The highest levels of agreement were as regards confidence that, *“anyone in Garda custody would have their rights fully respected”*, *“I would encourage a friend or relative to join the Gardaí”*, *“if my rights were infringed, I could rely on the Gardaí to help me”*, and that domestic violence is a Garda matter not just a private matter (73% disagreed). Agreement was also high with *“the Gardaí carry out their role in a fair and impartial manner”* and *“people like me would be welcome in the Gardaí as a member”*. Minorities who disagreed with these statements ranged from 13-20 per cent. A majority disagreed that the Gardaí discriminate against immigrants (57%).

The results are broadly along expected lines, with majorities agreeing where agreement is desirable or disagreeing where disagreement is desirable. There were two notable exceptions. Over half disagreed that *“the people around here have a real say in deciding what is important for the Gardaí to attend to”* (53%), while 44 per cent disagreed with the statement, *“when people are dissatisfied with what the Garda do, it is easy to have the matter corrected”*. These were also exceptions in the 2002, 2005 and 2006 surveys.

A comparison from 2002 to 2007 is set out in Table 66. Sixteen statements were common to all surveys, and for two statements there has been a continuous upwards or downwards trend in the percentages agreeing with them. For the statement, *“when people are dissatisfied with what the Gardaí do, it is easy to have the matter corrected”*, there has been a continuous increase in agreement from 2002 (23%) to 2007 (34%). There has been a continuous decline in agreement with the statement, *“Gardaí are representative of the communities they serve”*, from 68 per cent in 2002 to 61 per cent in 2007.

⁹ Most statements were posed such that a high level of agreement would be desired (e.g. *“If my rights were infringed, I could rely on the Gardaí to help me”*) and others were posed such that a low level of agreement would be desired (e.g. *“The Gardaí discriminate against immigrants”*).

Improvement from 2002 to 2005 with respect to the statement, “*Anyone in Garda custody would have their rights fully respected*” (from 64% in 2002 to 70% in 2005) was sustained in 2006 and improved on in 2007, notwithstanding the general decline for the period in the percentage agreeing that, “*Anyone in Garda custody would be well treated*”. From 2005 to 2006 the largest changes had been in respect to declines in agreement with the statements, “*Garda management fully support community policing*” and “*anyone in Garda custody would be well treated*” (a drop of six percentage points for both).

From 2006 to 2007 the largest changes were in respect to the statements, “*Garda management fully support community policing*” (an increase in agreement of four percentage points), and “*the local Gardaí reflect the make-up of my local community*”, “*the Gardaí serve the interests of the rich more than the poor*”, “*the people around here have a real say in deciding what is important for the Gardaí to attend to*” and “*domestic Violence is a private matter, not a Garda matter*” (for each, a decrease in agreement of four percentage points).

Table 66 Relationship between the Gardaí and the community: 2007–2002

Agreement with statement	2007	2006	2005	2002
	%	%	%	%
Anyone in Garda custody would have their rights fully respected	72	70	70	64
I would encourage a friend or relative to join the Gardaí	68	65	67	71
If my rights were infringed, I could rely on the Gardaí to help me	71	69	72	75
The Gardaí carry out their role in a fair and impartial manner	67	65	69	-
People like me would be welcome in the Gardaí as a member	64	63	63	71
The Garda organisation is made up of honest/ honourable people	60	61	62	60
Gardaí are representative of the communities they serve	61	64	66	68
Gardaí are sensitive to the needs of vulnerable people	59	62	61	60
Anyone in Garda custody would be well treated	51	50	56	60
Garda management fully support community policing	52	48	54	52
The local Gardaí reflect the make-up of my local community	50	53	53	54
The local Gardaí are fully answerable to the people for their actions and conduct	50	51	51	56
The Gardaí provide good leadership in the guidance and direction of our young people	48	51	51	46
The Gardaí never blame victims of crime	43	42	42	-
The Gardaí serve the interests of the rich more than the poor	35	39	34	34
When people are dissatisfied with what the Gardaí do, it is easy to have the matter corrected	34	32	31	23
The people around here have a real say in deciding what is important for the Gardaí to attend to	23	27	25	22
The Gardaí discriminate against immigrants	16	16	14	11
Domestic Violence is a private matter, not a Garda matter	13	17	16	-

The statements, “*The Gardaí carry out their role in a fair and impartial manner*”, “*The Gardaí never blame victims of crime*” and “*Domestic Violence is a private matter, not a Garda matter*” were not included in the 2002 survey.

PUBLIC SAFETY AND FEAR OF CRIME

Three-quarters of respondents (75%) said that they felt safe out walking in their neighbourhood after dark, but one in four felt unsafe, an improvement on the findings in 2002 (69%), 2005 (69%) and 2006 (71%). Feelings of safety were lowest in cities other than Dublin (Cork, Galway, Limerick and Waterford) and in large and small towns.

It is of note that feelings of safety in Dublin were similar to those expressed in villages and rural areas. An average of six per cent of respondents felt very unsafe in their neighbourhood after dark, rising to nine per cent in cities outside Dublin. See Table 67.

Table 67 How safe do you feel walking in your neighbourhood after dark?

Type of area	Very safe	Safe	Unsafe	Very unsafe	Total
	%	%	%	%	n
Dublin	14	63	18	4	2475
other city	16	50	25	9	1096
large town (10,000)	17	52	24	7	1093
town (1-10,000)	21	54	20	6	1506
village, rural, open country	20	57	19	4	3387
all	18	57	20	6	9557

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

The vast majority of respondents (87%) felt secure alone in their homes at night, although on average eleven per cent felt unsafe, and two per cent felt very unsafe. The levels of feelings of were quite similar in all areas, although Dublin had a smaller percentage of respondents that felt “very safe” (20%). See Table 68.

Table 68 How safe do you feel alone in your home at night?

Type of area	Very safe	Safe	Unsafe	Very unsafe	Total
	%	%	%	%	n
Dublin	20	68	11	2	2481
other city	24	64	10	2	1093
large town (10,000)	29	59	11	2	1097
town (1-10,000)	26	61	10	3	1498
village, rural, open country	24	62	12	2	3385
all	24	63	11	2	9554

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Feelings of safety varied substantially by Division, ranging from 88 per cent who felt “safe” or “very safe” in DMR East to 65 per cent in Kerry.

Of the Divisions that occupy the six lowest positions in the survey, two (Limerick and Waterford/Kilkenny) contain “Other cities” consistent with results in Table 67. See Table 69.

As regards feelings of safety alone at home at night, the proportions feeling “safe” or “very safe” ranged from 94 per cent in Clare to 76 per cent in Waterford/Kilkenny.

Table 69 Feelings of safety and Garda Division

Garda Division	Out walking after dark		Home alone at night	
	safe/very safe	unsafe/very unsafe	safe/very safe	unsafe/very unsafe
	%	%	%	%
DMR East	88	13	93	7
Cavan/Monaghan	82	18	92	8
Donegal	81	19	91	9
Sligo/Leitrim	80	20	93	7
Galway West	79	21	92	8
Mayo	79	21	91	9
Louth/Meath	79	21	90	10
DMR North	78	22	88	12
DMR North Central	77	23	85	15
Roscommon/Galway East	77	23	85	15
DMR South	77	23	88	12
Tipperary	75	25	86	14
Cork West	75	25	93	8
Longford/Westmeath	74	26	79	21
Clare	74	26	94	6
DMR South Central	74	26	77	23
Laois/Offaly	71	30	80	20
Cork City	70	30	92	8
DMR West	69	31	85	15
Cork North	68	32	87	13
Limerick	67	33	86	14
Wexford/Wicklow	66	34	81	19
Waterford/Kilkenny	66	34	76	24
Carlow/Kildare	66	34	77	23
Kerry	65	35	82	18
average	74	26	87	13

Table ordered according to values in column 2 (to one place of decimal). Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding

Compared with the 2006 survey, feelings of safety when out walking after dark were higher in 15 Divisions and lower in ten. The largest increases were recorded in Limerick, Laois/Offaly and DMR South. See Table 70.

From 2002 to 2007, feelings of safety when out walking after dark have shown continuous improvement in three Divisions (DMR East, DMR North Central and DMR South) and continuous deterioration in two Divisions (Wexford/Wicklow and Waterford/Kilkenny).

Using the 2002 and 2007 reports as reference points, the largest increases in feelings of safety out walking after dark were recorded in DMR North Central, DMR East, DMR South and DMR West. The greatest decreases were recorded in Kerry, Waterford/Kilkenny, Limerick and Wexford/Wicklow.

Compared with the 2006 survey, feelings of safety alone in the home at night were higher in 13 Divisions, lower in nine and the same in three. The largest increase was recorded in Sligo/Leitrim and the largest decrease was in DMR South Central.

From 2002 to 2007, feelings of safety in the home at night have shown continuous deterioration in one Division (Waterford/Kilkenny). Using the 2002 and 2007 survey findings as reference points, the greatest increase in feelings of safety was recorded in Clare. The greatest decreases were recorded in Waterford/Kilkenny, DMR South Central, Carlow/Kildare, Laois/Offaly and Wexford/Wicklow.

Table 70 Feelings of safety and Garda Division: 2007, 2006, 2005 and 2002 surveys

Garda Division	Safe/very safe out walking after dark				Safe/very safe home alone at night			
	2007	2006	2005	2002	2007	2006	2005	2002
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
DMR East	88	79	76	67	93	88	93	91
Cavan/Monaghan	82	77	70	74	92	86	91	91
Donegal	81	74	75	82	91	84	83	96
Sligo/Leitrim	80	71	78	77	93	85	87	92
Galway West	79	73	61	75	92	87	83	90
Mayo	79	74	73	82	91	89	80	94
Louth/Meath	79	76	63	74	90	87	78	88
DMR North	78	75	70	70	88	93	87	91
DMR North Central	77	68	63	54	85	85	78	89
Roscommon/Galway East	77	83	74	79	85	94	85	91
DMR South	77	67	65	61	88	82	85	90
Tipperary	75	76	70	68	86	89	83	88
Cork West	75	72	67	77	93	93	91	92
Longford/Westmeath	74	77	72	71	79	83	78	89
Clare	74	80	83	74	94	95	93	89
DMR South Central	74	77	74	67	77	90	87	90
Laois/Offaly	71	60	62	72	80	73	76	91
Cork City	70	62	55	68	92	88	87	90
DMR West	69	68	71	58	85	88	86	89
Cork North	68	71	67	70	87	83	87	90
Limerick	67	56	68	74	86	78	81	90
Wexford/Wicklow	66	69	71	73	81	81	82	92
Waterford/Kilkenny	66	67	69	75	76	77	84	93
Carlow/Kildare	66	69	59	66	77	75	73	89
Kerry	65	73	68	75	82	90	83	92
average	74	72	69	70	87	86	84	91

Table ordered according to values in column 2.

In two Divisions, a decrease in feelings of safety alone at home at night occurred, even though an increase had been recorded as regards feeling safe when out walking after dark (DMR North and DMR West).

In each of the report years 2002, 2005, 2006 and 2007, the average levels of feelings of safety alone at home have been substantially higher compared with feelings of safety walking in the neighbourhood after dark. However, over this period the gap between levels has continued to narrow.

Respondents' views on changes in feelings of safety are consistent with the earlier figures showing an improvement (from the 2006 level of 71%) in levels of perceived safety when out walking after dark. A fifth of respondents (20%) felt less safe when out walking than a year ago, while a quarter (25%) felt less safe than 6 years ago. The percentage of respondents in the "less safe" category for the variables, "compared with 12 months ago" and "compared with 6 years ago", continues to decline compared with levels in previous surveys. See Table 71.

From 2002 to 2007, the percentages of respondents in the "no different" category for the variables, "compared with 12 months ago" and "compared with 6 years ago", continue to increase.

Table 71 Do you feel more safe or less safe out walking in your area now than before?

Time	Survey	Safer	No different	Less safe	Don't know	Didn't live in area	Total
		%	%	%	%	%	n
compared with 12 months ago	2007	5	71	20	2	2	10067
	2006	4	70	23	1	2	10046
	2005	3	69	23	2	2	10046
	2002	5	69	24	1	1	10193
compared with 6 years ago	2007	9	53	25	3	8	10067
	2006	8	52	29	2	9	10046
	2005	7	50	31	3	9	10046
	2002	11	38	44	2	5	10051

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Missing values have been excluded; there were n=123 (for variable, 12 months ago) and n=177 (for variable, 6 years ago).

Thirty-seven per cent of respondents were worried about becoming a victim of crime themselves, and 44 per cent were worried about other family members and friends.

The percentages of respondents that worry about themselves, or their family and friends becoming a victim of crime, continue to decline compared with levels in previous surveys. See Table 72.

Table 72 Do you worry that you or a family member or friend might become a victim of crime?

Person	Survey	Yes	No	Total
		%	%	n
you	2007	37	63	10044
	2006	41	59	10009
	2005	45	55	9959
	2004	45	55	1016
	2003	54	45	1007
	2002	52	48	10267
family member of friend	2007	44	56	9999
	2006	49	51	9939
	2005	53	47	9892
	2004	68	32	1016
	2003	68	32	1003
	2002	69	31	10147

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. "Don't knows" have been excluded; there were n=23 (for "you") and n=68 (for "family member or friend").

Over seven out of ten respondents were as worried about personal injury crime as property crime (77%), and seven out of ten were just as worried about personal injury crime as property crime for a family member or friend (69%). Of the remainder, ten per cent worried about themselves being subject to personal injury only and 14 per cent worried about property theft or damage only. The corresponding figures for family and friends were 25 per cent and six per cent respectively. See Table 73.

Table 73 Do you worry that you or a family member or friend might become a victim of personal injury or property theft/damage?

Person	Survey	Personal injury only	Property theft/damage only	Both	Total
		%	%	%	n
you	2007	10	14	77	3656
	2006	16	15	69	4011
	2005	15	13	73	4396
	2002	16	17	67	5141
family member or friend	2007	25	6	69	4325
	2006	25	7	69	4713
	2005	18	7	75	5118
	2002	26	7	67	6801

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Fear of personally becoming a victim of crime ranged from 18 per cent in DMR East to 53 per cent in Kerry. Compared with 2006, the levels of fear of crime were lower in 18 Divisions and higher in seven.

The largest decreases in fear of crime were registered in DMR East (22 percentage points), DMR South (19 points) and Cork City (17 points). The largest increases were recorded in Kerry (17 percentage points), Cavan/Monaghan (9 points) and Mayo (8 points). See Table 74.

From 2002 to 2007, the levels of fear of personally becoming a victim of crime have continually decreased in eight Divisions. The largest decrease in fear was in DMR East (34 percentage points: from 52% in 2002 to 18% in 2007).

Table 74 Worry about crime victimisation and Garda Division (percentage “yes”)

Garda Division	You				Family member or friend			
	2007	2006	2005	2002	2007	2006	2005	2002
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
DMR East	18	40	44	52	27	49	53	71
Donegal	26	32	43	38	27	39	52	54
Sligo/Leitrim	27	35	45	44	26	37	52	63
Cork City	31	48	62	56	39	50	64	71
Clare	31	33	32	47	26	30	35	60
DMR South	32	51	55	58	45	61	65	77
Mayo	32	24	35	38	33	30	47	61
Cork West	33	34	26	43	40	41	31	67
Roscommon/Galway East	34	33	48	45	42	46	51	63
Tipperary	34	40	45	55	36	43	45	71
Cavan/Monaghan	35	26	31	43	42	35	40	66
DMR West	36	40	44	56	46	53	51	74
DMR North Central	36	43	44	62	43	45	50	80
Louth/Meath	36	37	48	52	47	46	57	65
Carlow/Kildare	38	51	55	58	43	48	56	74
Laois/Offaly	39	49	50	53	36	52	53	69
Wexford/Wicklow	40	48	49	49	48	57	60	65
DMR North	40	39	55	51	54	49	65	73
DMR South Central	41	36	39	59	52	39	47	75
Galway West	41	39	46	43	44	52	53	61
Cork North	42	44	50	49	45	52	53	69
Longford/Westmeath	42	46	43	54	49	54	55	68
Waterford/Kilkenny	46	52	41	49	48	60	56	64
Limerick	52	56	49	59	58	67	55	71
Kerry	53	36	38	46	66	38	41	61
average	37	41	45	52	42	49	53	69

Table ordered according to values in column 2.

Fear of a family member or friend becoming a victim of crime ranged from 26 per cent in Sligo/Leitrim and Clare to 66 per cent in Kerry. Compared with 2006, levels of fear decreased in 19 Divisions, and increased in six. The largest decreases were in DMR East (22 percentage points), Laois/Offaly (16 points) and DMR South (16 points). See Table 74.

From 2002 to 2007, the levels of fear of a family member or friend becoming a victim of crime have continually decreased in 16 Divisions. The largest decrease in fear was in DMR East (44 percentage points: from 71% in 2002 to 27% in 2007).

In an attempt to get specific information on their perception of particular crimes, respondents were asked how worried they were about particular types of personal injury and property theft/damage crimes. On average, respondents worried more about becoming the victim of property theft/damage crimes, compared with personal injury crimes. One of the major concerns identified was, “*Having your home broken into and something stolen*” (90%). See Table 75.

Table 75 How worried are you about the following crimes?

Personal injury	Very	Fairly	Not very	Not at all
	%	%	%	%
being mugged or robbed	31	53	14	2
being raped	17	27	30	27
being physically attacked by stranger	29	51	17	3
being insulted or pestered by anybody in street/public place	18	35	31	16
being subject to physical attack because of your religion/race/skin colour	11	15	27	47
Property theft/damage	Very	Fairly	Not very	Not at all
	%	%	%	%
having your home broken into and something stolen	42	48	9	1
having your car stolen	34	43	15	9
having things stolen from your car	30	43	17	9
having your property vandalised	36	47	14	4

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

The majority of respondents indicated that fear of crime did not affect their quality of life significantly. Twenty-seven per cent indicated that fear of crime moderately reduced their quality of life, while 30 per cent indicated that it reduced the quality a little. There was no reduction in quality of life for 28 per cent of respondents. See table 76.

Table 76 How much did the fear of crime reduce your quality of life?

Year	Greatly	Significantly	Moderately	little	None	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	n
2007	4	11	27	30	28	3549
2006	4	11	25	31	29	4016

“Don’t knows” have been excluded; there were n=117 in 2006 and n=129 in 2007.

Relatively few respondents thought crime was decreasing or staying the same. Over four-fifths thought crime was increasing in Ireland (86%), although a majority of respondents were more optimistic about their own area, with just under half thinking it was increasing in their locality (48%). See Table 77.

Table 77 Do you believe that crime is increasing, decreasing or staying the same?

Where	Increasing	Decreasing	Staying the same	Total
	%	%	%	n
in Ireland	86	2	12	9954
in your area	48	6	46	9944

“Don’t knows” have been excluded; there were n=113 (“in Ireland”) and n=123 (“in your area”).

Eighty-six per cent of respondents thought crime was a very serious or serious problem in Ireland. See Table 78.

Table 78 How would you describe crime in Ireland today?

A very serious problem	A serious problem	A fairly serious problem	Not a serious problem	Not a problem	Total
%	%	%	%	%	n
49	37	13	1	1	9904

Percentages do not sum to 100 due to rounding.

In an attempt to get more specific information on respondent perceptions of the nature of the crime problem, respondents were asked about different types of offending in their area and in Ireland as a whole. The order of questions was rotated among respondents to avoid position bias.

Considerably more respondents thought crime and offending behaviour were a major problem in the country as a whole than in their own area. Drug crime featured highest in both categories.

Nine out of ten respondents thought “drug abuse” (90%) and “other drug crimes” (89%) were major problems in the country as a whole, while for their own areas the corresponding figures were 37 per cent (drug abuse) and 32 per cent (other drug crimes). At the national level, violent crime (75%) and juvenile crime (72%), were third and fourth most prominent of the categories. See Table 79.

Table 79 Do you think the following are a major, minor or no problem?

Where you live	Major problem	Minor problem	Not a problem	Don't know
	%	%	%	%
juvenile/teenage crime	27	47	23	2
drug abuse	37	38	19	6
other drug crimes	32	35	23	10
public drunkenness	20	45	33	3
public nuisance	17	45	36	3
race/hate crime	8	30	54	9
violent crime	14	33	47	6
property crime	22	46	27	5
car crime	24	45	27	4
white collar crime	9	30	39	23
rape-sexual assault	10	29	48	14
domestic violence	10	30	34	26
In the country as a whole	Major problem	Minor problem	Not a problem	Don't know
	%	%	%	%
juvenile/teenage crime	72	25	1	2
drug abuse	90	8	1	2
other drug crimes	89	8	1	2
public drunkenness	54	38	5	3
public nuisance	46	44	7	4
race/hate crime	45	40	9	6
violent crime	75	20	2	3
property crime	62	32	2	4
car crime	65	29	2	3
white collar crime	45	36	6	13
rape-sexual assault	60	30	4	6
domestic violence	50	33	4	13

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding; n =10067.

VIEWS ON CRIME AND THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM

Respondents were asked about what they believed was the main cause of crime in Ireland today. They were pressed to give only one answer but some respondents gave more than one.

Six in ten respondents (61%) believed that crime could be attributed to drugs or drink or both, which was similar to the finding in the 2006 survey (60%). The next most frequent answer was, “*lack of parental control*” (10%). See Table 80.

Table 80 What do you believe to be the main cause of crime in Ireland today?

Cause	2007	2006	2005	2002
	%	%	%	%
drugs	22	18	18	29
drink/alcohol	7	8	7	4
drugs and drink	32	34	32	19
reduction in moral standards	6	7	5	5
human greed and individual deviance	5	5	5	6
an unequal society – unfair distribution of wealth	5	5	5	6
insufficient education, health and welfare provision	3	3	4	3
lack of parental control	10	10	11	7
the Irish system of criminal justice	4	4	4	2
poor policing	2	2	2	1
lenient penal system	3	3	4	2
other (specify)	1	2	2	12
don't know	2	1	2	3

n = 10067 in 2007, n = 10046 in 2006 and 2005 surveys, and n=10315 in 2002 survey. Percentages do not sum to 100, either due to rounding or because some respondents gave more than one reason.

A majority of respondents felt that the predominant response to juvenile offending and drug abuse should be treatment rather than punishment. While attitudes have hardened somewhat since the 2002 survey, the percentages advocating punishment in each category are the same as in the 2006 survey. See Table 81.

Table 81 Do you believe that juvenile/teenage crime and drug abuse should be combated predominantly by punishment or rehabilitation/counselling?

Category	Survey	Punishment	Rehabilitation /counselling	Don't know	Total
		%	%	%	n
juvenile/teenage crime	2007	40	56	4	10021
	2006	40	56	4	9997
	2005	38	55	7	10046
	2002	32	63	5	10245
drug abuse	2007	32	63	4	9994
	2006	32	63	4	9992
	2005	30	63	7	10046
	2002	19	77	4	10188

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

When asked to indicate which of three statements about the treatment of offenders in the criminal justice system was nearest the truth, over three-quarters (78%) opted for, “...is too lenient on offenders”. This had also been the most popular option in the 2006 survey (82%). See Table 82.

Table 82 Criminal justice system treatment of offenders

View	2007	2006	2005	2002
	%	%	%	%
is too lenient on offenders	78	82	71	74
deals with offenders properly	19	16	24	23
is too harsh on offenders	3	2	4	3

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding; n= 9945 in 2007, n= 9936 in 2006, n= 9882 in 2005 and 9560 in 2002.

The survey also sought the views of respondents about other aspects of the criminal justice system by asking whether they agreed or disagreed with various statements. See Table 83. Almost eight out of ten (79%) respondents agreed that prison does not prevent re-offending, while six out of ten (62%) felt that alternatives to prison should be used for all but the most serious crimes and offenders.

Table 83 Views on the criminal justice system and public safety

Statement	Agree	Neither	Disagree
	%	%	%
Prison does not prevent re-offending	79	11	10
Alternatives to prison, such as fines, community service and probation, should be used for all but the most serious crimes and offenders	62	15	23
People who are different are likely to experience ridicule or personal attack on our streets	57	20	23
Young people who are caught in possession of cannabis/ecstasy should be cautioned for first offence	56	14	30
The better off you are, the better you are treated by the criminal justice system	50	18	32
Victims of crime get a raw deal from the courts	49	25	26
Young people who are caught in possession of cannabis/ecstasy should be treated as criminals	48	20	32
Irish culture accepts violence as a means to resolve problems	37	17	47
The criminal justice system treats crimes of violence committed by strangers as different to those committed by people known to the victim	34	36	30
Penalties for possession of so-called "soft" and "hard" drugs should be the same	31	14	55
Penalties for people caught in possession of cannabis/ecstasy should be more lenient	21	15	64

Questions were rotated in four groups and sample sizes ranged from 2478 to 2534. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Almost two-thirds (64%) disagreed that penalties for possession of cannabis or ecstasy should be more lenient, while over half (55%) disagreed that penalties for possession of "soft" and "hard" drugs should be the same. Fewer than half (48%) agreed that young people caught in possession of cannabis or ecstasy should be treated as criminals, and over half (56%) agreed that they should be cautioned for a first offence.

NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH AND COMMUNITY ALERT

Just over a quarter (27%) of respondents said that they were in Neighbourhood Watch or Community Alert schemes, with just under half (49%) saying they were not; a quarter (25%) were unsure. The proportion of respondents in schemes is two percentage points lower than in the 2006 survey. See Table 84.

Table 84 Is your household in a Neighbourhood Watch/Community Alert scheme?

Survey	Yes	No	Don't know	Total
	%	%	%	n
2007	27	49	25	10067
2006	29	48	24	10046
2005	33	49	18	10046
2002	45	46	9	10149

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Of those who said they were covered by schemes, 19 per cent were kept informed regularly about criminal activity in their area, up on 2006 and 2005. See Table 85.

Table 85 Do your scheme co-ordinators keep residents informed about criminal activity in your area?

Survey	Regularly	Occasionally	Never	Total
	%	%	%	n
2007	19	44	37	2598
2006	15	45	40	2773
2005	18	38	44	3267
2002	15	36	50	4336

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding; "don't knows" excluded.

This year, the level of information provision was higher than that recorded in 2006 and 2005. Just over four in ten (41%) said they knew the name of at least one of the scheme co-ordinators. See Table 86.

Table 86 Do you know who your scheme co-ordinator(s) are?

Survey	Yes	No	Not sure	Total
	%	%	%	n
2007	41	38	21	2675
2006	37	38	25	2868
2005	36	43	21	3338
2002	32	63	6	4526

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Question not asked in 2003/2004.

Four in ten respondents (40%) felt that the schemes were successful or very successful in preventing crime, down on previous years.

Almost a third of respondents felt that the schemes made no difference (30%), while 31 per cent didn't know if the schemes were successful. See Table 87.

**Table 87 How successful do you think such schemes are in preventing crime?
(all respondents)**

Year	Very successful	Successful	Make no difference	Don't know	Total
	%	%	%	%	n
2007	8	32	30	31	10067
2006	8	34	28	30	10046
2005	9	33	26	32	10046
2002	10	42	31	17	10062

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

The results were more positive from respondents who had said they were in a scheme. Almost six in ten (59%) felt that the schemes were successful or very successful in preventing crime. See Table 88.

Table 88 How successful do you think such schemes are in preventing crime?

2007 Survey	Very successful	Successful	Make no difference	Don't know	Total
	%	%	%	%	n
all respondents	8	32	30	31	10067
those in schemes	14	45	32	10	2676

Appendix 1

Survey questionnaire

Questionnaire no.

() () () () ()

Version no.

1. Blue
2. Green
3. Pink
4. Yellow

**PUBLIC ATTITUDES
TO THE GARDA SÍOCHÁNA**

NAME :

ADDRESS :

.....

TELEPHONE :

.....

GARDA REGION CODE:

--	--

.....

GARDA DIVISION:

--	--

.....

ASSIGNMENT NUMBER

--	--	--	--	--	--

.....

LENGTH OF INTERVIEW

MINS

.....

INTERVIEWER NUMBER

--	--	--	--	--	--

I certify that this interview has been carried out strictly in accordance with your instructions

SIGNED

DATE

PUBLIC ATTITUDES TO THE GARDA SÍOCHÁNA

Good morning / afternoon / evening, my name is _____ from Millward Brown IMS. We have been commissioned by the Department of Justice, Equality and Law Reform to conduct a Garda Public Attitude Survey.

Garda Surveys are conducted to get the views of the public on Garda performance, priorities and policies. Information from the surveys helps An Garda Síochána to continuously improve and develop the services it provides.

We would like to get your views and experiences. The questions will take about twenty minutes to answer

The replies you give are completely confidential and your household will never be associated with the responses. The information collected will be used only for the purpose of the survey.

If you have any questions about the survey, feel free to call:

- Garda Divisional Office (list provided)
- Millward Brown IMS - Conor Hughes (01 - 6761196)
- Garda Research Unit - Sergeant Patrick Kennedy at (0504) 35428

PUBLIC ATTITUDES TO THE GARDA SÍOCHÁNA

The following question relates to the level of satisfaction with the overall service provided by the Gardaí

1. How satisfied or dissatisfied overall were you with the service provided to the community by the Garda Síochána during 2006 (circle one only).

Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
1	2	3	4

The following set of questions relate to any experience of being the victim of crime in 2006

2. Were you or any member of your household the victim of a crime in 2006? (circle one only).

You	1	← go to Q9
Household member	2	
Both	3	
Neither	4	

SHOW CARD "A"

3. a) What type of crime did you or a household member experience in 2006?
 b) How many times did you experience this in 2006?
 c) Which incident was the most recent? (Single code only)

	(A)		(B)	(C)
	Type of crime		No. of Occasions in 2006	Most Recent
	Yes	No		
burglary of your home or outbuildings (breaking and entering and stealing or attempting to steal)	1	2		1
burglary of your business premises (owned by you)	1	2		2
theft of car or other vehicle	1	2		3
theft from car or other vehicle	1	2		4
theft of bicycle	1	2		5
criminal damage to car or other vehicle	1	2		6
criminal damage to home or other property	1	2		7
Robbery involving force or threat of force (including mugging)	1	2		8
theft from your person without force (e.g. pickpocket)	1	2		9
theft from your home or outbuildings, other than burglary	1	2		10
consumer fraud , such as swindling or obtaining payment using false pretences	1	2		11
physical assault (other than domestic or sexual)	1	2		12
sexual assault	1	2		13
domestic violence (physical)	1	2		14
Other (please specify)	1	2		15

4. Thinking of the most recent incident, was the crime reported to the Garda Síochána?

Yes	1	← go to Q8
No	2	

- 5(a). Did you or anyone else in your household receive a letter acknowledging the report of the crime and giving the name of the Garda dealing with the case and other information?

Yes	1	Go to Q5b
No	2	Go to Q5c
Don't know/can't remember	3	Go to Q5c

- 5(b). To what extent did you find the letter helpful?

Very helpful	1
Helpful	2
Not much help	3
No help	4

- 5(c). Were you or anyone else in your household informed of the Garda's name through any other means?

Yes	1
No	2
Don't know/can't remember	3

- 5(d). Have you ever received information on victim support services from a member of the Garda Síochána?

Yes	1
No	2
Don't know/Not sure	3

- 6(a). Did you or anyone else in your household receive a letter reporting significant developments in your case (such as an arrest)?

Yes	1	Go to Q6b
No	2	Go to Q6c
Don't know/can't remember	3	Go to Q6c

- 6(b). To what extent did you find this further letter helpful?

Very helpful	1
Helpful	2
Not much help	3
No help	4

- 6(c). Were you or anyone else in your household contacted through any other means by the Gardaí about significant developments?

Yes	1
No	2
Don't know/can't remember	3

SHOW CARD "B"

7. In regard to this most recent incident, how satisfied or dissatisfied was your household with being kept informed of progress?

Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
1	2	3	4
Please go to Q9.			

SHOW CARD "C"

8. Why was the crime not reported (circle all that apply).

Not serious enough/no loss	1
No chance of recovering property	2
No insurance claim anticipated	3
Believed Gardaí could not have done anything	4
Believed Gardaí would not have been interested	5
Felt the Gardaí would not believe you	6
No involvement wanted with the Gardaí	7
Fear of reprisal	8
Did not have time	9
Other (please specify)	10
.....	
.....	
Don't Know	11

ASK ALL

The following questions relate to various forms of contact you personally may have had with the Gardaí in 2006

SHOW CARD "D"

9. a) Have you had contact with the Garda Siochana in 2006 for any of these reasons?
 b) How many times have you had contact with the Gardaí for that reason? (Repeat for each contact)
 c) What was the most recent contact? (Single code only)

(A) (B) (C)

	Yes	No	No. of Occasions in 2006	Most recent contact
Contact initiated by you				
to report a crime	1	2		1
to report a disturbance/nuisance	1	2		2
to report a traffic incident	1	2		3
to report suspicious activity	1	2		4
to report lost/found property	1	2		5
to make a general enquiry	1	2		6
to make a complaint	1	2		7
to enquire about a person in custody	1	2		8
to be a witness	1	2		9
signing passports	1	2		10
to avail of other services (witness documents etc.)	1	2		11
Garda-initiated contact				
to produce documents	1	2		12
to ask about a crime	1	2		13
to investigate a traffic collision	1	2		14
to investigate noise/disturbance	1	2		15
to carry out a routine vehicle check (on public street)	1	2		16
to make a witness statement	1	2		17
alleged speeding offence	1	2		18
alleged drink driving offence	1	2		19
alleged other driving/traffic offence	1	2		20
Arrested, detained for questioning or searched	1	2		21

to receive summons	1	2		22
any other reason (please specify)	1	2		23
.....				
.....				
If 'no' to all above please go to Q25(a)				

SHOW CARD "E"

10. Thinking of the most recent contact, what form did it take? (circle one only).

Visit to a Garda station	1	←	go to Q11
Telephone call to Gardaí (excluding 999/112 calls)	2	←	go to Q12
Telephone call from Gardaí	3	←	go to Q14
Letter from Gardaí	4	←	go to Q15
Electronic means (email, etc)	5	←	go to Q15
Spoke to Garda on patrol	6	←	go to Q14
Spoke to Garda at checkpoint/vehicle stop	7		
Garda called to my home/work	8		
Other (please specify)	9		
.....			
.....			

11. If you visited a Garda station were you dealt with... (circle one only)

Quicker than expected	1	←	go to Q14
Within the time expected	2		
Slower than expected	3		

12. If you telephoned, was your call answered... (circle one only)

Promptly	1
Following a short delay	2
After an unacceptable delay	3
Had to call more than once before getting through	4

13. When your call was answered, did the respondent identify the station?

Yes	1
No	2
Don't know/can't remember	3

SHOW CARD "F"

14. To what extent did the manner of the Garda with whom you spoke meet your expectations in terms of the following?

Read out	Better than you expected	As you expected	Worse than you expected
Helpfulness	1	2	3
Competence	1	2	3
Sensitivity	1	2	3
Politeness	1	2	3
Interest	1	2	3

15. Thinking of the most recent contact, do you think the matter required that a Garda call on you at your home?

Yes	1
No	2

16. Did the Gardaí indicate that someone would call on you?

Yes	1
No	2

17. Did a Garda call on you?

Yes	1
No	2

If 'no' to both Q16 and Q17 please go to Q20

18. When you originally contacted the Garda Síochána on this matter, were you told approximately how long it would be before someone would call on you?

Yes	1	← go to Q20.
No	2	

19. Did a Garda call on you within the time indicated?

Yes	1
No	2
This amount of time has not yet elapsed	3

ASK ALL

20. Did the Garda Síochána get in touch later to inform you about the outcome of your contact?

Yes	1	← go to Q22(a)
No	2	

21. Do you think you should have been contacted?

Yes	1
No	2

ASK ALL

22(a). Have you dialled 999 or 112 and asked for emergency Garda response in 2006?

Yes	1	← Go to Q24
No	2	

22(b). Was your call answered within 10 seconds?

Yes	1
No	2
Not sure	3

22(c). How long did it take for the Gardaí to call out to you?

Within 15 minutes	1	← go to Q23
More than 15 minutes	2	← go to Q22(d)
Did not respond	3	← go to Q23

22(d). If more than 15 minutes, how long did it take for the Gardaí to call out to you?

minutes

SHOW CARD "G"

23. If you called for emergency Garda response, how satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the service you received?

Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
1	2	3	4

The following questions relate to your overall contact with the Gardaí and suggestions for improvement

SHOW CARD "G" AGAIN

24. Thinking of your overall contact with the Gardaí, how satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the service you received?

Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
1	2	3	4

25(a). Do you think the service which the Garda provides needs to be improved?

Yes	1	← go to Q26
No	2	

25(b). How do you think the service could be improved?

More gardai on foot patrols	1
Greater Garda numbers	2
Enforce traffic laws more thoroughly	3
Garda stations open longer	4
Gardaí to be friendlier	5
More contact with the community	6
Other (please specify)	7
.....	
.....	

The next questions deal with Garda approachability and behaviour

SHOW CARD "H"

26. In general, how approachable do you think the Gardaí are at your local station? (**circle one only**)

Very approachable	1	← go to Q27(a)
Approachable	2	
Unapproachable	3	← go to Q27(b)
Very unapproachable	4	
Don't Know	5	← go to Q28

27(a). Why do you think they are approachable? (**Check all that apply**)

Very friendly/helpful	1
Respondent know them	2
Very reassuring	3
They have time for you	4
They are members of the community	5
Can communicate with them	6
Other (please specify)	7
.....	
.....	

27(b). Why do you think they are unapproachable? (**Check all that apply**)

Unfriendly/rude	1
Not always there/station frequently closed	2
Just not interested	3
Think they are superior/formal manner	4
Minor complaints dealt with more seriously	5
Unhelpful	6
Distance themselves from the community	7
Other (please specify)	8
.....	
.....	

ASK ALL

28. Do you know, by name, any member of the Garda Síochána at your local station or the station which you would normally contact?

Yes	1
No	2

29. Has a Garda ever behaved towards you in a way you consider unacceptable?

Yes	1	
No	2	← go to Q31

SHOW CARD "I"

30. In what way was the behaviour unacceptable? (circle all that apply).

Was disrespectful or impolite	1
Did not follow proper procedures	2
Stopped or searched without reason	3
Harassed	4
Clearly was very lax in carrying out duty	5
Used racist language	6
Used sexist or sectarian language	7
Made wrongful accusation	8
Behaved in a violent way (e.g. pushing)	9
Discriminated due to age, gender, race or ethnicity	10
Swore	11
Searched house without reason	12
Took an item of your property	13
Other – please specify:	14
.....	
.....	

ASK ALL

The next set of questions are about racism

31. Have you ever been subjected to a racist incident? (A racist incident is any incident which is perceived to be racist by the victim, a witness to the incident or the investigating Garda.)

Yes	1	
No	2	← go to Q36

32. Thinking of the most recent incident, was it reported to the Garda Síochána?

Yes	1	
No	2	← go to Q34

SHOW CARD "J"

33. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with how it was dealt with?

Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
1	2	3	4
Please go to Q35.			

34. Why did you not report the incident?

SHOW CARD "J1"

Not serious enough	1
Believed Gardaí could not have done anything	2
Believed Gardaí would not have been interested	3
No involvement wanted with the Gardaí	4
Fear of reprisal	5
Did not have time	6
Other (please specify)	7
.....	
Don't Know	8

35. Have you ever been subjected to a racist incident by a Garda?

Yes	1
No	2

ASK ALL

The following questions are concerned with Garda presence in your locality and road safety

SHOW CARD "K"

36. When was the last time you remember seeing a Garda in your locality?

Today	1
Yesterday	2
2-7 days ago	3
1-4 weeks ago	4
Longer	5
Can't remember	6

SHOW CARD "L"

37. How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with this level of Garda visibility in your locality?

Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
1	2	3	4

SHOW CARD "M"

38. Do you think the level of Garda foot patrol in your locality has changed in the past year?

Yes – increased	1
Yes – decreased	2
About the same/little or no change	3
Don't Know	4

SHOW CARD "M" AGAIN

39. Do you think the level of Garda activity in your locality, generally, has changed in the past year?

Yes – increased	1
Yes – decreased	2
About the same/little or no change	3
Don't Know	4

SHOW CARD "N"

40(a). All in all, how good a job do the Gardaí do in your locality?

Very Good	Fairly Good	Fairly Poor	Very Poor
1	2	3	4

SHOW CARD "N" AGAIN

40(b). How good a job do the Gardaí do in your locality as regards road safety?

Very Good	Fairly Good	Fairly Poor	Very Poor
1	2	3	4

41. Were you involved in a road traffic collision as a driver of a vehicle (e.g. car, bus, lorry, motorcycle etc), a pedestrian or a cyclist in 2006 which was dealt with by the Gardaí?

Yes	1	
No	2	← go to Q44.

42. If yes, who was most at fault?

You	1
The other party	2
Both equally	3

SHOW CARD “O”

43(a). How satisfied were you with the Garda investigation of the collision?

Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
1	2	3	4
go to Q44		go to Q43(b)	

43(b). Why were you dissatisfied with the Garda investigation?

Garda withheld information	1
Nothing was/has been done	2
Nobody came to the scene	3
Garda took very long time to come to scene	4
Garda wrongfully charged the respondent	5
Very bad service	6
Were not interested in incident	7
Other (Specify)	8

SHOW CARD “P”

44. The Garda Síochána has limited resources and is faced with a wide range of demands. In your opinion, what priority do you think the Garda should give to the following policing tasks? **ROTATE STARTING POINT.**

	Very high priority	High priority	Low priority
Investigate crime	1	2	3
Patrol on foot or bicycle	1	2	3
Patrol by car/van	1	2	3
Patrol by motorcycle	1	2	3
Enforce drink/drive laws	1	2	3
Enforce speed laws	1	2	3
Ensure effective traffic management and flow	1	2	3
Enforce laws relating to wearing of seatbelts	1	2	3
Enforce other traffic laws	1	2	3
Advise on personal safety and home security	1	2	3
Advise businesses/shops on crime prevention	1	2	3
Enforce laws relating to drugs	1	2	3
Ensure immediate response to emergencies	1	2	3
Deal with public annoyances (e.g. loud music, street fights)	1	2	3
Deal with vandalism	1	2	3
Provide help and support to victims of crime	1	2	3
Supervise licensed premises	1	2	3
Work with community groups (e.g. Neighbourhood Watch/Community Alert, youth clubs, schools, senior citizens)	1	2	3
Ensure State security	1	2	3
Enforce immigration laws	1	2	3
Deal with under-aged drinking in <u>pubs</u>	1	2	3
Deal with under-aged drinking on the <u>streets</u>	1	2	3
Tackle the sale of alcohol to those under age	1	2	3
Target organised crime	1	2	3
Deal with youths racing around in cars	1	2	3
Enforce laws relating to fraud & white collar crime	1	2	3
Deal with crimes of sexual violence	1	2	3
Deal with domestic violence incidents	1	2	3

SHOW CARD “Q”

45. In your opinion, what priority do you think the Garda actually give to the following policing tasks? **ROTATE STARTING POINT.**

	Very high priority	High priority	Low priority	Very low priority
Investigate crime	1	2	3	4
Patrol on foot or bicycle	1	2	3	4
Patrol by car/van	1	2	3	4
Patrol by motorcycle	1	2	3	4
Enforce drink/drive laws	1	2	3	4
Enforce speed laws	1	2	3	4
Ensure effective traffic management and flow	1	2	3	4
Enforce laws relating to wearing of seatbelts	1	2	3	4
Enforce other traffic laws	1	2	3	4
Advise on personal safety and home security	1	2	3	4
Advise businesses/shops on crime prevention	1	2	3	4
Enforce laws relating to drugs	1	2	3	4
Ensure immediate response to emergencies	1	2	3	4
Deal with public annoyances (e.g. loud music, street fights)	1	2	3	4
Deal with vandalism	1	2	3	4
Provide help and support to victims of crime	1	2	3	4
Supervise licensed premises	1	2	3	4
Work with community groups (e.g. Neighbourhood Watch/Community Alert, youth clubs, schools, senior citizens)	1	2	3	4
Ensure State security	1	2	3	4
Enforce immigration laws	1	2	3	4
Deal with under-aged drinking in <u>pubs</u>	1	2	3	4
Deal with under-aged drinking on the <u>streets</u>	1	2	3	4
Tackle the sale of alcohol to those under age	1	2	3	4
Target organised crime	1	2	3	4
Deal with youths racing around in cars	1	2	3	4
Enforce laws relating to fraud and white collar crime	1	2	3	4
Deal with crimes of sexual violence	1	2	3	4
Deal with domestic violence incidents	1	2	3	4

ASK ALL

The next set of questions concern the relationship between Gardai and the community, personal safety and crime generally in Ireland

SHOW CARD "R"

46. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with each of the following statements

	strongly agree	agree	neither	disagree	strongly disagree
The Gardaí serve the interests of the rich more than the poor	1	2	3	4	5
The better off you are, the better you are treated by the criminal justice system	1	2	3	4	5
Gardaí discriminate against immigrants	1	2	3	4	5
Gardaí are representative of the communities they serve	1	2	3	4	5
The local Gardaí reflect the make-up of my local community	1	2	3	4	5
Gardaí are sensitive to the needs of vulnerable people	1	2	3	4	5
The local Gardaí are fully answerable to the people for their actions and conduct	1	2	3	4	5
The people around here have a real say in deciding what is important for the Gardaí to attend to	1	2	3	4	5

ASK ALL

The next set of questions concern the relationship between gardai and the community, personal safety and crime generally in Ireland

SHOW CARD "R"

46. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with each of the following statements

	strongly agree	agree	neither	disagree	strongly disagree
When people are dissatisfied with what the Gardaí do, it is easy to have the matter corrected	1	2	3	4	5
The Gardaí carry out their role in a fair impartial manner	1	2	3	4	5
Garda management fully support community policing (e.g. assigning Community Guards to area, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
The Garda organisation is made up of honest and honourable people	1	2	3	4	5
People who are different are likely to experience ridicule or personal attack on our streets	1	2	3	4	5
The Gardaí provide good leadership in the guidance and direction of our young people	1	2	3	4	5
Anyone in Garda custody would be well treated	1	2	3	4	5

ASK ALL

The next set of questions concern the relationship between gardai and the community, personal safety and crime generally in Ireland

SHOW CARD "R"

46. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with each of the following statements

	strongly agree	agree	neither	disagree	strongly disagree
Anyone in Garda custody would have their rights fully respected	1	2	3	4	5
Penalties for people caught in possession of cannabis or ecstasy should be more lenient	1	2	3	4	5
Penalties for possession of so-called "soft" and "hard" drugs should be the same	1	2	3	4	5
Young people who are caught in possession of cannabis or ecstasy should be treated as criminals	1	2	3	4	5
Young people caught in possession of cannabis or ecstasy should be cautioned, for first offence	1	2	3	4	5
Alternatives to prison, such as fines, community service and probation, should be used for all but the most serious crimes and offenders	1	2	3	4	5
Prison does not prevent re-offending	1	2	3	4	5
I would encourage a friend or relative to join the Garda Síochána	1	2	3	4	5

Yellow

ASK ALL

The next set of questions concern the relationship between gardai and the community, personal safety and crime generally in Ireland

SHOW CARD "R"

46. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with each of the following statements

	strongly agree	agree	neither	disagree	strongly disagree
People like me would be welcome in the Garda Síochána as members	1	2	3	4	5
If my rights were infringed, I could rely on the Gardaí to help me	1	2	3	4	5
The Gardaí never blame victims of crime	1	2	3	4	5
Domestic violence is a private matter, not a garda matter	1	2	3	4	5
Irish culture accepts violence as a means to resolve problems	1	2	3	4	5
The criminal justice system treats crimes of violence committed by strangers as different to those committed by people known to the victim	1	2	3	4	5
Victims of crime get a raw deal from the courts	1	2	3	4	5

SHOW CARD "S"

47. How safe do you feel walking in your neighbourhood after dark?

Very safe	Safe	Unsafe	Very Unsafe
1	2	3	4

SHOW CARD "S" AGAIN

48. How safe do you feel alone in your home at night?

Very safe	Safe	Unsafe	Very Unsafe
1	2	3	4

SHOW CARD "T"

49. Do you feel more safe or less safe out walking in your area now than you did 12 months ago? And compared with six years ago?

	Safer	No different	Less safe	Don't know	Didn't live in area then
12 months ago	1	2	3	4	5
6 years ago	1	2	3	4	5

50(a). Do you worry that you might become a victim of a crime?

Yes	1	
No	2	← go to Q51(a)

SHOW CARD "U"

50(b) Do you worry that you might become a victim of personal injury or property theft/damage?

Only personal injury	1	← go to Q50(c)
Only property theft, damage	2	← go to Q50(d)
Both personal and property	3	← go to Q50 (c) & (d)

SHOW CARD "V"

50(c) How worried are you about the following?

	very	Fairly	Not very	Not at all
Being mugged or robbed	1	2	3	4
Being raped	1	2	3	4
Being physically attacked by stranger	1	2	3	4
Being insulted or pestered by anybody in street/public place	1	2	3	4
Being subject to physical attack because of your religion/race/skin colour	1	2	3	4

SHOW CARD "V" AGAIN

50(d) How worried are you about the following?

	very	Fairly	Not very	Not at all
Having your home broken into and something stolen	1	2	3	4
Having your car stolen	1	2	3	4
Having things stolen from your car	1	2	3	4
Having your property vandalised	1	2	3	4

SHOW CARD "W"

50e) How much has your fear of crime affected your quality of life?

Greatly reduced quality	Significantly reduced quality	Moderately reduced quality	Reduced quality a little	No effect on quality
1	2	3	4	5

ASK ALL

51(a). Do you worry that a family member or friend might become a victim of a crime?

Yes	1	
No	2	← go to Q52

SHOW CARD "X" AGAIN

51(b). Do you worry that a family member or friend might become a victim of personal injury or property theft/damage?

Only personal injury	1
Only property theft, damage	2
Both personal and property	3

52. Do you believe that crime in Ireland is increasing, decreasing or staying the same?

Increasing	Decreasing	Staying the same
1	2	3

53. Do you believe that crime in your area is increasing, decreasing or staying the same?

Increasing	Decreasing	Staying the same
1	2	3

SHOW CARD "Y"

54. How would you describe crime in Ireland today?

A very serious problem	A serious problem	A fairly serious problem	Not a serious problem	Not a problem
1	2	3	4	5

SHOW CARD "Z"

55. Thinking about where you live, do you think the following are a major problem, minor problem or not a problem?

ROTATE STARTING POINT.

READ OUT	Major problem	Minor problem	Not a problem	Don't know
Juvenile / teenage crime	1	2	3	4
Drug abuse (taking drugs)	1	2	3	4
Other drug crime (importing/selling)	1	2	3	4
Public drunkenness	1	2	3	4
Public nuisance	1	2	3	4
Race/hate crime	1	2	3	4
Violent crime	1	2	3	4
Rape/sexual assault	1	2	3	4
Domestic Violence	1	3	3	4
Property crime	1	2	3	4
Car crime	1	2	3	4
White collar crime	1	2	3	4

SHOW CARD "Z" AGAIN

56. With regard to the country as a whole, do you think the following are a major problem, minor problem or not a problem? **ROTATE STARTING POINT.**

READ OUT	Major problem	Minor problem	Not a problem	Don't know
Juvenile / teenage crime	1	2	3	4
Drug abuse (taking drugs)	1	2	3	4
Other drug crime (importing/selling)	1	2	3	4
Public drunkenness	1	2	3	4
Public nuisance	1	2	3	4
Race/hate crime	1	2	3	4
Violent crime	1	2	3	4
Rape/sexual assault	1	2	3	4
Domestic Violence	1	2	3	4
Property crime	1	2	3	4
Car crime	1	2	3	4
White collar crime	1	2	3	4

SHOW CARD "Z1"

57. What do you believe to be the main cause of crime in Ireland today? (**circle one only**)

Drugs	1
Drink/alcohol	2
Drugs and drink	3
Reduction in moral standards	4
Human greed and individual deviance	5
An unequal society – unfair distribution of wealth	6
Insufficient education, health and welfare provision	7
Lack of parental control	8
The Irish system of criminal justice	9
Poor policing	10
Lenient penal system	11
Other (please specify)	12
.....	
.....	
Don't know	13

58A. Do you believe that juvenile/teenage crime should be combated predominantly by ... ?

58B. Do you believe that drug abuse (taking drugs) should be combated predominantly by ... ?

	Punishment	Rehabilitation /counselling	Don't know
Juvenile / teenage crime	1	2	3
Drug abuse (taking drugs)	1	2	3

SHOW CARD "Z2"

59. Which of the following do you feel is nearest to the truth? (**circle one only**)

Our criminal justice system is too lenient on offenders	1
Our criminal justice system deals with offenders properly	2
Our criminal justice system is too harsh on offenders	3

ASK ALL

The next set of questions are about Neighbourhood Watch/Community Alert Schemes

60. Is your household in a Neighbourhood Watch or Community Alert Scheme?

Yes	1
No	2
Don't know	3

← go to Q62

61(a). Do your scheme co-ordinators keep residents informed about criminal activity in your area?

Regularly	Occasionally	Never
1	2	3

61(b). Do you know who your scheme co-ordinator(s) are?

Yes	1
No	2
Not sure / Dont know	3

62. How successful do you think such schemes are in preventing crime?

Very successful	1
Successful	2
Make no difference	3
Don't Know	4

ASK ALL

These final questions are general background questions used for basic analysis

B1. What was your age last birthday... (**STATE EXACT**)

--	--

& CODE:-

18-24	1
25-44	2
45-64	3
65+	4

B2. Record...

Male	1
Female	2

SHOW CARD "Z3"

B3. What is your marital status?

Single (never married)	1
Married	2
Co-habiting / Living together	3
Separated	4
Divorced	5
Widowed	6

SHOW CARD "Z4"

B4. What is your nationality?

Irish	1
English / British	2
Austrian	3
Belgian	4
Czech	5
Cypriot	6
Danish	7
Dutch	8
Estonian	9
Finnish	10
French	11
German	12
Greek	13
Hungarian	14
Italian	15
Latvian	16
Lithuanian	17
Luxembourg	18
Maltese	19
Polish	20
Portuguese	21
Slovakian	22
Slovenian	23
Spanish	24
Swedish	25
Other Non EU Country (please specify)	26
.....	
.....	
.....	

SHOW CARD "Z5"

B5. What is your highest Educational Qualification? (circle one only).

Primary education	1
Lower secondary (Junior/Group/O Level)	2
Upper secondary	
- Technical or Vocational	3
- Leaving Certificate	4
- Both Technical/Vocational and Leaving Certificate	5
Third Level	
- Non degree qualification	6
- Primary degree	7
- Professional qualification (of at least primary degree status)	8
- Primary degree and professional qualification	9
- Postgraduate degree (excluding postgraduate diplomas)	10
No formal qualification	11

B6. Which one of these areas would best describe your locality?

Dublin City	1
Other city (Cork, Galway, Limerick, Waterford)	2
Town (10,000 – 40,000 pop.)	3
Town (1,000 – 10,000 pop.)	4
Village/rural/open country	5

B7. Do you have any dependent children?

Yes	1
No	2

SHOW CARD "Z6"

B8. Is the home you live in...(circle one only)

Owned occupied with loan	1
Owned occupied without loan	2
Being purchased from a Local Authority	3
Rented from a Local Authority	4
Rented privately unfurnished	5
Rented privately furnished	6
Occupied free of rent	7
Other (please specify)	8
.....	
.....	
Don't know	9

SHOW CARD "Z7"

B9. Employment status (circle one only):

Self-employed	1
Working full-time	2
Working part-time	3
Seeking work for the first time	4
Unemployed (having lost or given up a job)	5
Home (domestic) duties	6
Unable to work due to permanent illness / disability	7
Not working (seeking work)	8
Not working (not seeking work)	9
On a government training / education scheme (e.g. Fás)	10
On government employment scheme (CE, Jobs-option etc.)	11
Retired	12
Student (further education)	13
Other (please specify)	14
.....	

B10. Have you ever had a paid job?

Yes	1	
No	2	← go to B13

B11. If at work (either self-employed or employee) what is your main occupation **OR** If unemployed, retired, engaged in home duties or on government training scheme and previously employed, what is the main occupation you previously held (please give as full a description as possible).

B12. If currently / previously a farmer or farm worker, please state the NUMBER OF ACRES of land farmed.

INTERVIEWER RECORD CLASS

- AB
- C1
- C2
- D
- E
- F50 +
- F50 -

B13. Do you have a telephone land-line?

Yes	1
No	2

B14a. Including yourself, how many people aged 18 years and over usually live in your household?

B14b. How many people aged under 18 usually live in your household?

Finally, do you have any further comments

If no suggestions, please tick box

Appendix 2

Survey methodology

The *Garda Public Attitudes Survey 2007* is the ninth in a series of national surveys of the adult population commissioned by the Garda Síochána. The main focus of the surveys is on satisfaction with Garda service, policing priorities and experiences and fear of crime.

Previous surveys were carried out in 2006, 2005, 2004, 2003, 2002, 2000, 1998 and 1993/1994. The sample size was 10,000 in 2007, 2006, 2005 and 2002, and 1,000 in the other surveys. The larger sample size allows analysis at Garda Division level and the national sample of 10,000 essentially comprises 25 Divisional surveys of 400 each.

The fieldwork for the 2007 survey was carried out by Millward Brown IMS (MBIMS), who were commissioned following a competitive public tendering process. The questionnaire was drawn up by the Garda Research Unit and minor changes agreed with MBIMS. Comparability with previous surveys was maximised by retaining the exact wording in as many questions as possible. Two general background questions were added this year to identify the number of persons over and under the age of 18 years living in the household with the respondent.

The survey was conducted by means of in-home face-to-face interviews, with respondents selected on the basis of quotas in each Garda Division and a limit of one interview per household. Interviewing took place between 12 March and 26 June 2007.

The sampling frame was created by MBIMS by matching District Electoral Divisions (DED's) contained in a dataset of Garda Divisions supplied by the Garda Research Unit with the complete list of DED's recorded by the Central Statistics Office. The sampling methodology is biased towards the settled community and is likely to under-represent members of the travelling community and certain other hard-to-reach groups such as non-English-speaking immigrants.

Quotas were imposed on each division by gender, age and social class, based on the known demographics of the adult population aged 18 years and over.

Social class was recorded on the basis of the occupation of the chief income earner in the household and then later coded according to the standard list of AIMRO occupations (see Appendix 3).

A total of 10,067 interviews were conducted across 25 Garda Divisions. One thousand two hundred and fifty (1,250) sampling points were selected nationwide; 50 sampling points per division. The interviewers received two copies each of four different colour coded questionnaires for each sampling point. This allowed specific questions to be rotated between respondents. The ordering of certain questions was also rotated to avoid possible position bias (see questionnaire in Appendix 1).

The interviewers used show cards where appropriate. Show cards are typically used when a question has a list of possible responses, one of which needs to be chosen by the respondent. The cards helped to speed the interview and were only used selectively.

On completion of the interview, the interviewer collected personal information such as name and telephone number. These were collected for verification purposes, and a supervisor at MBIMS verified at least ten per cent of the completed interviews. This information was removed from the final data file to preserve anonymity.

Once interviewing was completed, the data was entered onto computer by MBIMS using its Odin software package. The questionnaires were 'punched' into a flat ASCII datafile and the data then analysed using the company's Diana software package. The data was checked to ensure that all question filters had worked properly, and cleaned to remove internal system data as well as any personal information obtained from respondents (e.g. names and telephone numbers) that was present in the ASCII datafile. The dataset was then exported to an SPSS file for analysis by the Garda Research Unit.

Results were subsequently weighted at national level in order to adjust for differences between the known population and the sample.

The survey results are presented in the report as point estimates and MBIMS state that the true population values are likely to lie within a range of ± 1 per cent of these point estimates at the national level and within a ± 4.9 per cent error margin at Divisional level. Thus, for example, the true value of the national sample satisfaction rate of 80 per cent could vary between 79 and 81 per cent, while the true value of a similar Divisional satisfaction rate could lie between 75.1 and 84.9 per cent. Larger margins of error occur where questions were rotated and not asked of all respondents and for sub-categories of respondents where numbers were small. Comparisons with other surveys also need to take account of the error margins associated with those surveys. Multiple comparisons between Divisions widen the error margin further. Care should be taken, therefore, in drawing inferences from the survey results.

Appendix 3

Social class definitions

SOCIAL CLASS DEFINITIONS

Guide to Grade "A" Households

Upper Middle Class

Accountant (chartered) - Own practice or Partner/Principal in practice with 12+ employees
 Actor
 Advertising Executive - Director/Partner/Principal in Agency with 12+ employees
 Architect - Own practice or Partner/Principal in practice with 12+ employees
 Auctioneer - Own business or Director/Partner/Principal in business with 12+ employees

 Bank Manager (Large branch with 12+ employees)
 Barrister - Own practice or Partner/Principal in practice with 12+ employees
 Botanist
 Business Proprietor (with 12+ employees)
 Buyer (Senior) in leading Wholesale/Retail establishment

 Captain - Irish Naval Service/Large merchant vessel
 Church Dignitaries (Bishop and above) any denomination
 Civil Servant (Secretary/Assistant Secretary)
 Colonel - Army
 Commander - Irish Naval Service
 Company Director (in firm with 12+ employees)
 Company Secretary (in firm with 12+ employees)
 Computer Consultant (in firm with 12+ employees)

Grade "A" (cont'd)

County Planning Officer (Principal/Senior Official; Local Government)

 Dentist - Own practice or Partner/Principal in practice
 Doctor - Own practice or Partner/Principal in practice

 Editor - National Newspaper or Magazine
 Engineer - Senior (qualified with University degree) - own practice or Partner/ Principal in practice with 12+ employees

 Fire Officer (Chief)

 Garda (Chief Superintendent)
 General - Lieutenant or Major – Army
 Government Member (T.D)

 Headmaster/mistress - large secondary school

 Insurance underwriter

 Journalist (Senior) - own column in National Newspaper/Magazine

 Librarian - qualified, in charge of large library
 Lieutenant Colonel - Army/Air Corps

 Manager of large Factory/Business/Hotel/ Department etc. responsible for 12+ employees
 Matron of large Teaching Hospital

Grade "A" (cont'd)

People living in comfort on Investments or Private Income
 People (retired) where H/H would have been Grade "A" before retirement
 Physician
 Physicist
 Pilot (Commercial Airline)
 Professor - University
 Public Relations Executive - Director/Principal/Partner in Agency with 12+ employees

 Research - Director/Principal in Agency with 12+ employees

 Scientist - Senior Industrial
 Solicitor - own practice or Partner/Principal in practice with 12+ employees
 Specialist - Medical profession
 Stockbroker
 Surgeon
 Surveyor (Chartered) - own practice or Partner/Principal in practice with 12+ employees

 Town Clerk (City Manager, other Senior Principal Officer; Local Government)
 Treasurer (Senior Principal Officer; Local Government)
 Veterinary Surgeon - own practice or Partner/Principal in practice

SOCIAL CLASS DEFINITIONS

Guide to Grade "B" Households

Middle Class

Accountant - Qualified; no practice; employed as Executive

Architect - Qualified; no practice; employed as Executive

Bank Manager (small branch office - up to 12 employees)

Business Proprietor (with 3-12 employees)

Captain - Army/Air Corps

Civil Servant (Principal Officer/Assistant Principal Officer)

Commandant - Army/Air Corps

Computer Consultant (with 3 – 12 Employees)

Engineer (Qualified - University degree) - no practice; employed as Executive; not Grade "A"

Ensign - Irish Naval Service

Fire Officer (Assistant Chief)

Garda - Superintendent/Inspector

Headmaster/mistress in primary or Secondary smaller school

Insurance Company Manager (small branch office - up to 12 employees)

Journalist - not senior enough for Grade "A"

Lecturer - University or Technical College

Grade "B" (cont'd)

Librarian - Senior, Qualified; in charge of small branch library

Lieutenant, First - Army

Lieutenant - Commander - Irish Naval Service

Local Government Officer - Senior

Manager of Factory/Business/Hotel/ Department responsible for 6-12 persons

Matron - Non-Teaching Hospital

Parish Priest (or equivalent in any denomination) People, with smaller private incomes than Grade "A" living less luxuriously

People (retired); H/H before retirement would have been Grade "B"

Pharmacists - Qualified (University degree); own business with 3-12 employees

Professional people - not yet established; qualified less than 3 years

Sales Manager(Area) responsible for 6-12 persons

Sister/Tutor in large hospital

Solicitor - Qualified; no practice; employed as Executive, not Grade "A"

Surveyor - Qualified; no practice; employed as Executive, not Grade "A"

Teacher - Senior Secondary; in charge of Department

Technician - with degrees in Electronics/ Computers/Aircraft/Chemicals/Nuclear Energy

Guide to Grade "C1" Households

Lower Middle Class

Bank Clerk

Buyer (except Senior Buyer)

Civil Servant - (H.E.O./Junior Executive Officer/Staff Officer/Clerical Officer/Clerical Assistant)

Clerical Employees - supervisory grades; non-manual workers

Clerk (Articled)

Clerk (Despatch)

Clerk (Receptionist)

Clerk (Typist)

Clerk (National/Local Government)

Clerk (Insurance)

Commercial Traveller/Company Representative Curate (or equivalent in any denomination)

Draughtsman

Driving Instructor

Entertainer (Actor/Musician etc. - main occupation but not well known or established)

Garda Sergeant

Insurance Agent - door to door

Laboratory Assistant

Leading Seaman - Irish Naval Service

Lecturer - Junior, University

Library Assistant - not fully qualified Librarian

Lieutenant - School/Cadet - Army

Lieutenant - Sub - Irish Naval Service

SOCIAL CLASS DEFINITIONS

<i>Grade "C1" (cont'd)</i>	Guide to Grade "C2" Households	<i>Grade "C2" cont'd)</i>
<p>Machine (Office) Operator (Punch Card, Calculating, Accounting only) Manager of Factory/Business/Hotel/Office/Department - responsible for 1-5 persons Midwife</p> <p>Nun - any denomination; but not those with special responsibilities Nurse - Student, Staff, Sister - all State Registered</p> <p>People (retired) who before retirement would have been Grade "C1"; who have pensions rather than State or very modest private means Petty Officer - Irish Naval Service Physiotherapist Proprietor - Shop or Business - with 1-2 paid employees</p> <p>Radiographer Receptionist</p> <p>Secretary Sergeant - Army Student in any third level institution</p> <p>Teacher - Primary, Secondary, Vocational - without special responsibilities Technician/Engineer - (no degree but Technical/Professional qualification) Telegraphist Telephonist Telex Operator Typist</p> <p>Warrant Officer - Irish Naval Service</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Skilled Working Class</i></p> <p>AA Patrolman Ambulance Driver</p> <p>Baker Barber Barman - Head - in charge of others Blacksmith Brewer Bricklayer Butcher</p> <p>Cabinet Maker Carpenter Charge - Hand Chef Coach Builder Cobbler (Shoemaker) Compositor Coppersmith Corporal - Army</p> <p>Dental Mechanic/Technician Driver - Bus Driver - Long Distance Heavy Lorry Driver and Shunter (Engine) Driver - Taxi, Who owns his own taxi Dressmaker</p> <p>Electrician Electrotyper Engraver (Process) Excavator (Crane Driver)</p> <p>Filler Finisher - Paper and Board Manufacturer Fireman - not leading Fitter - Electrical Fitter - Mechanical</p>	<p>Foreman Furnace Man</p> <p>Ganger Garda - ordinary Gardener/Groundsman - Head - in charge of other employees Glazier Grinder Guard - Goods and Passenger</p> <p>Hewer Housekeeper - in charge of others</p> <p>Joiner</p> <p>Knitter - skilled in Hosiery/knitted goods</p> <p>Linesman (ESB) Linotype Operator</p> <p>Machine Man Maltster Manager - small shop; does most of work; not in charge of anyone Mason Millwright Miner Motor Mechanic Moulder</p> <p>Nylon (skilled in production)</p> <p>Overlooker Overseer (mainly manual work)</p> <p>Panel Beater Painter Pastry Cook</p>

SOCIAL CLASS DEFINITIONS

	<u>Guide to Grade "D" Households</u>	
<p style="color: red;"><i>Grade "C2" (cont'd)</i></p> <p>People (retired) who before retirement would have been Grade "C2"; very modest private means; small pensions other than state</p> <p>Plasterer Plater Plumber Prison Officer Proprietor - small shop; no paid employees Putter</p> <p>Riveter</p> <p>Seaman - Able - Irish Naval Service Security Officer (e.g. Securicor etc.) Self-employed - Skilled; no paid employees - unskilled; 1-4 employees Setter Shipwright Shop Assistant - Head - in charge of others Signalman Sorter - Post Office Smelter Sprayer Stereotyper Stevedore</p> <p>Tailor - Cutter and fitter Telephone installer Toolmaker Turner Typesetter</p> <p>Upholsterer</p> <p>Vehicle Builder</p> <p>Waiter - Head - in charge of others Weaver Welder</p>	<p style="color: red;"><i>Other Working Class</i></p> <p>Apprentices (those apprenticed to skilled trade) Assembler Attendant in hospital</p> <p>Barman (no special training/responsibilities) Blender Boilerman Bottler Breadman</p> <p>Carder Caretaker Chimney Sweep Cleaner Comber Conductor (Bus) Cook</p> <p>Docker (Dock Worker) Domestic Servant Dough Mixer Doubler Drawer Dustbin man/refuse collector Dyer</p> <p>Fisherman Forestry Worker</p> <p>Gardener/Groundsman (not in charge of others) Gardener (Market) - no employees</p> <p>Housekeeper (Not in charge of others)</p>	<p>Labourer Laundry Worker Lorry Driver (Local)</p> <p>Machinist (Tailoring) Mate (to those of "C2" occupation category) Meter Reader Milkman</p> <p>Opener Oven-man</p> <p>Park-keeper People (retired) who before retirement would have been Grade "D"; have small pensions other than State; very modest private means Porter - Railway/Hospital Postman Presser Processor Private or equivalent - Army</p> <p>Roundsman</p> <p>Seaman - Ordinary - Irish Naval Service Shop Assistant - no special training/responsibilities Spinner Storeman/Storekeeper - no special training/responsibilities</p> <p>Taxi Driver (who does not own cab) Textile Printer Ticket Collector Tractor Driver Twister</p>

SOCIAL CLASS DEFINITIONS

<p>Grade "D" (cont'd)</p> <p>Underground worker - unskilled</p> <p>Van Driver/Van Salesman</p> <p>Waitress/Waiter (unless Head Waiter)</p> <p>Warehouseman</p> <p>Watchman</p> <p>Window Cleaner</p> <p>Woolsorter</p> <p>Workers in general who are unskilled or semi-skilled</p>	<p>Guide to Grade "E" Households</p> <p><u>Lowest Level of Subsistence</u></p> <p>Casual/Part-time or lowest grade workers</p> <p>Pensioner - Old age, disability, Widows Pension - who are dependent on State Aid or Pensions only, with no other source of income</p> <p>People who are unable to take their place in the higher grades owing to periods of sickness/unemployment or lack of opportunity and are dependent on Social Security or whose private means are so modest as to be no more than basic Society Security payments</p> <p>Respondents will only be graded "E" if the Head of the Household is "E" and no other member of family is the Chief Wage Earner</p>	<p>Grade "F"</p> <p>Guide to Grade "F50+" Households</p> <p><i>Large Farmers</i></p> <p>Farmers or Farm Managers of holdings of 50 acres or more</p> <p>Guide to Grade "F50-" Households</p> <p><i>Small Farmers</i></p> <p>Farmers or Farm Managers with holdings of less than 50 acres</p> <p>Farm Workers/Labourers</p>
---	---	---

Appendix 4

Sample profile

The sample profile variables presented here are from the weighted database. Therefore, in some cases the variable categories do not sum to exactly 10067.

Table A1

Housing tenure	n	%
owner occupied with loan	3835	38.1
owner occupied without loan	3643	36.2
being purchased from a local authority	349	3.5
rented from a local authority	686	6.8
rented privately unfurnished	201	2.0
rented privately furnished	890	8.8
occupied free of rent	171	1.7
other	292	2.9
total	10067	100

Table A2

Gender	n	%
male	4892	48.6
female	5175	51.4
total	10067	100

Table A3

Marital status	n	%
single never married	3174	31.5
married	5277	52.4
cohabiting/living together	618	6.1
separated	285	2.8
divorced	117	1.2
widowed	561	5.6
refused/not stated	35	0.4
total	10067	100

Table A4

Social Class	n	%
AB middle/upper middle class	914	9.1
C1 lower middle class	3215	31.9
C2 skilled working class	2328	23.1
D other working class	1996	19.8
E lowest subsistence level	106	1.1
F farmer	679	6.8
refused/not stated	829	8.2
total	10067	100

Table A5

Age	n	%
18-24	1391	13.8
25-44	4191	41.6
45-64	3078	30.6
65+	1407	14.0
total	10067	100

Table A6

Dependent children	n	%
Yes	3835	38.1
No	5751	57.1
Not stated	481	4.8
total	10067	100

Table A7

Employment status	n	%
self-employed	1139	11.3
working full-time	4209	41.8
working part-time	1005	10.0
seeking work for first time	22	0.2
unemployed (having lost or given up job)	173	1.7
home (domestic) duties	1228	12.2
unable to work due to permanent illness or disability	140	1.4
not working, seeking work	103	1.0
not working, not seeking work	77	0.8
on govt. training/education scheme	37	0.4
on govt. employment scheme	20	0.2
retired	1249	12.4
student, further education	568	5.6
other	24	0.3
refused, not stated	73	0.7
total	10067	100

Table A8

Nationality	n	%
Irish	9261	92.0
UK	260	2.6
EU State	286	2.8
Other non EU country	244	2.4
Refused/not stated	15	0.2
total	10067	100

Table A9

Highest educational qualification	n	%
primary education	835	8.3
lower secondary	1417	14.1
technical or vocational	750	7.5
leaving certificate	3220	32.0
both technical/vocational and leaving certificate	619	6.1
non-degree qualification	869	8.6
primary degree	1107	11.0
professional qual. at least primary degree level	411	4.1
primary degree and professional qualification	387	3.8
postgraduate degree	279	2.8
no formal qualification	28	0.3
refused/not stated	145	1.4
total	10067	100

Table A10

Locality	n	%
Dublin City	2493	24.8
other city	1099	10.9
town (pop. 10,000 – 40,000)	1101	10.9
town (pop. 1,000 – 10,000)	1513	15.0
village, rural, open country	3390	33.7
refused, not stated	471	4.7
total	10067	100

Table A11

Aged 18 and over	n	%
none	20	0.2
one	1499	14.9
two	4693	46.6
three	1843	18.3
four	1280	12.7
five	375	3.7
six	148	1.5
seven	36	0.4
eight	23	0.2
nine +	9	0.1
Not stated/Refused	141	1.4
total	10067	100

Table A11

Aged under 18	n	%
none	4944	49.1
one	1596	15.9
two	1546	15.4
three	688	6.8
four	218	2.2
five	49	0.5
six	26	0.3
Seven +	14	0.1
Not stated/Refused	986	9.7
total	10067	100