

Garda Research Unit

Research Report No. 1/08

GARDA PUBLIC ATTITUDES SURVEY 2008

Colm Browne

For further information contact: Garda Research Unit Garda Síochána College Templemore Co. Tipperary Tel: (0504) 35428 Fax: (0504) 35455 Email: <u>gru@iol.ie</u>

Table of contents

List of tables	Ì
Executive Summary	v
Introduction	1
Overall satisfaction with Garda service	3
Experience of crime	8
Contact with the Gardaí	15
Emergency Garda response	22
Garda approachability	26
Unacceptable behaviour by Garda members	30
Racist incidents	32
Garda visibility and activity	33
Road traffic collisions	
Policing priorities	39
Further views on the Garda Síochána	
Public safety and fear of crime	49
Views on crime and the criminal justice system	
Neighbourhood Watch and Community Alert	62

List of tables

Table 1	Survey methodologies: 2002 - 2008	2
Table 2	Overall satisfaction with Garda service to the community and year of survey.	3
Table 3	Overall satisfaction: 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	5
Table 5	Overall satisfaction with Garda service and gender	5
	Overall satisfaction with Garda service and age category	6
Table 7	Overall satisfaction with Garda service and bouring topuro	
Table 8	Overall satisfaction with Garda service and housing tenure	
Table 9	Overall satisfaction with Garda service and social class	/
Table 10	Crime victimisation in preceding calendar year	8
Table 11	Crime victimisation in 2007: gender and age category	8
Table 12		8
Table 13	Crime victimisation in 2007 and Garda division	9
Table 14	Type of crime in preceding calendar year	10
Table 15	Was the crime (most recent) reported to the Gardai?	10
Table 16	Reasons for not reporting crime	11
Table 17	Receipt of Garda letter about the crime	. 11
Table 18	Helpfulness of letter	. 11
Table 19	Victim informed of Garda name by other means?	. 12
Table 20	Contact by Gardaí about significant developments?	. 12

i

Table 21	Helpfulness of update letter	12
Table 22	Informed of significant developments by other means?	
Table 23	Satisfaction with being kept informed of progress	
Table 24	Satisfaction with being kept informed of progress and Garda division	14
Table 25	Contact with Gardaí in preceding calendar year?	15
Table 26	Number of contacts with Gardaí in 2007	15
Table 27	Type of contact with Gardaí	16
Table 28	Frequency of contact and type of contact in 2007	17
Table 29	Form of most recent contact	18
Table 30	How quickly were you dealt with on visiting a Garda Station?	
Table 31	How quickly was your telephone call answered?	19
Table 32	Was Garda station identified when telephone call was answered?	19
Table 33	Garda manner	
Table 34	Follow-up contact by Gardaí (percentages – 'yes')	
Table 35	Follow-up contact by Gardaí regarding outcome (percentages - 'yes')	
Table 36	Dialled 999 or 112 for an emergency Garda response in previous year	22
Table 37	Speed of answering telephone	22
Table 38	Response time to call out to respondent	23
Table 39	Satisfaction with the emergency Garda service received	
Table 40	Satisfaction with overall contact with the Garda Síochána	23
Table 41	Satisfaction with overall contact with the Garda Síochána and division	
Table 42	Suggested improvements to Garda service	
Table 43	Approachability of Gardaí at local station	
Table 44	Approachability of Gardaí at local station: 2008 – 2002	
Table 45	Approachability of Gardaí at local station and division	
Table 46	Approachability of Gardaí at local station and division: 2008 and 2007	
Table 47	Reasons for approachability or unapproachability	
Table 48	Do you know any Garda member by name at your local station?	29
Table 49	Nature of any unacceptable behaviour	30
Table 50	Unacceptable behaviour and Garda division	
Table 51	Garda visibility	
Table 52	Satisfaction with the level of Garda visibility in the locality	
Table 53	Satisfaction with the level of Garda visibility in the locality and division	34
Table 54	Perceived changes in Garda activity in the locality in the last year	35
Table 55	Garda performance in the locality	35
Table 56	Garda performance in the locality and division	37
Table 57	Local Garda performance by housing tenure 2008 and 2007	37
Table 58	Satisfaction with the Garda investigation of road traffic collisions	38
Table 59	Dissatisfaction with Garda investigation of road traffic collisions	38
Table 60	Respondents' policing priorities	40
Table 61	Respondents' perceptions of Garda priorities, ranked by mean score	41
Table 62	Respondents' priorities and their perception of Garda priorities - rankings	42
Table 63	Respondents' priorities and perceived Garda priorities - mean scores	43
Table 64	Respondents' priorities: 2008, 2007, 2006, 2005, 2002	44
Table 65	Relationship between the Gardaí and the community	45
Table 66	Relationship between the Gardaí and the community: 2008 - 2002	47
Table 67	How safe do you feel walking in your neighbourhood after dark?	
Table 68	How safe do you feel alone in your home at night?	49
Table 69	Feelings of safety and Garda division	50
Table 70	Feelings of safety and Garda division: 2008, 2007, 2006 and 2005	51
Table 71	Do you feel more safe or less safe out walking in your area now?	

Table 73 Table 74 Table 75 Table 76 Table 77 Table 78 Table 79 Table 80 Table 81 Table 82 Table 83 Table 84 Table 85 Table 86	Worry about becoming a victim of crime. Worry about personal injury or property theft/damage crime Worry about crime victimisation and Garda division (percentage 'yes') How worried are you about the following crimes? How much did the fear of crime reduce your quality of life? Do you believe that crime is increasing, decreasing or staying the same? How would you describe crime in Ireland today? Do you think the following are a major, minor, or no problem? What do you believe to be the main cause of crime in Ireland today? Response to juvenile/teenage crime and drug abuse. Criminal justice system treatment of offenders Views on the criminal justice system and public safety Is your household in a Neighbourhood Watch/Community Alert scheme? Do you scheme co-ordinators keep residents informed?	$\begin{array}{c} 54\\ 55\\ 56\\ 57\\ 57\\ 58\\ 59\\ 60\\ 61\\ 62\\ 63\\ 63\\ \end{array}$
	Do you know who your scheme co-ordinator(s) are?	o∠ 63
	How successful are such schemes? (all respondents)	63
	How successful are such schemes? (respondents in schemes)	63

Appendix 1 Questionnaire	65
Appendix 2 – Survey methodology	91
Appendix 3 – Social class definitions	97
Appendix 4 – Sample profile	105



Executive Summary

This report presents the findings from the 2008 Garda Public Attitudes Survey. The main focus of the survey was on satisfaction with Garda service, policing priorities and experiences and fear of crime.

The survey was the seventh since 2002, and the tenth overall. This 2008 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, 2006 and 2007. The 2003 and 2004 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 9 January 2008 and 26 April 2008. 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 underrepresent certain hard-to-reach groups. Respondents to the survey 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 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, between divisions and for smaller sub-groups within the sample.

v

Satisfaction with overall Garda service to the community was 81 per cent, the same as in 2007. Previous rates were: 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 from 71 to 89 per cent within Garda divisions. Compared with 2007, satisfaction rates increased in 12 divisions and declined in 13. Satisfaction was lowest among those in local authority housing compared with other housing tenure categories.

Crime victimisation rates were similar to most previous years, with 9.2 per cent saying they or a member of their household had been a victim of a crime in 2007 (down by 0.6 of a percentage point compared with last year). Divisional rates of victimisation ranged from two to 19 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.

Regarding **crime reporting**, 84 per cent of those victimised said that they reported the most recent crime to the Gardaí, a lower rate than in the 2007 survey (by three percentage points). Fewer than half expressed satisfaction with **being kept informed of progress** in the investigation of the crime they had been a victim of (44%). Divisional satisfaction rates ranged from 27 to 63 per cent.

Forty per cent of respondents had **contact with the Gardaí** in 2007. 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 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 2007. In 83 per cent of cases their phone call was answered within 10 seconds. This rate was higher than those reported in 2007, 2006 and 2005, lower than in 2003 and 2004 and the same as in the large-scale survey in 2002. Response time to a call was within 15 minutes for 48 per cent of respondents. Sixty-five per cent expressed satisfaction with the emergency service received; five percentage points lower than in the 2007 survey.

vi

Satisfaction with overall contact with the Gardaí was 79 per cent, similar to the 2007 survey. Divisional satisfaction rates ranged from 65 to 88 per cent. Seventy-two per cent of respondents 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.

When asked about **Garda approachability**, 91 per cent of respondents described Gardaí at their local station as either 'very approachable' or 'approachable' (excluding 'don't know' responses). Divisional rates ranged from 82 to 97 per cent (excluding 'don't know' responses). Almost four out of ten respondents knew a member of An Garda Síochána at their local station by name (39%), a lower rate than in the 2007 report (41%).

As regards **unacceptable behaviour**, eight per cent of respondents said that a member of the Garda Siochána had, at some time, acted in an unacceptable way towards them. This rate is similar to that in 2007. Divisional rates ranged from two to 14 per cent. The most frequent type of unacceptable behaviour was that a Garda had been 'disrespectful or impolite'.

Relatively few respondents said that they had ever been subjected to a **racist incident** (1.5%). Of these, 18 per cent had reported the most recent incident to the Gardaí. The rate of racist incidents for non-Irish nationals is higher, rising to nine per cent of the 220 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.

Regarding **Garda visibility**, 53 per cent reported seeing a Garda in their locality in the previous week. Seven per cent of respondents remembered seeing a Garda on the day of their interview. Sixty-five per cent of respondents were satisfied with the level of Garda visibility in their locality (62% in 2007). Divisional satisfaction rates ranged from 52 to 77 per cent. Compared with 2007, increases in the satisfaction rate were registered in 15 divisions, while the rate declined in the others.

Ratings for **how good a job the Gardaí do in the locality** were at 82 per cent, the same as in 2007 ('very good' or 'fairly good' combined). Satisfaction rates were lower among local authority tenants compared with other housing tenure categories. Divisional ratings ranged from 73 to 93 per cent. Compared with 2007, 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 77 per cent, similar to the 2007 rate. Divisional ratings ranged from 58 to 88 per cent, with 14 divisions showing an increase in satisfaction ratings.

Three per cent of respondents had been involved in a **road traffic collision** in 2007. The level of satisfaction with the Garda investigation of the collision (79%) was similar to that in the 2007 survey (80%).

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

The perceived Garda priority ranking was generally different from respondents' own ranking. The more significant mismatches arose in respect to the sale of alcohol to those under age, youths racing around in cars, underage drinking on the streets (to which the public attached a higher priority than they perceive the Gardaí do), and State security, enforcement of traffic laws and immigration (to which the public attached a lower significance than they perceive the Gardaí do). Note that, regardless of rank positioning, the public attached higher levels of priority to all activities than they perceived 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 infringed and that the Gardaí carry out their role in a fair and impartial manner. Majorities disagreed with the statements: 'the Gardaí discriminate against immigrants' and '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, 74 per cent of respondents said that they felt safe out walking, similar to the 2007 survey (75%). Divisional rates ranged from 57 to 83 per cent. The proportion that felt safe alone at home at night was 89 per cent, similar to the 2007 survey (87%). Divisional rates ranged from 77 to 97 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, identical to 2007 survey rates. Divisional rates for personal fear of becoming a victim ranged from 21 to 51 per cent; the range for fear of a family member or friend becoming a victim was 21 to 61 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 (79%) and disagreed that penalties for possession of cannabis and ecstasy should be more lenient (68%). Just fewer than half of respondents felt that victims get a raw deal from the criminal justice system (49%).

ix

A quarter of respondents said they were in **Neighbourhood Watch/Community Alert** schemes (25%). Seventeen per cent of those in schemes said that they were regularly informed by scheme co-ordinators about criminal activity in their area (19% in 2007). Forty per cent of all respondents and 59 per cent of those who were in schemes, believed that such schemes were successful in preventing crime ('very successful' or 'successful'). These rates are identical to those in the 2007 report.

Garda Public Attitudes Survey 2008

Introduction

This report presents the findings from the *Garda Public Attitudes Survey 2008*, the tenth in a series of national surveys commissioned by An Garda Siochána. The main focus of the survey was 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 9 January 2008 and 26 April 2008. 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, 2006 and 2007. 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 2008 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.

1

A summary of methods used since 2002 is set out in table 1. An Garda Siochána also carried out public attitudes surveys in 2000, 1998 and 1993/94, but these are not reported on here.

Table I C	Table 1 Odi vey methodologies, 2002 – 2000								
Year	Sample	Company	Methodology						
2008	10,000	Millward Brown IMS	quota sampling, face-to-face interviews						
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						

Table 1 Survey methodologies: 2002 - 2008

The survey results are presented in the report as point estimates, and the true population values are likely to lie within the range ±1 percentage point of these point estimates at the national level and within the range ±4.9 percentage points at the divisional level. Thus, for example, the true value of a 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 subcategories 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. Therefore, care should be taken 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 2008 survey found that 81 per cent of respondents were 'satisfied' or 'very satisfied' with overall Garda service to the community in 2007.¹

Year	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Total
	%	%	%	%	n
2008	11	70	14	5	9581
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

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

Some percentages do not sum to exactly 100 due to rounding. Total respondent numbers are fewer than overall sample sizes due to exclusion of 'don't know' responses.

The level of satisfaction varied widely between Garda divisions. The range between the divisions with the highest and lowest levels of satisfaction was 18 percentage points. In 2007 and 2006 this range was 21 and 17 percentage points, respectively (table 3).

1 4010 0	o for all outlotu	stion. variatio	on between n	ignest and low	rest division re	uikinys
Year	Division ranking	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Total
	Tanking	%	%	%	%	n
2008	Highest	19	70	9	2	394
2000	Lowest	15	56	21	8	400
2007	Highest	25	64	9	2	401
2007	Lowest	2	66	26	6	401
2006	Highest	24	61	14	1	401
2000	Lowest	4	64	27	6	391
2005	Highest	35	57	7	1	399
	Lowest	6	71	16	6	406

Table 3 Overall satisfaction: variation between highest and lowest division rankings

Some percentages do not sum to exactly 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'.

¹ There were n=1076 respondents in the 'very satisfied' category and n=6704 in the 'satisfied' category (total = 7780). Excluding respondents in the 'don't know' category (n=451) the calculation is 7780/9581*100 = 81.2 per cent. When 'don't know' responses are included, the percentage is 77.6. The corresponding figures for the 2007 report are 80.9 per cent and 80.3 per cent, respectively.

The lowest level of satisfaction was in Waterford/Kilkenny (71%). Results are presented in table 4, with divisions ranked on the basis of mean score.²

Division	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
	%	%	%	%
Sligo/Leitrim	19	70	9	2
Cavan/Monaghan	20	67	10	4
Cork West	18	69	11	2
DMR South Central	22	60	16	- 3
Clare	14	73	13	1
DMR East	11	77	9	2
Kerry	11	74	11	4
Carlow/Kildare	16	64	15	5
Longford/Westmeath	9	76	12	4
Laois/Offaly	9	78	9	5
Roscommon/Galway East	8	76	13	3
Tipperary	13	69	14	4
DMR South	11	71	14	4
Galway West	7	78	13	3
Louth/Meath	15	62	18	6
Мауо	7	75	12	5
Cork North	9	71	16	4
DMR North Central	12	67	14	7
DMR North	11	69	14	6
Cork City	6	78	12	6
Wexford/Wicklow	9	70	18	4
Donegal	12	67	11	10
DMR West	9	68	16	7
Waterford/Kilkenny	15	56	21	- 8
Limerick	9	66	18	7
average	12	70	14	5

Some percentages do not sum to exactly 100 due to rounding. Carlow/Kildare and Longford/Westmeath divisions had the same mean score (2.09), as had Laois/Offaly, Roscommon/Galway East and Tipperary (2.10), DMR South and Galway West (2.12), Cork North, DMR North Central and DMR North (2.16), Cork City and Wexford (2.17), DMR West and Waterford/Kilkenny (2.22).

Compared with 2007, satisfaction levels were up in 12 divisions and down in 13, based on the sum of those who were 'very satisfied' and 'satisfied'. Increases ranged from 1.1 to 13.2 percentage points, with decreases in the range 0.3 to 7.8 percentage points.

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 know' responses have been omitted from these calculations). These scores are multiplied by the frequencies in each category of satisfaction level. Using the Sligo/Leitrim frequencies as an example: [(1x70) + (2x267) + (3x33) + (4x9)] = [70+534+99+36] = 739/379 = 1.95. The lower the mean score, the higher the level of satisfaction. Although Limerick division was ranked lowest using this method (Table 4), its overall level of satisfaction (75% – 'very satisfied' and 'satisfied' combined) was higher than that of Waterford/Kilkenny.

The largest increases in satisfaction levels were in the divisions of Laois/Offaly (+13.2 percentage points), DMR East (+8.1), Clare (+6.7), DMR West (+6.3) and Longford/Westmeath (+6.1). The largest decreases were in Limerick (-7.8 percentage points), Louth/Meath (-7.2) and Wexford/Wicklow (-6.5). See table 5.

Division	2008	2007	Change*	Change*	Division	2008	2007	Change
	%	%	onunge		%	%	Change	
Sligo/Leitrim	88.9	89.4	-0.5	Carlow/Kildare	79.9	82.2	-2.3	
Roscommon/Galway East	84.6	87.0	-2.4	DMR East	88.7	80.6	+8.1	
Мауо	82.7	86.9	-4.2	Donegal	79.3	80.3	-1.0	
Galway West	84.2	85.2	-1.0	DMR South	81.3	81.6	-0.3	
Cork West	86.6	84.0	+2.6	Tipperary	81.6	79.8	+1.8	
Cork City	83.0	83.8	-0.8	Clare	86.4	79.7	+6.7	
Louth/Meath	76.8	84.0	-7.2	Longford/Westmeath	84.9	78.8	+6.1	
Wexford/Wicklow	78.2	84.7	-6.5	DMR South Central	81.7	78.0	+3.7	
Limerick	75.0	82.8	-7.8	DMR North	79.5	78.4	+1.1	
Kerry	85.0	82.8	+2.2	Laois/Offaly	86.2	73.0	+13.2	
DMR North Central	79.2	82.3	-3.1	DMR West	76.8	70.5	+6.3	
Cavan/Monaghan	86.5	81.9	+4.6	Waterford/Kilkenny	70.9	68.0	+2.9	
Cork North	79.8	81.5	-1.7	average	81.9	81.1	+0.80	

Table 5	Overall satisfaction with Garda service: changes by Garda	division

*Change is given in percentage points (percentage 'very satisfied' or 'satisfied').

There was little difference between males (81%) and females (82%) regarding overall satisfaction with Garda service, and the rates for each gender were similar or identical to the rates in 2007 and 2006 (table 6).

Year	Gender	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Total
		%	%	%	%	n
	male	10	71	14	6	4700
2008	female	12	70	14	4	4880
	average	11	71	14	5	9580
	male	14	66	16	4	4862
2007	female	14	68	15	3	5137
	average	14	67	16	4	9999
	male	13	66	- 17	4	4939
2006	female	13	67	16	4	5037
	average	13	67	17	4	9976

 Table 6
 Overall satisfaction with Garda service and gender

Some percentages do not sum to exactly 100 due to rounding. Total respondent numbers are fewer than overall sample size due to the exclusion of 'don't know' responses.

A larger percentage of respondents in the 65+ age group was satisfied with overall service compared with their younger counterparts (85%). The maximum difference in satisfaction rates between age groups was six percentage points (65+ and 45-64 years categories). As age category increased there was an increase in the percentage of respondents that reported being 'very satisfied' with overall service (table 7).

Year	Age category	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Total				
		%	%	%	%	n				
	18-24	9	73	14	5	1393				
	25-44	10	72	13	5	4219				
2008	45-64	13	66	16	5	2825				
	65+	17	68	11	4	1141				
	average	12	70	14	5	9578				
	18-24	11	71	15	4	1380				
	25-44	12	69	16	4	4166				
2007	45-64	14	66	17	4	3062				
	65+	21	63	14	3	1394				
	average	15	67	16	4	10002				
	18-24	10	68	16	5	1372				
	25-44	10	. 69	17	4	4293				
2006 [45-64	14	65	16	4	2966				
[65+	20	61	16	3	1345				
	average	14	66	14	4	9976				

Table 7 Overall satisfaction with Garda service and age category

Some percentages do not sum to exactly 100 due to rounding. Total respondent numbers are fewer than overall sample size due to the exclusion of those in the category 'refused/not stated'.

When examined on the basis of housing tenure, respondents in the 'rented privately' category had the highest level of overall satisfaction (84%), followed by owner-occupiers and 'other' (82%), and then those in local authority housing (78%).³ See table 8.

³ 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.

Housing tenure	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Total
	%	%	%	%	n
Owner occupied	12	70	14	4	7128
Local authority	11	67	14	8	888
Rented privately	13	71	12	4	880
Other	4	78	12	6	358
average	10	72	13	6	9254

Table 8 Overall satisfaction with Garda service and housing tenure

Total respondent numbers are fewer than overall sample size due to the exclusion of those in the 'don't know' category.

Respondents in social class F (farmers) had the highest level of satisfaction (86%). Classes AB (upper middle and middle classes) and C1 (lower middle class) had the next highest rates at 83 per cent and 82 per cent, respectively. Categories DE (other working class and lowest level of subsistence) and C2 (skilled working class) had similar rates, at 80 per cent and 79 per cent, respectively (table 9).⁴

_ <u>_</u>	able 9	Overall satisfaction with	Garda serv	vice and	social	class	
		11					_

Social class category	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Total
category	%	%	%	%	'n.
AB	12	71	14	3	919
C1	11	71	14	4	3244
C2	9	70.	15	6	2073
DE	12	68	14	6	1856
F	13	73	10	4	588
average	11	71	13	5	8680

Total respondent number is fewer than overall sample size due to the exclusion of respondents in the 'refused/not stated' category.

⁴ A list of social class definitions can be found in Appendix 3.

Experience of crime

The level of crime victimisation was 9.2 per cent, down by 0.6 of a percentage point on last year. Over the last six years the rate has ranged from 11.7 per cent (2005 report) to 9.2 per cent (2008 report). See table 10.

Year	2008	2007	2006	2005	2004	2003
	%	%	%	%	%	%
respondent	5.9	6.1	5.7	6.9	6.3	5.8
household member	2.5	2.9	3.1	3.7	3.7	3.7
both	0.8	0.8	1.3	1.1	0.3	1.2
not a victim	90.5	90.1	89.8	88.3	89.9	89.3
total sample size (n)	10032	10067	10046	10035	1000.	1005

Table 10	Crime victimisation in preceding calendar year
	onne viennisation in preceding calendar year

For some years, percentages do not sum to exactly 100 due to the omission of the 'don't know' category.

For respondents who were personally a victim of crime in 2007, the breakdown by gender and age category is set out in table 11. Males and those in the age categories 18-24 and 25-44 were somewhat over-represented among the victims, as seen in the respective ratios.

	Gender			Age		
Status	Male	Female	18-24	25-44	45-64	65+
	%	%	%	%	%	%
victims	57.1	42.9	16.9	49.7	24.3	9.0
full sample	48.9	51.1	14.6	44.3	29.2	11.8
ratio	1.17	0.84	1.16	1.12	0.83	0.76

Table 11 Crime victimisation in 2007: gender and age category

Percentages for victims' age categories do not sum to exactly 100 due to rounding. Victims only include respondents (not other household members).

The majority of victims experienced just one crime incident (86%) and one crime type (84%). Fourteen per cent were victims on more than one occasion, including three per cent who were victimised on four or more occasions (table 12).

lable 12	Crime victir	nisation in	2007: inci	dents and	crime type	s
						T

Category	1	2	3	4	5 or more	Total	
Outogory	%	%	%	%	%	n	
incidents	86	9	2	1	2	1010	
crime type	84	12	3	1	1	929	

Includes respondent and household victims. Percentages for crime type do not sum to exactly 100 due to rounding.

As in previous surveys, there was considerable variation in divisional rates of crime victimisation. Mayo, Cork West, Clare and Sligo/Leitrim recorded the lowest rates, at less than half the national average; Longford/Westmeath and DMR South Central recorded the highest, with DMR South Central more than double the average. The average was 8.5 compared with 9.3 in 2007.

Rural divisions that recorded higher than average victimisation rates were: Galway West, Limerick, Wexford/Wicklow, Louth/Meath and Longford/Westmeath (table 13).

Garda division	%	Garda division	%
Мауо	2.3	Cork City	7.3
Cork West	3.2	Galway West	9.3
Clare	3.8	Limerick	10.4
Sligo/Leitrim	4.1	DMR South	11.0
Laois/Offaly	4.3	DMR North Central	11.1
Cork North	4.8	Wexford/Wicklow	11.2
Kerry	5.4	DMR West	11.3
Tipperary	5.8	DMR East	14.0
Waterford/Kilkenny	6.0	DMR North	14.0
Donegal	6.3	Louth/Meath	14.1
Cavan/Monaghan	6.5	Longford/Westmeath	14.5
Roscommon/Galway East	6.5	DMR South Central	19.3
Carlow/Kildare	6.7	average	8.5

Table 13 Crime victimisation in 2007 and Garda division

Includes respondent and household victims.

The most common crimes were domestic burglary (experienced by 26 per cent of victims) and criminal damage to car or other vehicle (17%). These had also been the most frequently cited crimes in the 2007 survey. The reported rate of burglary here was the same as in 2007 (table 14).

Type of crime	Percentage victimised least once		
	2008	2007	
	%	%	
burglary of home or outbuildings	26	26	
burglary of business premises owned by respondent	4	4	
theft of vehicle	9	9	
theft from vehicle	12	10	
theft of bicycle	3	4	
criminal damage to car or other vehicle	17	18	
criminal damage to home or other property	12	11	
robbery involving force or threat (including mugging)	4	5	
theft from person without force (e.g. pickpocket)	8	6	
theft from home or outbuildings (other than burglary)	5	5	
consumer fraud (e.g. swindling or false pretences)	3	2	
physical assault (other than sexual or domestic)	13	14	
sexual assault	1	1	
domestic violence (physical)	1	1	
other	5	5	
total (n)	1132	1175	

Table 14 Type of crime in preceding calendar year

The majority of victims said that the most recent crime was reported to the Gardaí (84%), which was consistent with previous surveys (table 15).

Survey	Yes	No	Total	
	%	%	n	
2008	84	16	929	
2007	87	13	978	
2006	86	14	1006	
2005	83	17	1167	
2004	79	21	101	
2003	81	19	107	
2002	84	16	1292	

lable 15 W	vas the crime	(most recent	 reported to 	the Gardaí?

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; felt the crime was not serious enough or believed the Gardaí would not have been interested. These were also the dominant reasons in the 2007 survey (table 16).

Table 16 Reasons for not reporting crime

Reason	2008	2007	2006
	%	%	%
not serious enough/no loss	24	28	19
no chance of recovering property	28	29	24
no insurance claim anticipated	5	4	7
believed Gardaí could not have done anything	32	38	38
believed Gardaí would not have been interested	18	20	25
felt the Gardaí would not believe you	1	6	4
no involvement wanted with the Gardaí	3	5	14
fear of reprisal	4	5	4
did not have time	3	1	2
other	6	12	18
number of respondents	146	132	130

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

Almost a third of victims who reported the crime 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 (32%). This rate is three percentage points higher than that in 2007 (table 17).

Table 17 Receipt of Garda letter about the crime

Receipt of letter		Yes	No	Total
		%	%	n
	2008	32	68	728
Survey	2007	29	71	773
	2006	27	73	807

Respondents in the category 'don't know/can't remember' have been excluded.

A majority of the letter recipients found it helpful (table 18).

Table 18 Helpfulness of letter

Year	Very helpful	Helpful	Not much help	No help	Total
	%	%	%	%	n
2008	31	40	23	7	229
2007	30	44	21	6	224
2006	28	40	24	8	217

Percentages for 2008 and 2007 do not sum to exactly 100 due to rounding.

Over two-fifths 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 (47%). See table 19.

Year	Yes	No	Total
	%	%	n
2008	47	53	704
2007	41	59	741
2006	46	54	755

	Table 19	Victim informed of Ga	arda name by	other means?
--	----------	-----------------------	--------------	--------------

As in 2007, 88 per cent of victims said that they hadn't received a letter reporting significant developments in their case (table 20).

Table 20 Contact by Gardaí about significant developments?

Receipt of letter		Yes	No	Total
		%	%	n
	2008	12	88	728
Survey	2007	12	88	791
	2006	13	87	811

The majority of recipients found the update letter helpful (table 21).

Table 21 Helpfulness of update letter

Year	Very helpful	Helpful	Not much help	No help	Total
- i cai	%	%	%	%	n
2008	43	42	11	4	83
2007	44	44	12	-	92
2006	34	50	12	5	104

The percentages for 2006 do not sum to exactly 100 due to rounding.

Just over a quarter 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 their case (26%). See table 22.

Table 22	Inf	formed of	⁻ significant	developments	i bi	y other means?
----------	-----	-----------	--------------------------	--------------	------	----------------

Year	Yes	No	Total
	%	%	n
2008	26	74	713
2007	27	.73.	777
2006	25	75	802

Forty-four per cent of respondents expressed satisfaction with being kept informed of progress with their case. This level of satisfaction is similar to the 2007 figure (table 23).

Survey	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Total
	%	%	%	%	n
2008	10	34	33	23	779
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

Table 23 Satisfaction with being kept informed of progress

The percentages for 2007 and 2005 do not sum to exactly 100 due to rounding.

Satisfaction with being kept informed of progress varied widely between Garda divisions and compared with the 2007 survey. The level of variation was 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 9 in Mayo to 60 in DMR South Central (the range was 10–65 in 2007). Therefore, the results must be interpreted with caution.

	Satisfied/very satisfied				
Garda division	2008	2007	Change		
	%	%	percentage points		
DMR South Central	63.3	67.7	-4.4		
DMR South	55.6	44.2	+11.4		
Cavan/Monaghan	54.5	51.4	+3.1		
DMR North Central	54.3	50.0	+4.3		
Cork West	53.8	42.1	+11.7		
Cork City	51.7	51.9	-0.2		
Laois/Offaly	50.0	37.5	+12.5		
Waterford/Kilkenny	50.0	25.8	+24.2		
Kerry	50.0	43.8	+6.2		
Wexford/Wicklow	47.4	42.4	+5.0		
Roscommon/Galway East	45.8	42.9	+2.9		
DMR East	45.0	65.1	-20.1		
Tipperary	44.4	45.8	-1.4		
Мауо	44.4	10.0	+34.4		
Galway West	43.8	32.0	+11.8		
DMR West	43.2	30.8	+12.4		
Clare	42.9	25.0	+17.9		
Donegal	40.0	45.2	-5.2		
DMR North	38.3	36.8	+1.5		
Longford/Westmeath	37.7	32.4	+5.3		
Limerick	36.8	45.2	-8.4		
Louth/Meath	33.3	44.7	-11.4		
Carlow/Kildare	30.8	44.1	-13.3		
Cork North	29.4	47.4	-18.0		
Sligo/Leitrim	26.7	44.0	-17.3		
average	44.5	41.9	+2.6		

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

Ranked in terms of the percentages that were 'satisfied' or 'very satisfied', divisional satisfaction rates ranged from 27 per cent in Sligo/Leitrim to 63 per cent in DMR South Central.

Compared with 2007, 15 divisions recorded an increase in satisfaction, and rates decreased in ten. The largest increases occurred in Mayo (+34.4 percentage points), Waterford/Kilkenny (+24.2) and Clare (+17.9). The largest decreases were recorded in DMR East (-20.1 percentage points), Cork North (-18.0) and Sligo/Leitrim (-17.3). See table 24.

Contact with the Gardaí

Forty per cent of respondents reported having had contact with the Gardaí in 2007, almost identical to the rate in the 2007 report (for year 2006). See table 25.

Cum cost	Yes	No	Total
Survey	%	%	n
2008	40.5	59.5	10032
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

Table 25	Contact with	Gardaí in	preceding	i calendar v	vear?

Two-thirds had contact on one occasion only (66%). Six per cent had four or more contacts during the year (table 26).

Table 26	Number	of	contacts	with	Gardaí in 2007	

Survey 2008	1	2	3	4	5 or more	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	n
Those who had contact	66	20	8	3	3	4061

The main reasons for respondent-initiated contact were to have passport forms signed or to report a crime, similar to the pattern in 2007. The main types of Garda-initiated contact were routine vehicle checks or requests for the production of documents (table 27).

Type of contact	2008	2007	2006
	%	%	%
Respondent-initiated	d contact		
to report a crime	14	14	20
to report a disturbance/nuisance	7	8	13
to report a traffic accident	4	4	7
to report suspicious activity	2	2	7
to report lost/found property	2	2	4
to make a general inquiry	5	5	10
to make a complaint	4	4	8
to enquire about a person in custody	1	1	1
to be a witness	1	. 1	3
signing passports	25	26	34
to avail of other services	9	9	12
Garda-initiated co	ontact		
to produce documents	5	5	8
to ask about a crime	2	2	5
to investigate a traffic collision	1	1	2
to investigate noise/disturbance	1	1	2
to carry out a routine vehicle check (on-street)	11	6	11
to take a witness statement	1	1	2
alleged speeding offence	. 1	1	3
alleged drink driving offence	1	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	40	42
total (number with at least one contact)	4061	4058	4201

Table 27 Type of contact with Gardaí

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, 34 per cent of those who were in contact to report a disturbance/nuisance had contact under this heading more than once (although not necessarily in connection with the same incident). See table 28.

	N	umber of cont	acts
Type of contact	1	2	3 or more
	%	%	%
Self-initiated			
to report a crime	83	11	7
to report a disturbance/nuisance	66	14	20
to report a traffic accident	90	6	4
to report suspicious activity	72	14	14
to report lost/found property	99	1*	-
to make a general inquiry	83	11	6
to make a complaint	74	11	15
to enquire about a person in custody	76	17*	7*
to be a witness	88	5*	8*
signing passports	96	3	1*
to avail of other services	92	5	3
Garda-initiated	l contact		
to produce documents	90	5	5
to ask about a crime	73	17	10
to investigate a traffic collision	84	16*	-
to investigate noise/disturbance	78	18	4*
to carry out a routine vehicle check (on street)	52	.29	19
to take a witness statement	85	8*	8*
alleged speeding offence	89	5*	6*
alleged drink driving offence	91	9*	_
alleged other driving/traffic offence	92*	6*	2*
arrested, detained for questioning or searched	69	18*	14*
to receive summons	82	11*	7*
other reason	82	9	10

Some percentages do not sum to exactly 100 due to rounding. An asterisk (*) denotes that percentages are based on a number of respondents fewer than 10.

The forms of the most recent contact with Gardaí are reported in table 29. By far the most common forms were a visit to a Garda station (58%) or a telephone call to the Gardaí (21%). While the percentage of respondents that visited a station was three points lower than in 2007, the percentage that spoke to a Garda at a vehicle checkpoint was three points higher. Contact with a Garda on patrol was at a level similar to those in 2007, 2006 and 2005.

Table 29 Form of most recent contact

Form of contact		2007	2006	2005
	%	%	%	%
visit to Garda station	58	61	61	58
telephone call to the Gardaí (excluding 999/112 calls)	21	22	22	24
telephone call from the Gardaí	1	1	2	1
letter from the Gardaí	1	1	1	0
electronic means (email etc.)	1	1	1	-
spoke to Garda on patrol	3	2	3	3
spoke to Garda at checkpoint/vehicle stop	11	8	7	7
Garda called to home or work	3	4	4	5
other	2	1	-2	2
total (n)	4058	4057	4151	4243

Some percentages do not sum to exactly 100 due to rounding.

A sizeable majority of visitors to Garda stations were dealt with more quickly than expected or within the time expected (87%), and results were similar to most previous years. In the three most recent surveys the percentages reporting 'quicker than expected' have been identical and represent a decrease for this category compared with earlier surveys (table 30).

Survey	Quicker than expected	Within the time expected	Slower than expected	Total
	%	%	%	n
2008	28	59	13	2349
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

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

The vast majority of those who telephoned the Gardaí, other than by emergency number, said that their call was answered 'promptly' or 'following a short delay' (92%), up by three percentage points compared with 2007. The percentage of respondents that reported having had to call more than once before getting through was down by three points compared with 2007 (table 31).

Survey	Promptly	Following a short delay	After an unacceptable delay	Had to call more than once before getting through	Total
	%	%	%	%	n
2008	69	23	6	3	814
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

Table 31 How quickly was your telephone call answered?

Some percentages do not sum to exactly 100 due to rounding.

Three-quarters of telephone callers said that the Garda gave the station name when answering (75%), while eight per cent said that the station name was not given (table 32). Excluding 'don't know' answers, 90 per cent of respondents said that the Garda gave the station name.

Survey	Yes	No	Don't know	Total
	%	%	%	n
2008	75	8	17	841
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

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

Some percentages do not sum to exactly 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 90 per cent for 'politeness' to 86 per cent for 'interest'. Compared with the 2007 survey, the percentages saying that Garda performance was 'better than expected' were identical or similar in all performance categories (table 33).

Service	Performance category	2008	2007	2006	2005	2004	2003
category	T enormance category	%	%	%	%	%	%
	better than expected	20	21	21	25	30	31
Helpfulness	as expected	69	69	70	65	59	57
	worse than expected	11	10	10	10	10	11
	better than expected	17	17	17	21	24	28
Competence	as expected	72	73	74	70	63	64
	worse than expected	10	10	9	9	13	8
	better than expected	17	. 17	15	19	25	24
Sensitivity	as expected	71	72	74	70	65	66
	worse than expected	13	11	11	11	11	10
	better than expected	19	20	19	23	30	33
Politeness	as expected	71	71	72	69	66	60
	worse than expected	10	9	9	9	5	7
	better than expected	17	17	17	21	24	27
Interest	as expected	69	70	70	65	62	61
	worse than expected	15	14	14	14	14	12

Table 33 Garda manner

Some percentages do not sum to exactly 100 due to rounding.

Table 34 presents the results for follow-up contact by Gardaí, focusing on the most recent contact by the respondent. A fifth of those who made contact felt that the matter required that a Garda call to them (20%). In three-quarters (75%) 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 (68%). The percentages are similar to 2007 for three of the five variables in table 34. For two variables: 'did a Garda call on you?' and 'did a Garda call on you within the time indicated?', decreases of six and five percentage points, respectively, were recorded.

Aspect of follow-up contact	2008	2007	2006	2005	2004	2003
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Do you think the matter required a Garda to call to your home?	20	19	21	22	29	21
Did the Gardaí indicate that someone would call on you?	18	17	18	19	23	21
Did a Garda call on you?	79	85	85	86	76	78
Were you told how long it would be before someone would call on you?	51	50	52	53	40	52
Did a Garda call on you within the time indicated?	74	79	77	83	77	69

Table 34 Follow-up contact by Gardaí (percentages – 'yes')

The Gardaí got in touch with 16 per cent of respondents about the outcome of their contact. The majority of respondents who were not contacted did not think contact was necessary (table 35).

Aspect of follow-up contact	2008	2007	2006	2005	2004	2003
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Did the Garda Síochána get in touch later to inform you about the outcome of your contact?	16	18	22	19	15	17
Do you think you should have been contacted?	21	20	21	19	*	*
*Not reported in 2003 and 2004						I

Table 35	Follow-up contact by	v Gardaí regardin	a outcome (pe	ercentages – 'ves')

*Not reported in 2003 and 2004.

Emergency Garda response

One in twenty-five respondents sought an emergency Garda response in 2007 by dialling 999 or 112, a rate similar to previous surveys (table 36).

Survey —	Yes	Total
Ourvey	%	n
2008	4	10032
2007	4	10067
2006	5	10046
2005	5	10046
2004	3	1014
2003	5	999
2002	5	10405

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

Of those who did seek an emergency response, 83 per cent had their call answered within 10 seconds (excluding those who couldn't remember). See table 37.

Table St	opeed of	answenny tei	ephone				
	Including 'not sure'			Excluding 'not sure'			
Survey	Within 10 seconds	Outside 10 seconds	Not sure	Total	Within 10 seconds	Outside 10 seconds	Total
	%	%	%	n	%	%	n
2008	68	14	18	413	83	17	340
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

One of the percentages for 2002 does not sum to exactly 100 due to rounding.

Where an emergency response was provided, in just under half of cases 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 136 cases where a response took more than 15 minutes, 60 per cent were within 30 minutes (n=81), 85 per cent within one hour (n=116) and 96 per cent within two hours (n=131). Times longer than two hours were recorded in five cases.⁵

⁵ There were n=154 respondents who reported that the response time was longer than 15 minutes. When asked to indicate how much longer, some respondents didn't know.

	lr.	Including 'did not respond'			Excluding 'did not respond'		
	Within	Longer	Did not		Within	Longer	
Survey	15	than 15		Total	15	than 15	Total
	minutes	minutes	respond		minutes	minutes	
	%	%	%	n	%	%	n
2008	48	39	13	392	55	45	343
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

Table 38	Response ti	ime to call	out to rea	spondent

Some percentages do not sum to exactly 100 due to rounding. Not asked in 2003 and 2004.

Two-thirds of respondents were satisfied with the emergency response received (65%). This was five percentage points lower than the rate in the 2007 report (table 39).

Survey	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Total
	%	%	%	%	n
2008	21	44	23	12	393
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

 Table 39
 Satisfaction with the emergency Garda service received

Some percentages do not sum to exactly 100 due to rounding.

Thinking of their overall contact with the Gardaí, 79 per cent of respondents expressed satisfaction ('very satisfied' and 'satisfied' combined). These rates are similar to those in 2007 (table 40).

Table 40 Satisfaction with overall contact with the Garda Siochána	Table 40	Satisfaction with	overall c	contact with th	ie Garda Síochána
--	----------	-------------------	-----------	-----------------	-------------------

Survey	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Total
	%	%	. %	%	'n
2008	20	59	15	6	3942
2007	20	60	15	6	3829
2006	20	59	14	6	4068
2005	25	55	14	6	4128
2002	27	<u>55</u>	13	4	4012

Some percentages do not sum to exactly 100 due to rounding. Not asked in 2003 and 2004.

Satisfaction levels ranged from 65 per cent in Limerick to 88 per cent in DMR East and Cork North. Compared with results from the 2007 survey, increases were recorded in 15 divisions and decreases in ten. The largest increase was in Waterford/Kilkenny (10.4 percentage points); the largest decrease was in DMR North (15.4 percentage points). The results should 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 (table 41).

	2008	2007	
Garda division	Satisfied/	Satisfied/	Change
	Very satisfied	Very satisfied	
	%	%	Percentage points
Carlow/Kildare	80.3	82.7	-2.4
Cavan/Monaghan	79.2	74.5	+4.7
Clare	86.6	82.3	+4.3
Cork City	81.5	81.2	+0.3
Cork North	87.7	85.0	+2.7
Cork West	86.1	82.2	+3.9
DMR East	87.9	80.7	+7.2
DMR North	66.3	81.7	-15.4
DMR North Central	82.5	74.5	+8.0
DMR South	76.0	80.6	-4.6
DMR South Central	82.3	78.5	+3.8
DMR West	73.6	75.0	-1.4
Donegal	71.1	70.4	+0.7
Galway West	80.6	84.8	-4.2
Kerry	86.3	84.2	+2.1
Laois/Offaly	80.4	78.0	+2.4
Limerick	64.8	79.7	-14.9
Longford/Westmeath	78.1	79.8	-1.7
Louth/Meath	72.8	76.1	-3.3
Mayo	83.7	78.0	+5.7
Roscommon/Galway East	85.2	80.3	+4.9
Sligo/Leitrim	79.5	83.6	-4.1
Tipperary	76.8	86.2	-9.4
Waterford/Kilkenny	79.4	69.0	+10.4
Wexford/Wicklow	79.0	76.5	+2.5
average	79.5	79.4	+0.1

Table 41 Satisfaction with overall contact with the Garda Slochana a	and division
--	--------------

Divisional sample sizes ranged between 82 in Tipperary and 207 in DMR East.

Just over seven out of every ten respondents (72%) felt that the Garda service needed to be improved (75%, 77%, 73% and 64% in 2007, 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 (table 42).

Table 42	Suggested	improvements t	to	Garda service

Suggestion	Percentage of respondents					
Guggeston	2008	2007	2006	2005		
greater manpower	53	54	60	56		
more Garda foot patrols	53	54	54	52		
more contact with the community	32	30	31	-		
Garda stations open longer	24	27	24	21		
enforce traffic laws more thoroughly	16	18	21	15		
Gardaí to be friendlier	17	16	15	11		
miscellaneous other	11	9	11	14		

The answers were unprompted. Sample sizes: n=7170 in 2008, n=7475 in 2007, n=7720 in 2006 and n=7350 in 2005. Percentages sum to more than 100 as respondents could make more than one suggestion.
Garda approachability

When asked about how approachable the Gardaí were at their local station, 79 per cent said that they were 'approachable' or 'very approachable', a rate identical to that in 2007. Two per cent said that the Gardaí were 'very unapproachable' (table 43).

	2008	2007	2006
Level of approachability	%	%	%
very approachable	32	33	31
approachable	47	46	48
unapproachable	6	6	6
very unapproachable	2	2	2
don't know	13	13	13
total	10032	10067	10046

Table 43 Approachability of Gard	laí at local station
----------------------------------	----------------------

For the purpose of further comparison with previous years, categories have been amalgamated and 'don't know' answers excluded in table 44. The 2008 survey result is similar to those in 2007, 2006 and 2005. The percentage of respondents that felt that local Gardaí were 'unapproachable' has been stable over the last four surveys (at either nine or ten per cent), but represents a deterioration compared with earlier years.

			2002
Year	Very approachable/ approachable	Very unapproachable/ unapproachable	Total
	%	%	n
2008	91	9	8727
2007	90	10	8771
2006	90	10	8792
2005	91	9	8969
2004	95	5	982
2003	94	6	959
2002	95	5	9618

 Table 44
 Approachability of Gardaí at local station: 2008 – 2002

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 (84%) and those in local authority housing (83%).

The proportion of respondents that considered local Gardaí to be 'very approachable' ranged from 20 per cent in Galway West and Longford/Westmeath to 52 per cent in Sligo/Leitrim. The proportion that considered local Gardaí to be 'very unapproachable' varied from one per cent (in eight divisions) to seven per cent in DMR North (table 45). The table is not rank ordered because the wide variation in the number of 'don't know' responses would distort the results.

Garda division	Very approach- able	Approach- able	Unapproa- chable	Very unapproa- chable	Don't know
	%	%	%	%	%
Carlow/Kildare	39	45	4	1	11
Cavan/Monaghan	33	38	4	2	24
Clare	44	35	6	2	14
Cork City	22	46	2	1	29
Cork North	36	52	3	1	9
Cork West	44	42	3	2	10
DMR East	36	48	8	1	8
DMR North	28	49	5	7	13
DMR North Central	34	38	6	3	19
DMR South	37	43	6	4	_10
DMR South Central	34	44	7	1	14
DMR West	28	58	5	4	6
Donegal	26	33	8	5	29
Galway West	20	55	8	2	15
Kerry	46	38	5	3	9
Laois/Offaly	30	53	6	2	9
Limerick	38	38	8	3	12
Longford/Westmeath	20	63	6	1	11
Louth/Meath	23	46	7	3	21
Мауо	33	45	5	2	15
Roscommon/Galway E.	31	51	7	1	10
Sligo/Leitrim	52	40	3	1	6
Tipperary	43	45	4	2	7
Waterford/Kilkenny	34	49	5	2	11
Wexford/Wicklow	28	53	7	2	10
average	34	46	6	2	13

Table 45 Approachability of Gardaí at local station and division

Some percentages do not sum to exactly 100 due to rounding.

Comparisons with 2007 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 that rated the local Gardaí as 'approachable' or 'very approachable'.

Using this measure, satisfaction levels ranged from 82 per cent in Donegal to 97 per cent in Sligo/Leitrim, and 16 divisions showed an increase compared with 2007. The largest increases were in the Waterford/Kilkenny, DMR West and DMR South Central divisions (up by 10.5, 10.4 and 7.3 percentage points, respectively). The remaining nine divisions showed decreases in satisfaction levels. The largest decreases were in Louth/Meath, DMR North and Limerick (down by 8.7, 7.7 and 5.5 percentage points, respectively). See table 46.

	-	Very approachable/ approachable				approach	
Garda division	2008	2007	change	Garda division	2008	2007	change
	%	%	% points		%	%	% points
Carlow/Kildare	94.7	93.5	+1.2	Galway West	88.8	92.9	-4.1
Cavan/Monaghan	92.2	89.0	+3.2	Kerry	91.3	92.9	-1.6
Clare	91.3	85.3	+6.0	Laois/Offaly	91.6	90.1	+1.5
Cork City	95.7	92.4	+3.3	Limerick	87.1	92.6	-5.5
Cork North	96.4	92.3	+4.1	Longford/Westmth	92.5	92.3	+0.2
Cork West	94.8	91.6	+3.2	Louth/Meath	87.0	95.7	-8.7
DMR East	90.5	84.3	+6.2	Mayo	92.1	96.3	-4.2
DMR North	87.4	95.1	-7.7	Roscom./Galway E	91.6	90.3	+1.3
DMR Nth Central	89.5	91.5	-2.0	Sligo/Leitrim	96.8	92.7	+4.1
DMR South	88.6	86.3	+2.3	Tipperary	94.1	92.2	+1.9
DMR Sth Central	90.6	83.3	+7.3	Waterford/Kilkenny	92.1	81.6	+10.5
DMR West	91.2	80.8	+10.4	Wexford	90.4	91.5	-1.1
Donegal	81.8	86.4	-4.6	average	91.2	90.1	+1.1

Table 46 Approachability of Gardaí at local station and division: 2008 and 2007

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 'just not interested', 'unfriendly/rude' or 'think they are superior/formal manner'.

Reason why Gardaí were considered approachable	n=7927
very friendly/helpful	58%
respondent knows them	19%
very reassuring	16%
they have time for you	22%
they are members of the community	17%
can communicate with them	21%
other	3%
Reason why Gardaí were considered unapproachable	n=800
unfriendly/rude	34%
not always there/station frequently closed	17%
just not interested	45%
think they are superior/formal manner	32%
minor complaints dealt with more seriously	13%
unhelpful	28%
distance themselves from community	20%
other	5%

 Table 47 Reasons for approachability or unapproachability

The answers were unprompted.

Almost four out of ten respondents said that they knew a Garda by name at their local station (39%). This is a decrease of two percentage points on the 2007 figure (table 48).

Yes	No	Total
%	%	n
39	61	9982
41	59	10002
40	60	9950
46	54	9912
48	52	1016
54	46	997
57	43	10255
	% 39 41 40 46 48	Yes No % % 39 61 41 59 40 60 46 54 48 52 54 46

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

Unacceptable behaviour by Garda members

One out of every thirteen respondents reported that a Garda had ever behaved towards them in a way they considered unacceptable (7.7%), a rate similar to that in the 2007 survey (7.5%). The type of unacceptable behaviour cited most frequently was that the Garda had been 'disrespectful or impolite' (table 49).

Table 49 Nature of any unacceptable behaviour						
Nature of behaviour	2008	2007	2006	2005	2004	2003
		%	%	%	%	%
was disrespectful or impolite	4.4	4.2	4.1	5.0	10.9	6.6
did not follow proper procedures	1.7	1.4	1.5	1.4	3.8	1.4
stopped or searched without reason	0.9	0.9	1.0	1.4	2.6	0.5
harassed	1.4	1.3	1.4	1.6	3.8	1.0
clearly was very lax in carrying out duty	1.2	0.8	1.2	1.4	5.3	1.1
used racist language	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.4	0
made wrongful accusation	1.4	0.1	1.4	1.5	4.5	1.7
behaved in a violent way (e.g. pushing)	0.7	0.9	0.7	0.9	2.6	0.9
discriminated due to age, gender, race or ethnicity	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.7	1.8	0.5
swore	0.9	0.8	0.6	0.8	3.3	0.9
searched house without reason	0.1	0.2	0.4	0.4	-	-
took an item of your property	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.5	0.2
other (incl. use of sexist or sectarian language)	1.0	0.5	1.2	1.2	2.9	0.4
any of the above	7.7	7.5	8.6	9.3	12.4	12.1

Table 49 Nature of any unacceptable behaviour

Garda division	2008	2007	Change
	%	%	% points
Carlow/Kildare	5.8	5.8	0
Cavan/Monaghan	4.0	9.2	-5.2
Clare	3.5	3.9	-0.4
Cork City	3.3	4.8	-1.5
Cork North	7.3	5.6	+1.7
Cork West	8.5	4.5	+4.0
DMR East	13.5	9.6	+3.9
DMR North	10.6	9.0	+1.6
DMR North Central	13.1	11.3	+1.8
DMR South	9.6	10.3	-0.7
DMR South Central	14.3	10.2	+4.1
DMR West	8.1	12.7	-4.6
Donegal	6.0	9.0	-3.0
Galway West	9.3	6.4	+2.9
Kerry	6.9	7.8	-0.9
Laois/Offaly	7.6	8.6	-1.0
Limerick	8.2	6.0	+2.2
Longford/Westmeath	2.7	6.3	-3.6
Louth/Meath	10.1	5.1	+5.0
Мауо	2.0	3.2	-1.2
Roscommon/Galway East	6.8	6.3	+0.5
Sligo/Leitrim	5.3	4.3	+1.0
Tipperary	4.7	3.6	+1.1
Waterford/Kilkenny	4.5	12.7	-8.2
Wexford/Wicklow	9.0	9.7	-0.7
	0.0	7.4	0.1

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.

Rates of unacceptable behaviour ranged from two per cent in Mayo to 14 per cent in DMR South Central. Compared with the 2007 survey, the percentage of respondents answering that a Garda had ever behaved towards them in an unacceptable way was lower in 12 divisions, higher in 12 and the same in one.⁶ The biggest improvements were in Waterford/Kilkenny (by 8.2 percentage points) and Cavan/Monaghan (by 5.2 percentage points). Disimprovements were biggest in Louth/Meath (by 5 percentage points) and DMR South Central (by 4.1 percentage points). The national average was unchanged from 2007 (table 50).

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

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, 1.5 per cent of respondents said that they had ever been subjected to a racist incident (n=152). Eighteen per cent of these had reported the most recent incident to the Gardaí (n=28). Of these, a third were satisfied (33%) with the way the incident was handled (n=9). In the 2007 survey, 2.1 per cent reported having experienced a racist incident (n=215); 18 per cent reported it to the Gardaí (n=39) and 49 per cent were satisfied with the way it was handled (n=18).

The vast majority of the 10,032 respondents to the survey were of Irish nationality (92%), and the exclusion of these produces a different picture. The rates of experience of racist incidents by non-Irish nationals are as follows: UK (2%), EU (7%), and non-EU (9%). These represent decreases of three, eight and 17 percentage points, respectively, compared with the 2007 rates.

When asked if they had ever been subjected to a racist incident by a Garda, 17 respondents said they had, compared with 33, 22, 31 and 21 in 2007, 2006, 2005 and 2002, respectively. Two non-Irish nationals were included in the 17.

In another section of the survey, 57 per cent of respondents agreed with the statement 'people who are different are likely to experience ridicule or personal attack on our streets', while only 22 per cent disagreed.⁷

⁷ The rest were undecided. These findings are identical to those in the 2007 report.

Garda visibility and activity

Just over a fifth of respondents reported seeing a Garda in their locality that day or the day before (22%). More than half had seen a Garda in the previous week (53%), identical to the rate in 2007.

The proportion of respondents that remembered seeing a Garda on the day of their interview was similar to that in 2007 (table 51).

Last sighting of	2008	2007	2006	2005	2004	2003
Garda in locality	%	%	%	%	%	%
today	7	8	8	8	16	15
yesterday	15	17	17	16	13	17
2-7 days ago	31	28	29	28	26	27
1-4 weeks ago	21	20	19	19	15	14
longer ago	14	14	14	18	21	21
can't remember	11	13	14	12	8	6

Table 51 Garda visibility

Some percentages do not sum to exactly 100 due to rounding.

Sixty-five per cent of respondents were satisfied with the level of Garda visibility in their locality. This represents an increase of three percentage points on 2007.

This year's level of satisfaction with visibility was higher than in any of the reports since 2002 (table 52).

Survey	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Total		
	%	%	%	%	n		
2008	9	56	29	6	9901		
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		

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

Some percentages do not sum to exactly 100 due to rounding.

Satisfaction with the level of local Garda visibility ranged from 52 per cent in Carlow/Kildare to 77 per cent in Cavan/Monaghan and Clare (table 53).

Compared with 2007, 15 divisions registered an increase in satisfaction levels and rates decreased in ten.

Compared with 2007, the largest increases in satisfaction rates were achieved in DMR North (+15.2 percentage points), Laois/Offaly (+12.6) and Galway West (+12.3). The largest decreases were recorded in Carlow/Kildare (-8.9 percentage points), Sligo/Leitrim (-8.5) and DMR South Central (-7.0).

	Satisfied/very satisfied				
Garda division	2008	2007	Change		
	%	%	Percentage points		
Cavan/Monaghan	76.9	73.2	+3.7		
Мауо	73.7	77.9	-4.2		
Kerry	72.1	60.6	+11.5		
Sligo/Leitrim	69.1	77.6	-8.5		
Roscommon/Galway East	68.7	68.2	+0.5		
Clare	76.5	66.3	+10.2		
Donegal	70.2	69.2	+1.0		
DMR South Central	72.0	79.0	-7.0		
Tipperary	61.9	64.4	-2.5		
Galway West	65.1	52.8	+12.3		
DMR East	75.0	76.5	-1.5		
DMR North Central	62.5	59.6	+2.9		
DMR South	63.3	69.2	-5.9		
Cork North	58.3	59.4	-1.1		
Laois/Offaly	70.8	58.2	+12.6		
DMR West	57.0	46.4	+10.6		
Cork West	75.4	67.3	+8.1		
Cork City	59.4	56.3	+3.1		
DMR North	62.7	47.5	+15.2		
Limerick	59.5	61.5	-2.0		
Carlow/Kildare	52.1	61.0	-8.9		
Longford/Westmeath	67.4	58.6	+8.8		
Louth/Meath	64.1	70.5	-6.4		
Wexford/Wicklow	62.1	56.9	+5.2		
Waterford/Kilkenny	55.4	44.0	+11.4		
average	66.0	63.3	+2.7		

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

The majority of respondents felt that the level of general Garda activity (60%) and the level of foot patrol (59%) in the locality had stayed the same in the previous year. This is broadly consistent with results from the 2007, 2006, 2005, 2004 and 2003 surveys.

A fifth of respondents felt that the level of general activity had increased (20%), while 13 per cent felt that it had decreased. Seventeen per cent felt that the level of foot patrol had increased, while16 per cent felt that it had decreased (table 54).

anie 34 Feiceiveu cha	nges ni Oalua ac	civicy ni c	ne roounty		or your		
Activity	Change	2008	2007	2006	2005	2004	2003
	Change	%	%	%	%	%	%
General Garda activity	increased	20	21	15	17 ·	22	24
	about same	60	57	60	60	60	60
	decreased	13	14	15	15	11	11
	don't know	7	8	9	9	8	5
Foot patrol	increased	17	18	12	14	19	15
	about same	59	56	61	60	59	57
	decreased	16	15	16	16	16	17
	don't know	9	11	11	11	6	11

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

Some percentages do not sum to exactly 100 due to rounding.

Over eight out of ten respondents rated the Garda performance in their locality as either 'very good' or 'fairly good' (82%). This performance rating is consistent with the satisfaction level with overall Garda service to the community as described at the beginning of this report (81%). Seventy-seven per cent of respondents felt that the Gardaí were doing a 'very good' or 'fairly good' job in their locality as regards road safety (table 55).

Performance	Rating	2008	2007	2006	2005	2004	2003
	Raung	%	%	%	%	%	%
	very good	15	17	15	22	22	27
All in all, how good a job do	fairly good	67	65	65	62	62	59
the Gardaí do in your	fairly poor	14	15	16	13	12	10
locality?	very poor	4	3	4	3	4	4
How good a job do the Gardaí do in your locality as regards road safety?	very good	14	15	12	21	20	26
	fairly good	63	61	58	58	50	51
	fairly poor	18	20	24	17	20	16
regarus roau salety?	very poor	5	5	7	5	10	7

Some percentages do not sum to exactly 100 due to rounding.

Male (82%) and female (83%) respondents had similar levels of satisfaction ('very good' and 'fairly good' combined) for local Garda performance. Rates of satisfaction for males (77%) and females (76%) were also similar regarding road safety performance in the locality.

Respondents in the 65+ age category expressed a higher level of satisfaction with local Garda performance than those in other age categories (88%), while those in this group also had the highest levels of satisfaction with Garda performance in road safety (81%).⁸

On a divisional basis, ratings for how good a job the Gardaí do in the locality ranged from 73 per cent in Donegal to 93 per cent in Cork West ('very good' and 'fairly good' combined). See table 56.

Compared with 2007, 16 divisions showed an increase in the satisfaction rating, with an average increase among these of 5.2 percentage points. The largest increases occurred in Waterford/Kilkenny (+11.6 percentage points), DMR West (+10.7) and DMR South Central (+9.9). For the nine divisions in which there were decreases, the average decrease was 5.9 percentage points. The largest decreases were in Louth/Meath (-9.6 percentage points), DMR North (-8.1).

Ratings for how good a job the Gardaí do locally regarding road safety ranged from 58 per cent in Donegal to 88 per cent in Clare and Laois/Offaly ('very good' or 'fairly good').

Compared with 2007, 14 divisions showed an increase in the satisfaction rating, with the average increase being 7.5 percentage points. For the other eleven divisions the average decrease was 5.2 percentage points. Compared with 2007, the largest increases in satisfaction occurred in DMR South Central (+16.8 percentage points), Waterford/Kilkenny (+14.6) and Clare (+14.5). The largest decreases were recorded in Donegal (-14.1 percentage points), Carlow/Kildare (-10.4) and DMR North (-9.5).

⁸ For Garda performance locally the exact percentages were: 81.7% (18-24 years), 81.3% (25-44), 81.2% (45-64) and 87.8% (65+). For Garda road safety performance the percentages were: 78.6% (18-24 years), 74.7% (25-44), 76.2% (45-64) and 81.2% (65+).

		rall perfor		Road safety			
Garda division	very	good / fair	ly good	very good / fairly good			
	2008	2007	change	2008	2007	change	
	%	%	% points	%	%	% points	
Cork West	92.5	87.6	+4.9	82.7	75.3	+7.4	
Clare	91.1	83.3	+7.8	88.1	73.6	+14.5	
Cork North	91.1	82.9	+8.2	76.0	71.1	+4.9	
Sligo/Leitrim	89.0	87.7	+1.3	80.7	78.0	+2.7	
Cavan/Monaghan	89.0	84.5	+4.5	85.5	80.1	+5.4	
DMR East	88.9	85.6	+3.3	80.4	84.4	-4.0	
Kerry	88.5	79.7	+8.8	80.0	72.0	+8.0	
Laois/Offaly	88.3	85.3	+3.0	87.8	84.8	+3.0	
Roscommon/Galway East	87.0	86.6	+0.4	81 .1	77.0	+4.1	
DMR South Central	86.6	7 6.7	+9.9	83.2	66.4	+16.8	
Tipperary	86.4	88.4	-2.0	84.5	86.4	-1.9	
Mayo	85.0	87.3	-2.3	78.0	82.3	-4.3	
Galway West	83.0	80.2	+2.8	77.7	73.1	+4.6	
Longford/Westmeath	82.7	79.8	+2.9	81.0	77.2	+3.8	
DMR North Central	82.6	80.8	+1.8	78.2	78.7	-0.5	
Wexford/Wicklow	81.8	83.7	-1.9	76.1	73.4	+2.7	
Carlow/Kildare	80.8	88.0	-7.2	72.2	82.6	-10.4	
Limerick	79.3	84.0	-4.7	75.9	76.1	-0.2	
Cork City	79.3	78.8	+0.5	69.4	70.4	-1.0	
DMR West	79.1	68.4	+10.7	79.9	. 67.1	+12.8	
DMR South	78.5	86.2	-7.7	75.8	83.6	-7.8	
DMR North	76.6	84.7	-8.1	71.6	81.1	-9.5	
Louth/Meath	75.0	84.6	-9.6	71.6	74.7	-3.1	
Waterford/Kilkenny	73.5	61.9	+11.6	68.9	54.3	+14.6	
Donegal	72.6	81.8	-9.2	58.4	72.5	-14.1	
average	83.5	82.3	+1.2	77.8	75.8	+2.0	

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

When respondents were categorised according to housing tenure, the range of ratings for satisfaction with Garda performance locally in 2008 was similar to that in 2007. Ratings ranged from 78-85 per cent, compared with 76-84 per cent in 2007. In 2008, occupants of local authority housing gave a lower rating than other respondents, with 78 per cent saying they thought the Gardaí did a 'very good' or 'fairly good' job in their locality (table 57).

Table 57	Local Garda	performance I	ov housind	g tenure 2008 and 2007

2008 Survey		2007 Survey	
Housing type	%	Housing type	%
owner occupied	82.4	owner occupied	82.9
local authority housing	77.5	local authority housing	75.8
rented privately	85.2	rented privately	84.1
other	85.1	other	82.6

Road traffic collisions

Three per cent of respondents said that they had been involved in the previous year in road traffic collisions dealt with by the Gardaí, similar to last year's percentage (4% in 2007). The majority believed that the other party was at fault for the collision (58%), while 28 per cent felt that they themselves were at fault. Thirteen per cent felt that both parties were, while one per cent did not know who was at fault.⁹ Seventy-nine per cent of respondents were satisfied with the Garda investigation of the collisions, a finding similar to last year's (table 58).

Survey	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Total
Ourvey	%	%	%	%	n
2008	31	48	17	4	273
2007	22	58	11	10	344
2006	30	48	13	8	358
2005	25	48	15	12	272
2002	39	40	12	9	465

Table 58 Satisfaction with the Garda investigation of road traffic collisions

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 presented as frequencies in table 59.

Deeeen fan die afiefe stiere	Mentioned (n)	Mentioned (n)
Reason for dissatisfaction		2007
Garda withheld information		7
nothing was/has been done	13	23
nobody came to the scene	9	11
Garda took very long time to come to scene	17	20
Garda wrongfully charged the respondent	3	1
very bad service	18	21
were not interested in incident	21	25
other	5	8

Table 59	Dissatisfaction with Garda investigation of road traffic collisions	\$
	Dissausiacion with Carda myeshyation of Idau fiamic comstons	•

In 2008 there were no responses to the category 'Garda withheld information'.

⁹ There was only one respondent who reported not knowing who was at fault. This frequency has been rounded up to one per cent.

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 asked, 'in your opinion, what priority do you think the Garda <u>should give</u> to the following policing tasks?', and then, 'in your opinion, what priority do you think the Garda <u>should give</u> 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 enforcing laws relating to drugs, followed by ensuring an immediate response to emergencies, targeting organised crime, investigating crime and dealing with crimes of sexual violence. Crime prevention advice to businesses, advice on personal safety and home security and supervision of licensed premises were the lowest ranked tasks (table 60).

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 77 per cent for 'supervise licensed premises' to 99 per cent for 'investigate crime'. Readers should note 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.

Task	Very high priority	High priority	Low priority	Rank
	%	%	%	
enforce laws relating to drugs	75	22	3	1
ensure immediate response to emergencies	73	25	2	2
target organised crime	72	26	2	3
investigate crime	69	31	1	4
deal with crimes of sexual violence	66	31	3	5
deal with youths racing around in cars	62	34	4	6
enforce drink driving laws	62	34	4	7
enforce speed laws	59	36	5	8
deal with domestic violence incidents	59	37	4	9
deal with underage drinking on the streets	59	36	5	10
tackle the sale of alcohol to those under age	57	36	.6	11
deal with underage drinking in pubs	. 53	38	9	12
deal with vandalism	46	46	8	13
enforce laws relating to fraud and white collar crime	45	48	8	14
provide help and support to victims of crime	44	48	8	15
enforce laws relating to wearing of seat belts	44	48	8.	16
patrol by car/van	43	49	8	17
ensure State security	43	46	11	18
deal with public annoyances (e.g. loud music, fights)	41	49	10	19
enforce immigration laws	39	48	13	20
work with community groups	36	53	11	21
patrol on foot or bicycle	39	47	15	22
ensure effective traffic management and flow	34	53	13	23
enforce other traffic laws	32	54	14	24
patrol by motorcycle	34	47	19	25
supervise licensed premises	30	47	23	26
advise on personal safety and home security	26	52	22	27
advise businesses/shops on crime prevention	25	53	22	28

Table 60 Respondents' policing priorities

Some percentages do not sum to exactly 100 because of rounding. 'Don't know' answers are excluded; they ranged from 0.5% to 1.5% of respondents. Tasks are ranked by mean score, and these scores are shown in table 63.

Respondents' perceptions of the priority 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, targeting organised crime, enforcing drink driving laws and ensuring State security.

The perceived Garda priority order was generally different from respondents' own priorities. The rankings were the same for five activities: ensuring immediate response to emergencies, targeting organised crime, dealing with domestic violence incidents, dealing with public annoyances (e.g. loud music, fights) and advising on personal safety and home security.

The difference in rankings was relatively small for 13 of the remaining activities, while the other ten showed differences of six or more ranking places (table 62).

Task	Very high priority	High priority	Low priority	Very Iow priority	Rank
	%	%	.%	%	
investigate crime	31	55	13	2	1
ensure immediate response to emergencies	33	49	15	3	2
target organised crime	29	49	17	5	3
enforce drink driving laws	26	53	18	4	4
ensure State security	26	50	18	6	5
enforce laws relating to drugs	26	51	19	5	6
enforce speed laws	25	51	20	5	7
deal with crimes of sexual violence	24	51	20	5	8
deal with domestic violence incidents	19	47	26	8	9
enforce laws relating to wearing of seat belts	18	48	27	6	10
enforce immigration laws	17	46	29	8	11
patrol by car/van	16	48	29	7	12
enforce laws relating to fraud and white collar crime	15	44	32	9	13
enforce other traffic laws	13	46	33	7	14
ensure effective traffic management and flow	13	44	36	8	15
provide help and support to victims of crime	13	40	37	10	16
deal with youths racing around in cars	14	36	37	13 .	17
deal with vandalism	13	38	38	11	18
deal with public annoyances (e.g. loud music, fights)	12	40	38	10	19
deal with underage drinking on the streets	14	34	39	13	20
deal with underage drinking in pubs	14	32	41	13	21
supervise licensed premises	12	34	40	14	22
tackle the sale of alcohol to those under age	12	32	42	14	23
work with community groups	9	36	41	14	24
advise businesses/shops on crime prevention	9	31	43	17	25
patrol by motorcycle	9	28	42	22	26
advise on personal safety and home security	8	29	44	19	27
patrol on foot or bicycle	9	24	42	25	28

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

Some percentages do not sum to exactly 100 because of rounding. 'Don't know' answers are excluded; they ranged from 0.9% to 3.5% of respondents. Tasks are ranked by mean scores, and these scores are shown in table 63.

The largest difference occurred in respect of 'ensuring State security', which the public rated 13 ranking places lower than it perceived the Gardaí do. The next largest differences were for tackling the sale of alcohol to those under age, dealing with youths racing around in cars and dealing with underage drinking on the streets, which the public rated 12, 11 and ten places, respectively, higher than it perceived the Gardaí do.

Other significant mismatches arose in relation to dealing with underage drinking in pubs (to which the public attached a higher ranking than they perceive the Gardaí do), enforcing other traffic laws and enforcing immigration laws (to which the public attached a lower ranking than they perceive the Gardaí do – ten and nine ranking places, respectively).

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

Table 62 Respondents' priorities and their perception of Garda priorities – rankings

Without exception, respondents assigned a higher priority to activities than they perceived the Gardaí do. This was so even when an activity appeared in the same ranking position in both respondent and Garda lists.

Task	Desired priority	Perceived Garda priority	Difference
	mean	mean	mean
	score	score	score
enforce laws relating to drugs	1.28	1.98	-0.70
ensure immediate response to emergencies	1.29	1.86	-0.57
target organised crime	1.30	1.93	-0.63
investigate crime	1.32	1.84	-0.52
deal with crimes of sexual violence	1.37	2.02	-0.65
deal with youths racing around in cars	1.41	2.36	-0.95
enforce drink driving laws	1.42	1.95	-0.53
enforce speed laws	1.45	2.00	-0.55
deal with domestic violence incidents	1.46	2.14	-0.68
deal with underage drinking on the streets	1.46	2.38	-0.92
tackle the sale of alcohol to those under age	1.49	2.45	-0.96
deal with underage drinking in pubs	1.56	2.40	-0.84
deal with vandalism	1.63	2.36	-0.73
enforce laws relating to fraud and white collar crime	1.63	2.26	-0.63
provide help and support to victims of crime	1.63	2.34	-0.71
enforce laws relating to wearing of seat belts	1.65	2.15	-0.50
patrol by car/van	1.65	2.21	-0.56
ensure State security	1.68	1.97	-0.29
deal with public annoyances (e.g. loud music, fights)	1.69	2.36	-0.67
enforce immigration laws	1.73	2.20	-0.47
work with community groups	1.75	2.45	-0.70
patrol on foot or bicycle	1.76	2.58	-0.82
ensure effective traffic management and flow	1.79	2.30	-0.51
enforce other traffic laws	1.81	2.27	-0.46
patrol by motorcycle	1.85	2.55	-0.70
supervise licensed premises	1.93	2.42	-0.49
advise on personal safety and home security	1.96	2.55	-0.59
advise businesses/shops on crime prevention	1.97	2.52	-0.55

Table 63 Respondents' priorities and perceived Garda priorities – mean scores

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, 5710 said 'very high', 3628 'high' and 637 'low', giving a mean score of [(5710x1)+(3628x2)+(637x3)] / [5710+7256+1911] = 14877 / 9975 = 1.4914. 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 decimal places. Ranking is based on four decimal places.

The largest differences occurred in respect of tackling the sale of alcohol to juveniles, dealing with youths racing around in cars and dealing with underage drinking on the streets and in pubs. Among the other sizeable differences were those relating to patrolling on foot or bicycle and dealing with vandalism (table 63).

With a small number of exceptions, the public's own rankings have been very consistent in the surveys since 2002. Compared with 2007, enforcing laws relating to fraud and white collar crime, enforcing immigration laws and working with community groups achieved the greatest jumps in ranking. The largest falls in ranking were for enforcing laws relating to wearing of seat belts, ensuring effective traffic management and flow and enforcing other traffic laws (table 64).¹⁰

Table 64 Respondents priorities: 2006, 2	Year	2008	2007	2006	2005	2002
Task	n	n¹	n²	n ³	n⁴	n⁵
enforce laws relating to drugs		1	2	2	2	3
ensure immediate response to emergencies		2	1	1	1	1
target organised crime		3	3	3	3	2
investigate crime		. 4	- 4	5	5	6
deal with crimes of sexual violence		5	5	6	4	-
deal with youths racing around in cars		6	7	8	6	3
enforce drink driving laws		7	6	4	8	3
enforce speed laws		8	8	7	12	7
deal with domestic violence incidents		9	10	11	10	-
deal with underage drinking on the streets		10	9	9	7	8
tackle the sale of alcohol to those under age	;	11	11	10	9	9
deal with underage drinking in pubs		12	12	12	11	11
deal with vandalism		13	15	14	13	13
enforce laws relating to fraud and white colla	ar crime	14	17	15	14	12
provide help and support to victims of crime		15	14	16	15	14
enforce laws relating to wearing of seat belts	3	16	13	13	16	10
patrol by car/van		17	16	17	17	16
ensure State security		18	18	19	18	15
deal with public annoyances (e.g. loud musi	c,)	19	19	18	19	17
enforce immigration laws		20	23	25	25	23
work with community groups		21	24	23	22	22
patrol on foot or bicycle		22	22	20	20	21
ensure effective traffic management and flow			20	22	23	18
enforce other traffic laws			21	21	24	18
patrol by motorcycle			25	24	21	20
supervise licensed premises			27	27	27	24
advise on personal safety and home security		27	26	26	26	26
advise businesses/shops on crime preventic	n	28	28	28	28	25

Table 64	Respondents'	priorities: 2008	. 2007. 2006	. 2005. 2002

Table includes two tasks: 'deal with crimes of sexual violence' added in 2004 and 'deal with domestic violence incidents', added in 2005. Sample size: $n^1 = 10,000$; $n^2 = 10,000$; $n^3 = 10,000$; $n^4 = 10,000$ and $n^5 = 10,000$. Rankings prior to 2005 were based on mean scores to two decimal places and joint rankings occurred in several instances.

¹⁰ Note that a change in rank position from 23 in 2007 to 20 in 2008 (enforce immigration laws) represents an increase in respondents' priority for that task. A change in rank from 21 in 2007 to 24 in 2008 (enforce other traffic laws) represents a decrease in priority.

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 t	ne Gardaí	and the community
----------	--------------	-----------	-----------	-------------------

Questions were rotated in four groups and sample sizes ranged from 2435 to 2542. Some percentages do not sum to exactly 100 because of rounding.

The results are summarised in table 65 showing agreement ('strongly agree' and 'agree' combined), disagreement ('disagree' and 'strongly disagree' combined) or neither.¹¹

The highest levels of agreement were with the statements: 'anyone in Garda custody would have their rights fully respected', 'if my rights were infringed, I could rely on the Gardaí to help me', 'I would encourage a friend or relative to join the Gardaí' and 'domestic violence is a private matter, not a Garda matter' (73% disagreed). Agreement was also high with: 'people like me would be welcome in the Gardaí as a member' and 'the Gardaí carry out their role in a fair and impartial manner'. Minorities that disagreed with these statements ranged from 11–17 per cent. A majority disagreed that the Gardaí discriminate against immigrants (60%).

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' (51%), while 43 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 2007, 2006, 2005 and 2002 surveys.

A comparison of responses from 2002 to 2008 is set out in table 66. Sixteen statements were common to all surveys, and for one 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 the percentage agreeing with it; from 23 per cent in 2002 to 35 per cent in 2008. In 2002, 56 per cent of respondents agreed that 'the local Gardaí are fully answerable to the people for their actions and conduct'. This year the level of agreement for this variable was 50 per cent.

¹¹ 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').

Table 66 Relationship between the Gardai and the commu	inity: 20	08 – 20	02		
Agreement with statement	2008	2007	2006	2005	2002
	%	%	%	%	%
Anyone in Garda custody would have their rights fully respected	76	72	70	70	64
If my rights were infringed, I could rely on the Gardaí to help me	73	71	69	72	75
I would encourage a friend or relative to join the Gardaí	69	68	65	67	71
People like me would be welcome in the Gardaí as a member	68	64	63	63	71
The Gardaí carry out their role in a fair and impartial manner	67	67	65	69	-
Gardaí are sensitive to the needs of vulnerable people	64	59	62	61	60
The Garda organisation is made up of honest/ honourable people	63	60	61	62	60
Gardaí are representative of the communities they serve	62	61	64	66	68
Anyone in Garda custody would be well treated	55	51	50	56	60
Garda management fully supports community policing (e.g. assigning Community Gardaí to area)	55	52	48	54	52
The Gardaí provide good leadership in the guidance and direction of our young people	54	48	51	51	46
The local Gardaí reflect the make-up of my local community	52	50	53	53	54
The local Gardaí are fully answerable to the people for their actions and conduct	50	50	51	-51	56
The Gardaí never blame victims of crime	45	43	42	42	-
The Gardaí serve the interests of the rich more than the poor	35	35	39	34	34
When people are dissatisfied with what the Gardaí do, it is easy to have the matter corrected	35	34	32	31	23
The people around here have a real say in deciding what is important for the Gardaí to attend to	26	23	27	25	22
The Gardaí discriminate against immigrants	15	16	16	14	11
Domestic violence is a private matter, not a Garda matter	13	13	17	16	-

Table 66 Relationship between the Gardaí and the community: 2008 - 2002

The statements: 'the Gardai carry out their role in a fair and impartial manner', 'the Gardai never blame victims of crime' and 'domestic violence is a private matter, not a Garda matter' were not included in the 2002 survey.

An increase in agreement 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 and 2008. In the period 2002 to 2006 there was a decline in the percentage agreeing that 'anyone in Garda custody would be well treated'. However, since 2006, there has been an increase in agreement for this variable (51% in 2007 and 55% in 2008).

From 2005 to 2006 the largest changes had been for declines in agreement with the statements: 'Garda management fully supports community policing' and 'anyone in Garda custody would be well treated' (a drop of six percentage points for each).

From 2006 to 2007 the largest changes were in respect to the statements: 'Garda management fully supports community policing' (an increase in agreement of four percentage points), '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' (a decrease in agreement of four percentage points for each).

From 2007 to 2008 the largest changes were for the statements: 'the Gardaí provide good leadership in the guidance and direction of our young people' and 'Gardaí are sensitive to the needs of vulnerable people' (an increase in agreement of six and five percentage points, respectively).

Public safety and fear of crime

Almost three-quarters of respondents said that they felt safe out walking in their neighbourhood after dark (74%). In earlier surveys the corresponding figures were: 75 per cent in 2007, 71 per cent in 2006 and 69 per cent in 2005 and 2002.

Feelings of safety were lowest in cities other than Dublin (Cork, Galway, Limerick and Waterford) and in large towns. An average of four per cent of respondents felt very unsafe walking in their neighbourhood after dark, rising to six per cent in cities outside Dublin (table 67).

Type of area	Very safe	Safe	Unsafe	Very unsafe	Total
	%	%	%	%	n
Dublin	16	62	18	4	2589
other city	11	57	27	6	1047
large town (10,000)	17	52	26	5	837
town (1-10,000)	17	55	. 25	3	1813
village, rural, open country	19	56	20	5	3709
all	17	57	22	4	9995

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

One percentage does not sum to exactly 100 due to rounding.

The vast majority of respondents felt secure alone in their homes at night (89%), although on average ten per cent felt unsafe and one per cent felt very unsafe. Feelings of safety were similar in four categories of area (range 87% - 89%), with respondents in the 'large town' category having a notably higher rate (93%). See table 68.

Type of area	Very safe	Safe	Unsafe	Very unsafe	Total
	%	%	%	%	n
Dublin	21	66	11	. 2	2589
other city	19	70	10	2	1048
large town (10,000)	26	67	6	1	837
town (1-10,000)	22	66	10	1	1813
village, rural, open country	26	63	10	1	3709
all	23	66	10	1	9996

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

Some percentages do not sum to exactly 100 due to rounding.

Feelings of safety walking in the neighbourhood after dark varied substantially by division ('very safe' and 'safe' combined), ranging from 57 per cent in Carlow/Kildare to 83 per cent in Clare, DMR East and Cavan/Monaghan (table 69).

Of the seven divisions that had the lowest rates for feelings of safety, three (Cork, Waterford/Kilkenny and Limerick) contain 'other cities' consistent with earlier results in table 67.

The proportions feeling 'safe' or 'very safe' alone at home at night ranged from 77 per cent in Waterford/Kilkenny to 97 per cent in Cork North (table 69).

	Out walkir	ig after dark	Home alone at night		
Garda division	safe/very	unsafe/very	safe/very	unsafe/very	
	safe	unsafe	safe	unsafe	
	%	%	%	%	
Clare	83	17	96	4	
DMR East	83	17	95	5	
Cavan/Monaghan	83	18	94	. 6	
Мауо	82	19	90	10	
Sligo/Leitrim	81	19	94	6	
DMR South Central	79	21	91	9	
DMR North Central	79	21	88	12	
Donegal	78	22	91	9	
Longford/Westmeath	78	22	80	20	
DMR North	77	23	84	16	
Galway West	76	24	91	9	
Tipperary	76	24	90	11	
Roscommon/Galway East	76	24	87	13	
Cork West	76	24	92	8	
DMR South	76	25	85	16	
Louth/Meath	75	25	93	8	
DMR West	74	26	86	14	
Cork North	72	28	97	3	
Wexford	69	31	82	18	
Laois/Offaly	69	31	89	11	
Cork City	69	31	93	8	
Kerry	68	32	91	9	
Waterford/Kilkenny	67	33	77	24	
Limerick	63	37	81	19	
Carlow/Kildare	57	43	89	12	
average	75	25	89	11	

Table 69 Feelings of safety and Garda division

Table ordered according to values in column 2 (to one decimal place). Some percentages do not sum to exactly 100 due to rounding.

Compared with 2007, feelings of safety when out walking after dark were higher in 14 divisions and lower in eleven. The largest increases were recorded in Clare, DMR South Central and DMR West (table 70).

From 2005 to 2008, feelings of safety when out walking after dark have shown continuous improvement in four divisions (Cavan/Monaghan, Mayo, DMR North Central and Cork West).

Using the 2005 and 2008 reports as reference points, the largest increases in feelings of safety out walking after dark were recorded in DMR North Central, Galway West and Cork City. The largest decrease was in Limerick.

	S	afe/very	safe ou	t	Safe/very safe home			
Garda division	walking after dark				alone at night			
	2008	2007	2006	2005	2008	2007	2006	2005
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Clare	83	74	80	83	96	94	95	93
DMR East	83	88	79	76	95	93	88	93
Cavan/Monaghan	83	82	77	70	94	92	86	91
Мауо	82	79	74	73	90	91	89	80
Sligo/Leitrim	81	80	71	78	94	93	85	87
DMR South Central	79	- 74	77	74	91	77	90	87
DMR North Central	79	77	68	63	88	85	85	78
Donegal	78	81	74	75	91	91	84	83
Longford/Westmeath	78	74	77	72	80	79	83	78
DMR North	77	78	75	70	84	88	93	87
Galway West	76	79	73	61	91	92	87	83
Tipperary	76	75	76	70	90	86	89	83
Roscommon/Galway East	76	77	83	74	87	85	94	85
Cork West	76	75	72	67	92	93	93	91
DMR South	76	77	67	65	85	88	82	85
Louth/Meath	75	79	76	63	93	90	87	78
DMR West	74	69	68	71	86	85	.88	86
Cork North	72	68	71	67	97	87	83	87
Wexford/Wicklow	69	66	69	71	82	81	81	82
Laois/Offaly	69	71	60	62	89	80	73	76
Cork City	69	70	62	55	93	92	88	87
Kerry	68	65	73	68	91	82	90	83
Waterford/Kilkenny	67	66	67	69	77	76	77	84
Limerick	63	67	56	68	81	86	78	81
Carlow/Kildare	57	66	69	59	89	77	75	73
average	75	74	72	69	89	87	86	84

Table 70 Feelings of safe	y and Garda division: 2	008, 2007, 2006 and	d 2005
---------------------------	-------------------------	---------------------	--------

Table ordered according to values in column 2 (to one decimal place).

Compared with 2007, feelings of safety alone in the home at night were higher in 18 divisions, lower in six and the same in one. The largest increase was recorded in DMR South Central and the largest decrease in Limerick (table 70).

From 2005 to 2008, feelings of safety in the home at night have shown a continuous increase in two divisions: Cork City and Carlow/Kildare. Using the 2005 and 2008 survey findings as reference points, the greatest increase in feelings of safety were recorded in Carlow/Kildare, Louth/Meath and Laois/Offaly. Two divisions recorded decreases: Waterford/Kilkenny and DMR North.

In two divisions – Mayo and Cork West – a decrease in feelings of safety alone at home at night occurred, even though an increase had been recorded regarding feeling safe when out walking after dark.

In each of the report years 2005, 2006, 2007 and 2008, every division reported higher levels of feelings of safety alone at home compared with feelings of safety walking in the neighbourhood after dark. For the period 2005-2008, the percentage of respondents that felt safe alone at home was, on average, 14 points higher.

Just over a fifth of respondents felt less safe when out walking in their area than they had felt 12 months ago (21%), while over a quarter felt less safe out walking than they had felt 6 years ago (29%). See table 71.

						Didn't	I
Time	Survey	Safer	No different	Less safe	Don't know	live in area	Total
		%	%	%	%	%	n
	2008	5	71	21	1	2	10032
compared with 12	2007	5	71	20	2	2	10067
months ago	2006	4	70	23	1	2	10046
montho ago	2005	3	69	23	2	2	10046
	2002	5	69	24	1	1	10193
	2008	8	52	29	3	9	10032
compared with 6	2007	9	53	25	3	8	10067
years ago	2006	8	52	29	2	9	10046
	2005	7 .	50	31	3	9	10046
	2002	11	38	44	2	5	10051

Table 71	Do you feel	more safe or	less safe	e out walki	ng in y	your area now?

Some percentages do not sum to exactly 100 due to rounding. Missing values have been excluded; there were n=15 of these for the variable, 'compared with 12 months ago' and n=46 for the variable, 'compared with 6 years ago'.

3.55

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. These rates are identical to those in 2007 (table 72).

Since 2002 there has been a downwards trend in the proportion of respondents that worried about themselves, or their family and friends, becoming victims of crime.

Person	Survey	Yes	No	Total
1.612011	Survey	%	%	n
	2008	37	63	10018
	2007	37	63	10044
	2006	41	59	10009
you	2005	45	55	9959
	2004	45	55	1016
	2003	54	45	1007
	2002	52	48	10267
	2008	44	56	9972
	2007	44	56	9999
family member of	2006	49	51	9939
friend	2005	53	47	9892
	2004	68	32	1016
	2003	68	32	1003
	2002	69	31	10147

 Table 72
 Worry about becoming a victim of crime

One percentage does not sum to exactly 100 due to rounding. 'Don't knows' have been excluded; there were n=14 (for 'you') and n=60 (for 'family member or friend').

Almost eight out of ten respondents were as worried about becoming a victim of personal injury crime as property crime (78%), and over six out of ten were as worried about personal injury crime as property crime for a family member or friend (66%). Of the remainder, eight 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 worry about family and friends were 28 per cent (personal injury only) and six per cent (property theft or damage only). See table 73.

53

Person	Survey	Personal injury only	Property theft/damage only	Both	Total
		%	%	%	n
	2008	8	14	78	3715
	2007	10	14	77	3656
you	2006	16	15	69	4011
	2005	15	13	73	4396
	2002	16	17	67	5141
	2008	28	6	66	4326
family mombor	2007	25	6	69	4325
family member or friend	2006	25	7	69	4713
	2005	18	7	75	5118
	2002	26	7	67	6801

Table 73 Worry about personal injury or property theft/damage crime

Some percentages do not sum to exactly 100 due to rounding.

Fear of personally becoming a victim of crime ranged from 21 per cent in Donegal to 51 per cent in Limerick. Compared with 2007, the levels of fear were lower in 14 divisions and higher in eleven (table 74).

The largest decreases in fear of crime were registered in Kerry (15 percentage points), Cavan/Monaghan (10 points) and Longford/Westmeath (8 points). The largest increases were recorded in DMR East (21 percentage points), DMR West (9 points) and Roscommon/Galway East (8 points).

From 2005 to 2008, the levels of fear of personally becoming a victim of crime have continually decreased in four divisions. The largest decrease was in Donegal (22 percentage points – from 43% in 2005 to 21% in 2008).

rabie 14 Horry about chine		Yo	u		Family member or friend				
Garda division	2008	2007	2006	2005	2008	2007	2006	2005	
	%	%	%	~~ %	%	%	%	%	
Donegal	21	26	32	43	26	27	39	52	
Мауо	25	32	24	35	35	33	30	47	
Cavan/Monaghan	25	35	26	31	29	42	35	40	
Clare	27	31	33	32	21	26	30	35	
Sligo/Leitrim	29	27	35	45	44	26	37	52	
Louth/Meath	31	36	37	48	35	47	46	57	
Cork West	32	33	34	26	40	40	41	31	
DMR North Central	32	36	43	44	42	43	45	50	
Cork City	34	31	48	62	41	39	50	64	
Longford/Westmeath	34	42	46	43	34	49	54	55	
DMR South Central	35	41	36	39	47	52	39	47	
Laois/Offaly	36	39	49	50	31	36	52	53	
Galway West	37	41	39	46	39	44	52	53	
DMR South	38	32	51	55	45	45	61 -	65	
DMR North	38	40	39	55	48	54	49	65	
Kerry	38	53	36	38	49	66	38	41	
DMR East	39	18	40	44	48	27	49	53	
Tipperary	39	34	40	45	40	36	43	45	
Roscommon/Galway East	42	34	33	- 48	41	42	46	51	
Wexford/Wicklow	43	40	48	49	49	48	57	60	
DMR West	45	36	40	44	58	46	53	51	
Carlow/Kildare	45	38	51	55	50	43	-48	56	
Cork North	48	42	44	50	61	45	52	53	
Waterford/Kilkenny	49	46	52	41	56	48	60	56	
Limerick	51	52	56	49	53	58	67	55	
average able ordered according to values	37	37	40	45	42	42	47	51	

Table 74	Worr	y about crime	e victimisation ar	d Garda	division	(percentage 'yes')

Table ordered according to values in column 2 (ascending).

Fear of a family member or friend becoming a victim of crime ranged from 21 per cent in Clare to 61 per cent in Cork North. Compared with 2007, the levels of fear decreased in 13 divisions, increased in ten and were at the same level in the remaining two (table 74).

The largest decreases were in Kerry (17 percentage points), Longford/Westmeath (15 points) and Cavan/Monaghan (13 points). The largest increases were in DMR East (21 percentage points), Sligo/Leitrim (18 points) and Cork North (16 points).

From 2005 to 2008, the levels of fear of a family member or friend becoming a victim of crime have continually decreased in seven divisions. The largest decrease was in Donegal (26 percentage points – from 52% in 2005 to 26% in 2008).

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' (87% - 'very worried' and 'fairly worried' combined). See table 75.

Personal injury	Very	Fairly	Not very	Not at all
	%	%	%	% 1 23 3 14 42 Not at all % 2 8
being mugged or robbed	35	48	16	1
being raped	22	27	29	23
being physically attacked by stranger	34	47	16	3
being insulted or pestered by anybody in street/public place	23	33	30	14
being subject to physical attack because of your religion/race/skin colour	15	15	28	42
Property theft/damage	Very	Fairly	Not very	Not at all
i roperty inervalnage	%	%	%	%
having your home broken into and something stolen	41	46	11	2
having your car stolen	38	39	16	8
having things stolen from your car	35	39	18	8
having your property vandalised	40	40	16	4

Table 75 How worried are you about the following crimes?

Some percentages do not sum to exactly 100 due to rounding.

11

2006

The majority of respondents indicated that fear of crime did not affect their quality of life significantly. A quarter indicated that fear of crime moderately reduced their quality of life (25%), while 29 per cent indicated that it reduced the quality a little. There was no reduction in quality of life for almost a third of those who responded (32%). See table 76.

			· ennie reduce	your quality		
Year	Greatly	Significantly	Moderately	Little	None	Total
1001	%	%	%	%	%	n
2008	4	10	25	29	32	3640
2007	4	11	27	30	28	3549

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

25 'Don't knows' have been excluded; there were n=81 in 2008, n=129 in 2007, and n=117 in 2006.

Relatively few respondents thought crime was decreasing or staying the same in Ireland. Almost nine out of ten respondents thought that it was increasing (89%). Respondents were more optimistic about their own area; half of them thought crime was increasing (50%), while 45 per cent thought it was staying the same (table 77).

31

29

4016

Where	Increasing	Decreasing	Staying the same	Total
	%	%	%	n
in Ireland	89	3	8	9852
in your area	50	5	45	9869

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

'Don't knows' have been excluded; there were n=180 ('in Ireland') and n=163 ('in your area').

Eighty-nine per cent of respondents thought crime was a 'very serious' or 'serious' problem in Ireland (table 78).

Table 78	How would	you	describe	crime ir	Ireland today?
----------	-----------	-----	----------	----------	----------------

A very serious problem	A serious problem	A fairly serious problem	Not a serious problem	Not a problem	Total
%	%	%	%	%	n
57	32	10	1	1	9805

Percentages do not sum to exactly 100 due to rounding.

In an attempt to get more specific information about respondents' 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 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.

Nine out of ten respondents thought 'drug abuse' (91%) and 'other drug crime' (91%) were major problems in the country as a whole, while for their own areas the corresponding figures were 39 per cent (drug abuse) and 33 per cent (other drug crime). In the country as a whole, 'violent crime' (78%) and 'juvenile crime' (76%) were the third and fourth most prominent of the categories (table 79).

Where you live	Major problem	Minor problem	Not a problem	Don't know
	%	<u> </u>	problem	%
juvenile/teenage crime	27	47	24	3
drug abuse	39	38	17	7
other drug crimes	33	33	22	12
public drunkenness	22	41	34	3
public nuisance	18	42	37	3
race/hate crime	8	26	57	9
violent crime	13	30	51	6
property crime	21	44	30	6
car crime	22	44	29	5
white collar crime	9	27	40	24
rape-sexual assault	9	25	51	15
domestic violence	10	27	36	26
In the country as a whole	Major problem	Minor problem	Not a problem	Don't know
	%	%	%	%
juvenile/teenage crime	76	21	1	- 2
drug abuse	91	7	1	1
other drug crimes	91	7	1	1
public drunkenness	60	33	5	2
public nuisance	52	39	6	3
race/hate crime	48	36	11	6
violent crime	78	18	2	- 3
property crime	63	31	3	4
car crime	64	30	3	3
white collar crime	51	30	7	13
rape-sexual assault	59	28	6	8
domestic violence	53	29	3	15

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

Some percentages do not sum to exactly 100 due to rounding; n =10032.

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.

Two-thirds believed that crime could be attributed to drugs or drink or both (66%), which for these categories was five percentage points higher than in the 2007 survey. The next most frequent answer was 'lack of parental control' (9%). See table 80.

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

Cause	2008	2007	2006	2005	2002
	%	%	%	%	%
drugs	24	22	18	18	29
drink/alcohol	8	7	8	7	4
drugs and drink	34	32	34	32	19
reduction in moral standards	5	6	7	5	5
human greed and individual deviance	5	5	5	5	6
an unequal society – unfair distribution of wealth	4	5	5	5	6
insufficient education, health, and welfare provision	3	3	3	4	3
lack of parental control	9	10	10	11	7
the Irish system of criminal justice	4	4	4	4	2
poor policing	2	2	2	2	- 1
lenient penal system	2	3	3	4	2
other (specify)	2	1	2	2	12
don't know	1	2	1	2	3

n = 10032 in 2008, n = 10067 in 2007, n = 10046 in 2006 and 2005 surveys, and n=10315 in 2002 survey. Percentages do not sum to exactly 100, due to rounding and because some respondents gave more than one cause.

A majority of respondents felt that the predominant response to juvenile offending and drug abuse should be treatment rather than punishment (52% for juvenile offending and 61% for drug abuse). Since 2002, there has been a notable increase in the proportion of respondents advocating punishment, and this year the percentages advocating punishment for juvenile offending and drug abuse were five and four percentage points higher, respectively, compared with 2007 (table 81).

Category	Survey	Punishment	Rehabilitation /counselling	Don't know	Total
		%	%	%	n
	2008	45	52	3	9949
iuvopilo/toopogo	2007	40	56	4	10021
juvenile/teenage crime	2006	40	56	4	9997
	2005	38	55	7	10046
	2002	32	63	5	10245
	2008	36	61	3	9809
drug abuse	2007	32	63	4	9994
	2006	32	63	4	9992
	2005	30	63	7	10046
	2002	19	77	4	10188

Table 81	Response to	juvenile/teenac	ge crime and drug abuse
----------	-------------	-----------------	-------------------------

Some percentages do not sum to exactly 100 due to rounding. The response category 'both' has been omitted from the questions. There were n=83 of these for 'juvenile/teenage crime' and n=223 for 'drug abuse'.

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 opted for 'our criminal justice system is too lenient on offenders' (79%). This has also been the most popular option in previous surveys (table 82).

Table 82	Criminal	justice sys	stem treatment	of offenders

View	2008	2007	2006	2005	2002
	%	%	%	%	%
is too lenient on offenders	79	78	82	71	74
deals with offenders properly	19	19	16	24	23
is too harsh on offenders	2	3	2	4	3

One percentages does not sum to exactly 100 due to rounding; n= 9934 in 2008, n= 9945 in 2007, n= 9936 in 2006, n= 9882 in 2005 and n=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.

Statement	Agree	Neither	Disagree
	%	%	%
Prison does not prevent re-offending	80	10	10
Alternatives to prison, such as fines, community service and probation, should be used for all but the most serious crimes and offenders	60	16	24
People who are different are likely to experience ridicule or personal attack on our streets	57	21	22
Young people who are caught in possession of cannabis or ecstasy should be cautioned for first offence	56	13	32
Young people who are caught in possession of cannabis or ecstasy should be treated as criminals	54	20 ·	26
The better off you are, the better you are treated by the criminal justice system	52	16	33
Victims of crime get a raw deal from the courts	49	24	27
Irish culture accepts violence as a means to resolve problems	36	18	46
Penalties for possession of so-called 'soft' and 'hard' drugs should be the same	36	12	52
The criminal justice system treats crimes of violence committed by strangers as different to those committed by people known to the victim	35	35	.31
Penalties for people caught in possession of cannabis or ecstasy should be more lenient	18	14	68

Table 83 Views on the criminal justice system and public safe	Table 83	system and public sat	Views on the criminal justice	etv
---	----------	-----------------------	-------------------------------	-----

Some percentages do not sum to exactly 100 due to rounding. Questions were rotated in four groups and sample sizes ranged from 2464 to 2541.

Eight out of ten respondents agreed that prison does not prevent re-offending (80%), while six out of ten felt that alternatives to prison should be used for all but the most serious crimes and offenders (60%). See table 83.

Just over two-thirds disagreed that penalties for possession of cannabis or ecstasy should be more lenient (68%), while over half disagreed that penalties for possession of 'soft' and 'hard' drugs should be the same (52%). Over half agreed that young people caught in possession of cannabis or ecstasy should be treated as criminals (54%) and over half agreed that they should be cautioned for a first offence (56%).
Neighbourhood Watch and Community Alert

A quarter of respondents said that they were in a Neighbourhood Watch or Community Alert scheme (25%), with half saying they were not (50%); a quarter were unsure. The proportion of respondents in schemes is two percentage points lower than in the 2007 survey (table 84).

Survey	Yes	No	Don't know	Total
ý	%	%	%	n
2008	25	50	25	10032
2007	27	49	25	10067
2006	29	48	24	10046
2005	33	49	18	10046
2002	45	46	9	10149

Table 84 Is your household in a Neighbourhood Watch/Community Alert schem	Table 84
---	----------

Some percentages do not sum to exactly 100 due to rounding.

Of those who said that they were covered by a scheme, 17 per cent were regularly kept informed about criminal activity in their area. This is two percentage points lower than in 2007 (table 85).

Survey	Regularly	Occasionally	Never	Total
00.10)	%	%	%	n
2008	17	46	38	2428
2007	19	44	37	2598
2006	15	45	40	2773
2005	18	38	44	3267
2002	15	36	50	4336

 Table 85
 Do your scheme co-ordinators keep residents informed?

Some percentages do not sum to exactly 100 due to rounding; 'don't knows' excluded.

This year, the level of information provision was higher than that recorded in any of the large-scale surveys of recent years. Four out of ten respondents said that they knew the name of at least one of the scheme co-ordinators (41%). See table 86.

Survey	Yes	No	Not sure	Total
	%	%	%	'n
2008	43	36	21	2488
2007	41	38	21	2675
2006	37	38	25	2868
2005	36	43	21	3338
2002	32	63	6	4526

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

One percentage does not sum to exactly 100 due to rounding.

Four out of ten respondents felt that the schemes were 'very successful' or 'successful' in preventing crime (40%). This is identical to last year's rate, but lower than in years prior to 2007. Almost a third of respondents felt that the schemes made no difference (31%), while the remainder didn't know if the schemes were successful (29%). See table 87.

Year	Very successful	Successful	Make no difference	Don't know	Total
	%	%	%	%	n
2008	7	33	31	29	10032
2007	8	32	30	31	10067
2006	8	34	28	30	10046
2005	9	33	26	32	10046
2002	10	42	31	17	10062

 Table 87 How successful are such schemes? (all respondents)

One percentage does not sum to exactly 100 due to rounding.

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

Table 88	How successful are such schemes?	(respondents in schemes)

2008 Survey	Very successful	Successful	Make no difference	Don't know	Total
	%	%	%	%	n
all respondents	7	33	31	29	10032
those in schemes	13	46	31	9	2488

One percentage does not sum to exactly 100 due to rounding.

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

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 Attitudes 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)
- Conor Hughes Millward Brown IMS (01-2974500)
- Garda Research Unit Sergeant Patrick Kennedy at (0504) 35428

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 Siochána during 2007? (circle one only).

Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Don't know	
1	2	3	4 .	5	

The following set of questions relate to any experience of being the victim of crime in 2007

2.

Were you or any member of your household the victim of a crime in 2007? (circle one	only).
---	--------



SHOW CARD 'A'

З. a) What type of crime did you or a household member

experience in 2007?

b) c)

How many times did you experience this in 2007? Which incident was the most recent? (single code only).

	(/	A)	(B)	(C)
	Type of crime		No. of occasions	Most recent
	Yes	No	- in 2007	
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

Thinking of the most recent incident, was the crime reported to the Garda Siochána?

Yes	1		
No	2	¢	go to Q8

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			10	1.11	2
Don't know	//can't re	membe	ŕ		3

5(d).

4.

). Have you ever received information on victim support services from a member of the Garda Siochána?

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?

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

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 Gardal 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 Gardai	7
Fear of reprisal	8
Did not have time	9
Other (please specify)	
	10
Don't Know	11

ASK ALL:

9.

The following questions relate to various forms of contact you personally may have had with the Gardai in 2007

- SHOW CARD 'D'
 a) Have you had contact with the Garda Siochána in 2007 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 occasio ns in 2007	Most recent contact
Contact initiated by you				
to report a crime	1 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		1		
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 abo	ve plea	se go	to Q25(a)	

71

واحد دائران

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	Û	go to Q15
Spoke to Garda on patrol	5		
Spoke to Garda at checkpoint/vehicle stop	6		
Garda called to my home/work	7	<	go to Q14
Electronic means (email, etc)	8		9010014
Other (please specify)	9		

11.

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

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

12. If you <u>telephoned</u>, 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	4
through	

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

Did the Gardai indicate that someone would call on you?

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	As you	Worse than you
	expected	expected	expected
Helpfulness	1	2	3
Competence	1	2	3
Sensitivity	1	2	3
Politeness	. 1	2	3
Interest	1	2	3

15.

Yes	1
No	2

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

16.

Yes	1	٦
No	2	٦

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 Siochána on this matter, were you told approximately how long it would be before someone would call on you?



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

Yes	1
No	2
This amount of time has not yet	2
elapsed	5

Ask All 20.

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

Yes	1	î	go to Q22(a)
No	2		

21. Do you think you should have been contacted?



Ask Ali 22(a).

a). Have you dialled 999 or 112 and asked for emergency Garda response in 2007?



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 <u>emergency Garda response</u>, 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 <u>overall contact</u> 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	
No	2	⇐ go to Q26

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

1
2
3
4
5
6
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	~	go to 427(a)
Unapproachable	3		go to Q27(b)
Very unapproachable	4	⇐	90 to Q27(b)
Don't Know	5	¢=,	go to Q28

27(a). Why do you think they are approachable? (circle 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

GO TO Q28

27(b). Why do you think they are unapproachable? (circle 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?



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

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 31. investigating Garda.)

Yes	1	L	
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?

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

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 Gardai	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'

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

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

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 2007 which was dealt with by the Gardaí?



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?

go to Q	44	go to Q43(b)		
1	2	3	4	
Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	

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

41.

SHOW CARD 'P'

44.

The Garda Siochána 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	Low
	high	priority	priority
	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 pubs	1	2	3
Deal with under-aged drinking on the streets	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 <u>actually give</u> to the following policing tasks? **ROTATE STARTING POINT.**

	Very	High	Low	Very low
	high	Priorit y	priority	priority
	priority	r noncy	priority	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	1.	2	3	4
fights)				
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,	1	2	3	4
youth clubs, schools, senior				
citizens)				
Ensure state security	1	2	3	4
Enforce immigration laws	1	2	3	4
Deal with under-aged	1	2	3	4
drinking in pubs		2	J	4
Deal with under-aged	1	2	3	4
drinking on the streets	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	2	3	4
Tackle the sale of alcohol to	1 .	2	3	4
those under age			5	4
Target organised crime	1	2	3	4
Deal with youths racing	1	2	3	4
around in cars		2	3	4
Enforce laws relating to	1	2	3	4
fraud and white collar crime		2	3	4
Deal with crimes of sexual	1	2	3	4
violence	1	2	3	4
Deal with domestic violence	1	2	3	4
incidents	1	2	3	4

Blue

ASK ALL

The next set of questions concern the relationship between Gardaí 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 Gardai 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
Gardai 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 Gardai 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

GREEN

ASK ALL

The next set of questions concern the relationship between Gardaí 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 Gardal do, it is easy to have the matter corrected	1	2	3	4	5
The Gardal 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

PINK

ASK ALL

The next set of questions concern the relationship between Gardaí 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
l 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'

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

^{46.}

SHOW CARD 'S'

47. How

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'

50b) 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'

50c) How worried are you about the following?

	very	Fairly	Not	Not at
			very	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

50d)

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 Ail

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'

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.

Increasing	Decreasing	Staying the same
1	2	3

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

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

53.

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 <u>where you live</u>, 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 '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 is about Neighbourhood Watch/Community Alert Schemes

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

60.

 Yes
 1

 No
 2
 go to Q62

 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 / don't 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
	1.

SHOW CARD 'Z5'

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

	1 1
Primary education	┼╌╧╾┤
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)

ŝ

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 sta	atus (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?



B11. If at work (either self-employed or employee) what is your main occupation <u>OR</u> 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



B13.

3. Do you have a telephone land-line?



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



B14b. How many people aged <u>under 18</u> usually live in your household?

SHOW CARD 'Z8'

B15.

Do you have any of the following long lasting conditions? (circle yes to all that apply)

-	Yes	No
Blindness, deafness or a severe vision or hearing impairment	. 1	2
A condition that substantially limits one or more basic physical activities such as walking, climbing stairs, reaching, lifting or carrying	1	2
A learning or intellectual disability	1	2
A psychological or emotional condition	1	2
Other, including any chronic illness	1	2

ASK IF YES TO ANY OF THE CONDITIONS IN B15

SHOW CARD 'Z9'

B16. Do you have any difficulty in doing any of the following activities? (circle yes to all that apply)

	Yes	No
Learning, remembering or concentrating	1	2
Dressing, bathing or getting around inside the home	1	2
Going outside the home alone to shop or visit a doctors surgery	1	2
Working at a job or business or attending school or college	1	2 ·
Participating in other activities, for example leisure or using transport	1	2

Finally, do you have any further comments



Appendix 2

Survey methodology

.

The *Garda Public Attitudes Survey 2008* is the tenth in a series of national surveys of the adult population commissioned by An Garda Síochána. Surveys were also carried out in 2007, 2006, 2005, 2004, 2003, 2002, 2000, 1998, and 1993/1994. The main focus of the surveys was on satisfaction with Garda service, policing priorities and experiences and fear of crime.

The sample size was 10,000 in 2008, 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 2008 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. Following discussions with the National Disability Authority (NDA), two questions were added this year's survey to identify respondents who had a disability as defined by the NDA. The survey findings relating to respondents with a disability were the subject of a separate Garda Research Unit report.

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 9 January 2008 and 26 April 2008.

The sampling frame was created by MBIMS by matching Electoral Divisions (EDs) contained in a dataset of Garda divisions supplied by the Garda Research Unit with the complete list of EDs 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 the Association of Irish Market Research Organisations (AIMRO) occupations (see Appendix 3).

A total of 10,032 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 survey 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 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 81 per cent could vary between 80 and 82 per cent, while the true value of a similar divisional satisfaction rate could lie between 76.1 and 85.9 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

Guide to Grade 'A' Households		
Upper Middle Class	Grade 'A' (cont'd)	Grade 'A' (cont'd)
untant (chartered) - Own practice or ther/Principal in practice with 12+ oloyees	County Planning Officer (Principal/Senior Official; Local Government)	People living in comfort on Investments or Private Income
Actor Advertising Executive - Director/Partner/ Den Principal in Agency with 12+ employees Doo Architect - Own practice or Partner/Principal pr in practice with 12+ employees	Dentist - Own practice or Partner/Principal in practice Doctor - Own practice or Partner/Principal in practice	Peopre (reurea) where H/H would have been Grade 'A' before retirement Physician Physicist Pilot (Commercial Airline)
йш 	Editor - National Newspaper or Magazine Engineer - Senior (qualified with University degree) - own practice or Partner/ Principal in practice with 12+ employaes	Protessor - University Public Relations Executive - Director/ Principal/Partner in Agency with 12+ employees
r/Principal Fi	Fire Officer (Chief)	Research - Director/Principal in Agency with 12+ employees
1 12+ employees etor (with 12+ employees) I leading Wholesale/Retail	Garda (Chief Superintendent) General - Lieutenant or Major – Army Government Member (T.D)	Scientist - Senior Industrial Solicitor - own practice or Partner/Principal in practice with 12+ employees
establishment Rea Captain - Irish Naval Service/Large merchant	Headmaster/mistress - large secondary school	Stockbroker Surgeon
	Insurance underwriter	Surveyor (Unartered) - own practice or Partner/Principal in practice with 12+ employees
ecretary/Assistant Secretary) ish Naval Service	Journalist (Senior) - own column in National Newspaper/Magazine	Town Clerk (City Manager, other Senior Principal Officer, Local Government)
+ 2+ 12+	Librarian - quaimed, in charge of large ilbrary Lieutenant Colonel - Army/Air Corps Manager of large Factory/Business/Hotel/ Department etc. responsible for 12+ employees	I reasurer (Senior Principal Officer; Local Government) Veterinary Surgeon - own practice or Partner/Principal in practice

Millward Brown IMS Limited

	SOCIAL CLASS DEFINITIONS	
Guide to Grade 'B' Households		Guide to Grade 'C1' Households
Middle Class	Grade 'B' (cont'd)	Lower 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) Business Proprietor (with 3-12 employees) Captain - Army/Air Corps Civil Servant (Principal Officer/Assistant Principal Officer) Commandant - Army/Air Corps Commandant - Army/Air Corps Computer Consultant (with 3 – 12 Employees) Commandant - Army/Air Corps Computer Consultant (with 3 – 12 Employees) Commandant - Army/Air Corps Commandant - Army/	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 Sister/Tutor in large hospital	Bank Clerk Buyer (except Senior Buyer) Civil Servant - (H.E.O./Junior Executive Officer/Staff Officer/Clerical Officer/Clerical Assistant) Clerk (Articled) Clerk (Articled) Clerk (Despatch) Clerk (Despatch) Clerk (Receptionist) Clerk (Insurance) Clerk (Insurance) Clerk (Insurance) Clerk (Insurance) Clerk (Insurance) Clerk (Insurance) Clerk (Insurance) Clerk (Insurance) Commercial Traveller/Company Representative Clerk (Insurance) Commercial Traveller/Company Representative Clerk (Insurance) Commercial Traveller/Company Representative Clerk (Insurance) Commercial Traveller/Company Clerk (Insurance) Clerk (Insurance) C

Millward Brown IMS Limited

	cuide to Grade 'CZ' Households	
Grade 'C1' (cont'd)	Skilled Working Class	Grade 'C2' cont'd)
Machine (Office) Operator (Punch Card, Calculating, Accounting only) Manager of Factory/Business/Hotel/Office/	AA Patrolman Ambulance Driver	Foreman Furnace Man
Department - responsible for 1-5 persons Midwife	Baker Barber	Ganger Garda - ordinary
Nun - any denomination; but not those with special responsibilities	Barman - Head - in charge of others Blacksmith Brewer	Gardener/Groundsman - Head - in charge of other employees Glazier
Nurse - Student, Staff, Sister - all State Registered	Bricklayer Butcher	Grinder Guard - Goods and Passenger
People (retired) who before retirement would have been Grade 'C1'; who have pensions	Cabinet Maker Carpenter	Hewer Housekeeper - in charge of others
rather than State or very modest private means	Charge - Hand Chef	Joiner
Petty Officer - Irish Naval Service Physiotherapist	Coach Builder Cobbler (Shoemaker)	Knitter - skilled in Hosiery/knitted goods
Proprietor - Shop or Business - with 1-2 paid employees	Compositor Coppersmith	Linesman (ESB) Linotype Operator
Radiographer Receptionist	Corporal - Army Dental Mechanic/Technician	Machine Man Maltster
Correterio	Driver - Bus	Manager - small shop; does most of work; not
Sergeant - Army Student in any third level institution	Driver - Long Distance Heavy Lorry Driver and Shunter (Engine)	In cnarge of anyone Mason Millwricht
Teacher - Primary Secondary Vocational -	Dressmaker	Miner
5	Electricían	Motor Mechanic Moulder
l echnician/Engineer - (no degree but Technical/Professional qualification)	Electrotyper Engraver (Process)	Nylon (skilled in production)
Telegraphist Telephonist	Excavator (Crane Driver)	Overlooker
Telex Operator	Filler	Overseer (mainly manual work)
Typist	Finisher - Paper and Board Manufacturer Fireman - not leading	Panel Beater
Warrant Officer - Irish Naval Service	Fitter - Electrical Fitter - Mechanical	Painter Pastry Cook

SOCIAL CLASS DEFINITIONS

Millward Brown IMS Limited

Guide to Grade 'O' (cont'd) Other Working Class Grade 'C2' (cont'd) Other Working Class Feeple (retired) who before retirement would means; senal pensions other than state means; mail pensions other means; mail pensions other means; mail pension; or paid employees state means; means; mail pension; or paid means; means; mea			SOCIAL CLASS DEFINITIONS	
Other Working Class est private Apprentices (those apprenticed to skilled trade) Assembler Assembler Attendant in hospital Barman (no special training/responsibilities) Barman (no special training/responsibilities) Barman (no special training/responsibilities) ployees ployees Carder Carder Comber Comber Conductor (Bus) Conductor (Bus) Ook Dough Mixer Douger Gardener/	L		Guide to Grade 'D' Households	
ent would trade) assembler Assembler Assembler Atendant in hospital Barman (no special training/responsibilities) Bender Biender Biender Biender Biender Biereat Biereat Carter Breadman Carter Comber Comber Comber Conductor (Bus) or others Or others Conductor (Bus) Conductor (Bus) Conductor Comber Conducto		Grade 'C2' (cont'd)	Other Working Class	
Barman (no special training/responsibilities) Biender Beinder Beinder Bottler Bottler Bottler Bottler Bottler Carder Carder Carder Comber Conductor (Bus) Comber Doubler Doubler Dubler		People (retired) who before retirement would have been Grade 'C2'; very modest private means; small pensions other than state Plasterer	Apprentices (those apprenticed to skilled trade) Assembler Attendant in hospital	Labourer Laundry Worker Lorry Driver (Local)
Breadman Carder Carder Caretaker Chimney Sweep Chimney Sweep Comber Comber Comber Conductor (Bus) Cook Conductor (Bus) Cook Conductor (Bus) Cook Conductor (Bus) Cook Conductor (Bus) Cook Conductor (Bus) Cook Doucher Dough Mixer Dough		Plater Plumber Prison Officer Proprietor - small shop; no paid employees	Barman (no special training/responsibilities) Blender Boilerman Bottler	Machinist (Tailoring) Mate (to those of 'C2' occupation category) Meter Reader Milkman
of others - Carder Caretaker Chimney Sweep Cleaner Comber Comber Cook Conductor (Bus) Cook Cook Cook Cook Cook Cook Cook Coo		Riveter	Breadman	Opener Oven-men
of others Cook Cook Docker (Dock Worker) Dough Mixer Dough Mixer Doubler Doubler Drawer Dustbin man/refuse collector Dustbin man/refuse collector Diser Dustbin man/refuse collector Diser Dustbin man/refuse collector Diser Dis Diser Diser Diser Di		an - Able - Irish Naval Service ty Officer (e.g. Securicor etc.) nployed - Skilled; no paid employees illed; 1-4 employees	Carder Caretaker Chimney Sweep Cleaner Comber	Park-keeper People (retired) who before retirement would have been Grade 'D'; have small pensions other than State very modest private
Docker (Dock Worker) Domestic Servant Dough Mixer Dough Mixer Doubler Drawer Drawer Drawer Drawer Drawer Drawer Drawer Fisherman Forestry Worker Forestry Worker Forestry Worker Gardener/Groundsman (not in charge of others) Gardener (Market) - no employees Housekeeper (Not in charge of others)		Shipwright Shop Assistant - Head - in charge of others	Conductor (Bus) Cook	means Porter - Railway/Hospital
Doubler Doubler Drawer Dustbin man/refuse collector Dyer Fisherman Forestry Worker Gardener/Groundsman (not in charge of others) Gardener (Market) - no employees Housekeeper (Not in charge of others)		Signalman Sorter - Post Office	Docker (Dock Worker) Domestic Servant	Postman Presser Processor
Drawer Dustbin man/refuse collector Dyer Fisherman Forestry Worker Gardener/Groundsman (not in charge of others) Gardener (Market) - no employees Housekeeper (Not in charge of others)		Sprayer Strayer	Dough Mixer Doubler	Private or equivalent - Army
Dyer Fisherman Forestry Worker Gardener/Groundsman (not in charge of others) Gardener (Market) - no employees Housekeeper (Not in charge of others)		Stevedore	Drawer Dustbin man/refuse collector	Roundsman
Forestry Worker Gardener/Groundsman (not in charge of others) Gardener (Market) - no employees Housekeeper (Not in charge of others)		Tailor - Cutter and fitter Telephone installer	Dyer	Seaman - Ordinary - Irish Naval Service Shop Assistant - no special training/
Gardener/Groundsman (not in charge of others) Gardener (Market) - no employees Housekeeper (Not in charge of others)		Toolmaker Turner	Fisherman Forestry Worker	responsibilities Spinner
Gardener (Market) - no employees Housekeeper (Not in charge of others)		Typesetter Upholsterer	Gardener/Groundsman (not in charge of others)	Storeman/Storekeeper - no special training/ responsibilities
Housekeeper (Not in charge of others)	•	Vehicle Builder	Gardener (Market) - no employees	Taxi Driver (who does not own cab) Taviile Drinfer
		Waiter - Head - in charge of others Weaver Welder	Housekeeper (Not in charge of others)	Ticket Collector Tractor Driver Twister

Millward Brown IMS Limited

	SOCIAL CLASS DEFINITIONS	
Grade 'D' (cont'd)	Guide to Grade 'E' Households	Grade 'F'
Underground worker - unskilled	Lowest Level of Subsistence	Guide to Grade 'F50+' Households
Van Driver/Van Salesman	Casual/Part-time or lowest grade workers	Large Farmers
Waitress/Waiter (unless Head Waiter) Warehouseman Watchman Window Cleaner	Pensioner - Old age, disability, Widows Pension - who are dependent on State Aid or Pensions only, with no other source of income	Farmers or Farm Managers of holdings of 50 acres or more
Woolsorter Workers in general who are unskilled or semi- skilled	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 navements	Guide to Grade 'F50-' Households Small Farmers
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Respondents will only be graded 'E' if the Head of the Household is 'E' and no other	Farm Workers/Labourers
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	member of family is the Chief Wage Earner	
	· · ·	· ·
Millward Brown IMS Limited		

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 10032.

Table A1		
Housing tenure of respondents	n	%
owner occupied with loan	4467	44.5
owner occupied without loan	2980	29.7
being purchased from a local authority	165	1.6
rented from a local authority	765	7.6
rented privately unfurnished	108	1.1
rented privately furnished	829	8.3
occupied free of rent	102	1.0
other	269	2.7
don't know	347	3.5
total	10032	100

Table A2

Gender of respondents	n	%
male	4905	48.9
female	5127	51.1
total	10032	100

Table A3		
Marital status of respondents	<u> </u>	%
single never married	3080	30.7
married	5297	52.8
cohabiting/living together	669	6.7
separated	325	3.2
divorced	110	1.1
widowed	520	5.2
refused/not stated	31	0.3
total	10032	100

Table A4		
Social class of respondents	n	%
AB (middle/upper middle class)	973	9.7
C1 (lower middle class)	3399	33.9
C2 (skilled working class)	2179	21.7
D (other working class)	1899	18.9
E (lowest subsistence level)	31	0.3
F (farmer)	606	6.0
refused/not stated	946	9.4
total	10032	100

Percentages do not sum to exactly 100 due to rounding.

Т	a	b	ļ	e	Α	5
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Age category of respondents	n	%
18-24	4405	
	1465	14.6
25-44	4449	44.3
45-64	2933	29.2
65+	1181	11.8
refused/not stated	5	0.05
total	10032	100

Percentages do not sum to exactly 100 due to rounding.

Table A6

Dependent children of respondents	n	%
Yes	4333	43.2
No	5621	56.0
Not stated	78	0.8
total	10032	100

Table A7		
Employment status of respondents	n	%
self-employed	1154	11.5
working full-time	4164	41.5
working part-time	1039	10.4
seeking work for first time	22	0.2
unemployed (having lost or given up job)	180	1.8
home (domestic) duties	1182	11.8
unable to work due to permanent illness or disability	109	1.1
not working – seeking work	120	1.2
not working – not seeking work	98	1.0
on govt. training/education scheme	30	0.3
on govt. employment scheme	7	0.1
retired	1155	11.5
Student – further education	689	6.9
other	26	0.3
refused, not stated	55	0.5
total	10032	100

Percentages do not sum to exactly 100 due to rounding.

Table	- A8
-------	------

Nationality of respondents	··· n	%
Irish	9220	91.9
UK	333	3.3
EU State	248	2.5
Other non EU country	220	2.2
Refused/not stated	10	0.1
total	10032	100

Table A9		
Highest educational qualification of respondents	n	%
primary education	737	7.3
lower secondary	1242	12.4
technical or vocational	795	7.9
leaving certificate	3293	32.8
both technical/vocational and leaving certificate	659	6.6
non-degree qualification	958	9.5
primary degree	1225	12.2
professional qualification – at least primary degree level	458	4.6
primary degree and professional qualification	309	3.1
postgraduate degree	289	2.9
no formal qualification	31	0.3
refused/not stated	37	0.4
total	10032	100

Table A10

Locality of respondents	n	%
Dublin City	2591	25.8
other city	1047	10.4
town (pop. 10,000 – 40,000)	837	8.3
town (pop. 1,000 – 10,000)	1813	18.1
village, rural, open country	3717	37.1
refused, not stated	27	0.3
total	10032	100

Table A11(i)

People aged 18 and over in respondent's household	n	%
none	19	0.2
one	1439	14.3
two	4972	49.6
three	1803	18.0
four	1201	12.0
five	375	3.7
six	125	1.2
seven	25	0.2
eight	17	0.2
nine or more	15	0.1
not stated/refused	42	0.4
total	10032	100

Percentages do not sum to exactly 100 due to rounding.

People aged under 18 in respondent's household	n	%
none	4613	46.0
one	1720	17.1
two	1708	17.0
three	765	7.6
four	266	2.7
five	62	0.6
six	21	0.2
seven or more	11	0.1
not stated/refused	866	8.6
total	10032	100

Percentages do not sum to exactly 100 due to rounding.