



Garda Research Unit
Research Report No. 4/06

GARDA PUBLIC ATTITUDES SURVEY 2006

Patrick Kennedy and Colm Browne

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

Table of contents

List of tables	i
Executive Summary	v
Introduction	1
Overall satisfaction with Garda service	3
Experience of crime	7
Contact with the Gardaí	13
Emergency Garda response	18
Garda approachability	21
Unacceptable behaviour by Garda members	25
Racist incidents	26
Garda visibility and activity	27
Road traffic collisions	32
Policing priorities	33
Further views on the Garda Síochána	39
Public safety and fear of crime	41
Views on crime and the criminal justice system	50
Neighbourhood Watch and Community Alert	52
List of tables	
Table 1 Survey Methodologies: 2002-2006	2
Table 2 Overall satisfaction with Garda service to the community by year of survey	3
Table 3 Overall satisfaction with Garda service to the community: variation between highest and lowest Division rankings	3
Table 4 Overall satisfaction with Garda service to the community by Garda Division	4
Table 5 Overall satisfaction with Garda service: changes by Garda Division (percentage “satisfied” or “very satisfied”)	5
Table 6 Overall satisfaction with Garda service by gender	5
Table 7 Overall satisfaction with Garda service by age category	6
Table 8 Overall satisfaction with Garda service by housing tenure	6
Table 9 Overall satisfaction with Garda service by social class	7
Table 10 Crime victimisation in preceding calendar year	7
Table 11 Crime victimisation in 2005 by gender and age category	7
Table 12 Crime victimisation in 2005: incidents and crime types	8

Table 13	Crime victimisation in 2005 by Garda Division	8
Table 14	Type of crime in previous calendar year	9
Table 15	Was the crime (most recent) reported to the Gardai?	9
Table 16	Reasons for not reporting crime	10
Table 17	Receipt of Garda letter about the crime	10
Table 18	Helpfulness of letter	10
Table 19	Victim informed of Garda name by other means	10
Table 20	Contact by Gardai about significant developments	11
Table 21	Helpfulness of update letter	11
Table 22	Informed of significant developments by other means	11
Table 23	Satisfaction with being kept informed of progress	11
Table 24	Informed of victim support services	12
Table 25	Satisfaction with being kept informed of progress by Garda Division	12
Table 26	Contact with Gardai in preceding calendar year	13
Table 27	Number of contacts with Gardai in 2005	13
Table 28	Type of contact with Gardai	14
Table 29	Frequency of contact by type of contact in 2005	15
Table 30	Form of most recent contact	15
Table 31	How quickly were you dealt with on visiting a Garda Station?	16
Table 32	How quickly was your telephone call answered?	16
Table 33	Was Garda station identified when telephone call was answered?	17
Table 34	Garda manner	17
Table 35	Follow-up contact by Gardai (percentages reporting "yes")	18
Table 36	Follow-up contact by Gardai regarding outcome	18
Table 37	Dialled 999 or 112 for an emergency Garda response in previous calendar year	18
Table 38	Speed of answering telephone	19
Table 39	Response time to call out to respondent	19
Table 40	Satisfaction with the emergency Garda service received	19
Table 41	Satisfaction with overall contact with the Garda Síochána	20
Table 42	Satisfaction with overall contact with the Garda Síochána by Division	20
Table 43	Suggested improvements to Garda service	21
Table 44	Approachability of Gardai at local station	21
Table 45	Approachability of Gardai at local station: 2006 - 2002	22
Table 46	Approachability of Gardai at local station by Division	23
Table 47	Approachability of Gardai at local station by Division: 2006–2005	24
Table 48	Reasons for approachability or unapproachability	24
Table 49	Do you know any Garda member by name in your locality?	25
Table 50	Nature of any unacceptable behaviour	25
Table 51	Unacceptable behaviour by Garda Division (percentage of respondents who said that a Garda had ever behaved towards them in a way that they considered unacceptable)	26
Table 52	Garda visibility	27
Table 53	Satisfaction with the level of Garda visibility in the locality	28
Table 54	Satisfaction with the level of Garda visibility in the locality by Division	29
Table 55	Perceived changes in Garda activity in the locality in the last year	30
Table 56	Garda performance in the locality	30
Table 57	Garda performance in the locality by Division	31

Table 58	Local Garda performance by housing tenure	32
Table 59	Satisfaction with the Garda investigation of road traffic collisions	32
Table 60	Dissatisfaction with Garda investigation of road traffic collision	33
Table 61	Respondents' policing priorities	34
Table 62	Respondents' perceptions of Garda priorities, ranked by mean score	35
Table 63	Comparison of respondents' priorities and their perception of Garda priorities – rankings	36
Table 64	Comparison of respondents' priorities and their perception of Garda priorities – mean scores	37
Table 65	Respondents' priorities: 2006 - 2002	38
Table 66	Relationship between the Gardaí and the community	39
Table 67	Relationship between the Gardaí and the community: 2006 - 2002	41
Table 68	How safe do you feel walking in your neighbourhood after dark?	42
Table 69	How safe do you feel alone in your home at night?	42
Table 70	Feelings of safety by Garda Division	43
Table 71	Feelings of safety by Garda Division: 2006, 2005 and 2002 surveys	44
Table 72	Do you feel more safe or less safe out walking in your area now than before?	45
Table 73	Do you worry that you or a family member or friend might become a victim of crime?	45
Table 74	Do you worry that you or a family member or friend might become a victim of personal injury or property theft/damage?	46
Table 75	Worry about crime victimisation by Garda Division (percentage "yes")	47
Table 76	How worried are you about the following crimes?	48
Table 77	Do you believe that crime is increasing, decreasing or staying the same?	48
Table 78	How would you describe crime in Ireland today?	48
Table 79	Do you think the following are a major, minor or no problem?	49
Table 80	What do you believe to be the main cause of crime in Ireland today?	50
Table 81	Do you believe that juvenile/teenage crime and drug abuse should be combated predominantly by punishment or rehabilitation/counselling?	50
Table 82	Criminal justice system treatment of offenders	51
Table 83	Views on the criminal justice system and public safety	52
Table 84	Is your household in a Neighbourhood Watch/Community Alert scheme?	52
Table 85	Do your scheme co-ordinators keep residents informed about criminal activity in your area?	53
Table 86	Do you know who your scheme co-ordinator(s) are?	53
Table 87	How successful do you think such schemes are in preventing crime? (all respondents)	53
Table 88	How successful do you think such schemes are in preventing crime?	54

Appendix 1 - Questionnaire	55
Appendix 2 - Survey methodology	71
Appendix 3 - Social class definitions	75
Appendix 4 - Sample profile	81

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the findings from the 2006 Garda Public Attitudes Survey. The main focus of the survey is on satisfaction with Garda service, policing priorities and experiences and fear of crime.

The survey is the fifth since 2002. This 2006 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 and 2005. The intervening surveys involved national samples of 1,000.

The survey was carried out by Millward Brown IMS by means of in-home, face-to-face interviews. Interviewing took place between 10 April and 7 July 2006. Respondents were selected according to quotas based on age, gender and social class. Results were subsequently weighted to ensure a match with national populations. The sampling methodology is biased towards the settled community and is likely to under-represent certain hard-to-reach groups. As with previous surveys, it was confined to participants aged 18 or over.

It is of note that results in respect of key indicators, such as satisfaction with overall service, satisfaction with contact with the Gardaí, Garda approachability and overall performance at local level, have been consistent over the recent surveys despite changes in survey company and methodology.

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

Satisfaction with overall Garda service to the community was 79 per cent, compared with 83 per cent in 2005, 85 per cent in 2004, 81 per cent in 2003 and 87 per cent in 2002. Rates ranged within Garda Divisions from 68 to 85 per cent. Compared with 2005, satisfaction rates declined in 21 Divisions and improved in four. The declines were greater than five percentage points in nine Divisions. Satisfaction was lower among those in local authority housing compared with other housing tenure categories.

Crime victimisation rates were similar to previous years, with 10.1 per cent saying they or a member of their household had been a victim of a crime in 2005 (down by 1.6 percentage points compared with the 2005 report). Divisional rates varied from four to 18 per cent. The most prevalent crimes were domestic burglary, criminal damage to vehicle, theft of vehicle, criminal damage to home or other property and physical assault.

As regards **crime reporting**, 86 per cent of those victimised said that they reported the most recent crime to the Gardaí, a higher rate than in the 2005 survey (up by two percentage points). Under half (42%) expressed satisfaction with **being kept informed of progress**. Divisional satisfaction rates varied between 12 and 59 per cent. Thirteen per cent of those victimised stated they had received information on victim support services from a member of the Garda Síochána.

Forty-two per cent of respondents had **contact with the Gardaí** in 2005. The most common forms of respondent-initiated contact were to have a passport signed, to report a crime or a nuisance/disturbance and to avail of other services. The most common forms of Garda-initiated contact were to carry out a routine vehicle check (on street) or to produce 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.

Five per cent of respondents requested an **emergency Garda response** in 2005. In 80 per cent of cases their phone call was answered within 10 seconds; higher than in 2005, but lower than in the surveys prior to 2005. Response time was within 15 minutes for 53 per cent of respondents. Seventy per cent expressed satisfaction with the service received, similar to the 2005 survey.

Satisfaction with overall contact with the Gardaí was 79 per cent, similar to the 2005 survey. Divisional satisfaction rates varied between 69 and 87 per cent. Over three-quarters (77%) felt that the Garda service needed to be improved. The most frequent suggestions were for greater manpower, more foot patrols, more contact with the community and longer station opening hours.

Asked about **Garda approachability**, 90 per cent of respondents described Gardaí at their local station as either approachable or very approachable. Divisional rates

ranged from 84–95 per cent. Four out of ten (40%) knew a member of the Force in their locality by name, down from 46 per cent in the 2005 survey.

As regards **unacceptable behaviour**, nine per cent of respondents said that a member of the Garda Síochána had ever acted in an unacceptable way towards them, down on previous years. Divisional rates varied between three and 15 per cent. The most frequent type of unacceptable behaviour was that a Garda ‘was disrespectful or impolite’ (four per cent of respondents).

Only 2.6 per cent of respondents said that they had ever been subjected to a **racist incident**, 17 per cent of whom said that they reported the most recent incident to the Gardaí. The rate for non-nationals is significantly higher, rising to 28 per cent of the 230 respondents in the survey who were from outside the European Union. The survey is likely to under-represent certain minority groups and therefore understate racist incidents.

As regards **Garda visibility**, 54 per cent reported seeing a Garda in their locality in the previous week. The proportion who remembered seeing a Garda on the day of their interview was the same as in 2005 (eight per cent). In 2005, this figure had been the lowest in surveys since 2002. Fifty-nine per cent of respondents were satisfied with the level of Garda visibility in their locality. Divisional rates varied between 44 and 74 per cent. Compared with 2005, improvements were registered in 12 Divisions, and disimprovements in 13.

Ratings for **how good a job the Gardaí do in the locality** were at 80 per cent, down by between four and seven percentage points on surveys since 2002. Satisfaction rates were lower among local authority tenants than other housing tenure categories. Divisional ratings ranged from 63–88 per cent “very good” or “fairly good”. Compared with 2005, 17 Divisions showed a drop in satisfaction ratings, with an average decrease among the 17 of almost seven percentage points. Ratings for how good a job the Gardaí do in the locality **as regards road safety** were at 70 per cent, down by nine percentage points on 2005. Divisional ratings ranged from 51–83 per cent, with 22 Divisions showing a drop in satisfaction ratings (average drop of almost 11 percentage points).

Four per cent of respondents had been involved in a **road traffic collision** in 2005. The level of satisfaction with the Garda investigation (78%) was higher than in the 2005 survey (73%).

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

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

It is of interest that the task of patrol on foot or bicycle was ranked 20th of 28 tasks in 2006 and 2005, 19th of 27 tasks in 2004 and 21st in 2003 and 2002. This would suggest that while the public would like to see more Gardaí on the beat, they would not like this to occur at the expense of other tasks.

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

Feelings of security were lowest in cities other than Dublin (Cork, Galway, Limerick and Waterford) and highest in villages and rural areas. Overall, 71 per cent of respondents said that they felt safe out walking in their neighbourhood after dark, similar to the 2005 survey. Divisional rates ranged from 56 to 83 per cent. The

proportion who felt safe at home alone at night was 86 per cent, up from 84 per cent in 2005. Divisional rates ranged from 73 to 95 per cent.

Regarding **fear of crime**, 41 per cent of respondents worried about becoming a victim of crime themselves while 49 per cent were worried about other family members and friends becoming victims. These represent improvements on the 2005 survey. Divisional rates for personal fear of becoming a victim ranged from 24 to 56 per cent while the range for a family member or friend was from 30 to 67 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 and for alternatives to prison generally. At the same time a majority of respondents considered that the criminal justice system was too lenient on offenders (82%) and disagreed that penalties for possession of cannabis and ecstasy should be more lenient (65%). Half of respondents felt that victims get a raw deal from the criminal justice system.

Less than a third of respondents (29%) said they were in **Neighbourhood Watch/Community Alert** schemes, down substantially on previous surveys. The activity levels of the schemes were similar to those in the 2005 and 2002 surveys, with 15 per cent of those in schemes saying that they were regularly informed about criminal activity in their area. Forty-two percent believed that such schemes were successful in preventing crime, the same as in 2005 (but down on 2002).

GARDA PUBLIC ATTITUDES SURVEY 2005

INTRODUCTION

This report presents the findings from the *Garda Public Attitudes Survey 2006*, the eighth in a series of national surveys commissioned by the Garda Síochána. The main focus of the survey is on satisfaction with Garda service, policing priorities and experiences and fear of crime. The results inform Garda policy and planning and form an important part of the Garda performance management system. The survey provides information on key performance indicators which are reported on in the Garda Annual Report. A copy of the survey questionnaire is presented in Appendix 1.

The survey fieldwork was carried out by Millward Brown IMS, who were commissioned following a competitive public tendering process. The survey was conducted by means of in-home face-to-face interviews, with respondents selected on the basis of quotas in each Garda Division. Interviewing took place between 10 April and 7 July 2006. 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 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 2004 and 2003 and of a similar size to those carried out in 2002 and 2005. The larger 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 2006 findings. Comparability between the surveys was maximised by retaining the exact wording in as many questions as possible.

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

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

Table 1 Survey Methodologies: 2002-2006

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

The survey results are presented in the report as point estimates and Millward Brown IMS state that the true population values are likely to lie within a range of ± 1 per cent of these point estimates at the national level and within a ± 4.9 per cent error margin at the Divisional level. Thus, for example, the true value of the national sample satisfaction rate of 79 per cent could vary between 78 and 80 per cent, while the true value of a similar Divisional satisfaction rate could lie between 74.1 and 83.9 per cent. Larger margins of error occur where questions were rotated and not asked of all respondents and for sub-categories of respondents where numbers were small. Comparisons with other surveys also need to take account of the error margins associated with those surveys. Multiple comparisons between Divisions widen the error margin further. Care should be taken, therefore, in drawing inferences from the survey results.

Results are presented under the following headings:

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

OVERALL SATISFACTION WITH GARDA SERVICE

The 2006 survey found that 79 per cent of respondents were “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with overall Garda service to the community in 2005.¹ See Table 2.

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

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

*Total respondent numbers can be less than overall sample size due to exclusion of “don’t knows”.

The level of satisfaction varied substantially by Garda Division. In this study the range between the Divisions with the highest and lowest levels of satisfaction was 17 percentage points. In 2005 and 2002 this range had been 15 and ten percentage points, respectively. See Table 3.

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

Year	Division ranking	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Total
		%	%	%	%	n
2006	highest	24	61	14	1	401
	lowest	4	64	27	6	391
2005	highest	35	57	7	1	399
	lowest	6	71	16	6	406
2002	highest	22	70	7	1	402
	lowest	9	73	13	5	417

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

The highest level of satisfaction was in the Kerry Division where 85 per cent of respondents were satisfied or very satisfied. The lowest level of satisfaction was in Waterford/Kilkenny (68%). Results are presented in Table 4, with divisions ranked on the basis of mean score.²

¹ The combined frequencies for “very satisfied” and “satisfied” sum to 79%. The individual categories in Table 2 sum to 80% due to rounding.

² Calculated on the basis of a score of 1 for “very satisfied”, 2 for “satisfied”, 3 for “dissatisfied” and 4 for “very dissatisfied” (“don’t knows” have been omitted). Using the Kerry Division frequencies as an example $[(92 \times 1) + (237 \times 2) + (55 \times 3) + (5 \times 4)] / [92 + 237 + 55 + 5] = 751 / 389 = 1.93$. These scores are multiplied by the frequencies for each Division. The lower the score, the higher the level of satisfaction.

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

Division	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
	%	%	%	%
Kerry	24	61	14	1
Tipperary	24	58	16	3
Roscommon/Galway East	16	70	13	1
Cork West	17	68	12	3
Sligo/Leitrim	16	69	13	2
Galway West	15	69	14	2
DMR South	18	62	16	4
DMR North	20	59	16	5
Mayo	15	67	13	5
Cavan/Monaghan	10	74	13	3
Cork City	12	69	15	3
DMR North Central	15	65	13	7
Clare	14	66	13	7
DMR South Central	14	65	15	6
Limerick	14	62	18	5
Carlow/Kildare	8	73	17	2
Longford/Westmeath	8	72	17	2
Laois/Offaly	7	74	16	3
Cork North	13	63	17	7
DMR West	11	65	19	6
Louth/Meath	7	71	17	5
Wexford/Wicklow	6	70	20	4
DMR East	5	72	16	6
Donegal	10	62	20	8
Waterford/Kilkenny	4	64	27	6
average	13	67	16	4

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Cork West and Sligo/Leitrim Divisions had the same mean scores as had Cavan/Monaghan and Mayo. Clare, DMR North Central and DMR South were also tied, as were Carlow/Kildare, Limerick and Longford/Westmeath.

Compared with 2005, satisfaction levels were down in 21 Divisions and up in four, based on the sum of those who were “very satisfied” and “satisfied”.³ Decreases ranged from 12.3 to 0.2 percentage points, with increases from 0.3 to 4.6 percentage points. The largest decreases in satisfaction levels were in Waterford/Kilkenny (-12.3) and Cork North (-10.5). The largest increase was in DMR South Central (+4.6), followed by DMR North (+4.4). See Table 5.

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

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

Division	2006	2005	Change*	Division	2006	2005	Change
	%	%			%	%	
Roscommon/Galway East	86.0	88.7	-2.7	Longford/Westmeath	80.7	87.2	-6.5
Cork West	84.8	92.2	-7.4	DMR North Central	79.8	78.8	+1.0
Galway West	84.1	89.7	-5.6	DMR South Central	79.4	74.8	+4.6
Sligo/Leitrim	84.5	86.2	-1.7	DMR North	78.9	74.5	+4.4
Cavan/Monaghan	84.1	85.3	-1.2	Louth/Meath	77.5	80.9	-3.4
Kerry	84.6	85.7	-1.1	Limerick	76.8	82.3	-5.5
Mayo	82.0	81.7	+0.3	Wexford/Wicklow	76.3	80.0	-3.7
Cork City	81.4	86.5	-5.1	Cork North	76.3	86.8	-10.5
Carlow/Kildare	80.9	83.1	-2.2	DMR East	77.4	85.2	-7.8
Clare	80.3	80.5	-0.2	DMR West	75.7	77.6	-1.9
Laois/Offaly	80.9	84.0	-3.1	Donegal	72.5	80.3	-7.8
Tipperary	81.7	81.9	-0.2	Waterford/Kilkenny	67.5	79.8	-12.3
DMR South	80.3	80.7	-0.4	average	79.8	83.0	-3.2

*Change is given in percentage points.

There was very little difference between genders for overall satisfaction (“very satisfied” or “satisfied”) with Garda service. Females reported slightly higher levels (80%) than males (79%). Females were down five percentage points on 2005 levels, with males down by two percentage points.

Table 6 Overall satisfaction with Garda service by gender

Year	Gender	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Total
		%	%	%	%	n
2006	male	13	66	17	4	4939
	female	13	67	16	4	5037
	average	13	67	16	4	9976
2005	male	16	65	15	4	4910
	female	17	68	12	2	5089
	average	16	67	14	3	9999

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

Older respondents (aged 65+) expressed greater satisfaction with service than their younger counterparts. The maximum variation (“very satisfied” and “satisfied” combined) between groups was three percentage points (between 18-24 years and 65+). There was an increase with age in the percentages saying they were “very satisfied” as opposed to “satisfied”. In each age category there was a decline in the percentages expressing satisfaction, compared with 2005. See Table 7.

Table 7 Overall satisfaction with Garda service by age category

Year	Age category	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Total
		%	%	%	%	n
2006	18-24	10	68	16	5	1372
	25-44	10	69	17	4	4293
	45-64	14	65	16	4	2966
	65+	20	61	16	3	1345
	average	14	66	14	4	9976
2005	18-24	13	70	15	3	1571
	25-44	14	68	14	4	4059
	45-64	17	65	15	4	2993
	65+	25	64	10	2	1375
	average	17	67	14	3	9998

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

Those who privately rented their housing expressed the highest levels of satisfaction (81%) followed by owner-occupiers (80%) and those in local authority housing (70%). The highest percentages of “very satisfied” respondents were owner-occupiers and those in “other” category (13% each).⁴ See Table 8.

Table 8 Overall satisfaction with Garda service by housing tenure

Housing tenure	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Total
	%	%	%	%	n
owner occupied	13	67	16	3	7407
local authority	10	60	23	8	1030
rented privately	11	70	15	5	1079
other	13	67	14	6	285
average	12	66	17	6	9801

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

Respondents in social class F (farmers) had the highest level of satisfaction (84%). Classes AB (upper middle class) and C1 (lower middle class) had identical rates (81%), and were one percentage point higher than those in categories C2 (skilled working class) and DE (other working class and lowest level of subsistence, respectively). See Table 9. Compared with the 2005 findings, satisfaction levels were down in all classes. Classes AB and F were down by four percentage points, C1 and DE by two, while C2 was down by one percentage point.⁵

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

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

Table 9 Overall satisfaction with Garda service by social class

Social class category	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Total
	%	%	%	%	n
AB	13	68	17	3	894
C1	13	68	16	4	2998
C2	12	68	16	4	2514
DE	12	68	18	6	2275
F	15	69	13	2	771
average	13	68	16	4	9452

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

EXPERIENCE OF CRIME

The level of crime victimisation experienced by respondents was 10.1 per cent, down by 1.6 percentage points on last year. Over the last five years the rate ranged from 12.5 (2002 report) to 10.1 (2006 report). See Table 10.

Table 10 Crime victimisation in preceding calendar year

Victim category	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002
	%	%	%	%	n
respondent	5.7	6.9	6.3	5.8	6.6
household member	3.1	3.7	3.7	3.7	4.4
both	1.3	1.1	0.3	1.2	1.5
not a victim	89.8	88.3	89.9	89.3	87.5
total sample size (n)	10046	10035	1000	1005	10340

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

For respondents who were personally a victim of crime in 2005, the breakdown by gender and age category is set out in Table 11. Males and younger people (under 44) were somewhat over-represented among the victims, as seen in the respective ratios.

Table 11 Crime victimisation in 2005 by gender and age category

Status	Gender		Age			
	Male	Female	18-24	25-44	45-64	65+
	%	%	%	%	%	%
victims	52.1	47.9	14.2	48.4	29.5	7.9
full sample	49.6	50.4	13.8	43.0	29.7	13.6
ratio	1.05	0.95	1.03	1.13	0.99	0.58

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

The majority of victims experienced just one crime incident (82%) and one crime type (81%). Eighteen per cent were victims on more than one occasion, including three per cent who were victimised on four or more occasions. See Table 12.

Table 12 Crime victimisation in 2005: incidents and crime types

Category	1	2	3	4	5 or more	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	n
incidents	82	12	3	1	2	1097
crime type	81	15	2	1	1	1001

Includes respondent and household victims.

There was considerable variation in Divisional rates of crime victimisation, as was the case in 2005. Mayo and Kerry Divisions recorded the lowest rates, at less than half the national average; while DMR Divisions South and South Central recorded the highest, with nearly double the average. The average here represents a decrease of two percentage points on the rate recorded in the 2005 survey. Rural Divisions that recorded higher than average victimisation rates were Cavan/Monaghan, Galway West, Carlow/Kildare, Limerick, Donegal and Louth/Meath. See Table 13.

Table 13 Crime victimisation in 2005 by Garda Division

Garda Division	%	Garda Division	%
Mayo	4.1	Cavan/Monaghan	9.5
Kerry	4.3	DMR West	10.2
Cork West	4.5	Galway West	10.2
Clare	5.5	Carlow/Kildare	10.6
Roscommon/Galway East	6.2	Limerick	10.9
Tipperary	6.3	Donegal	11.5
Waterford/Kilkenny	6.6	Louth/Meath	13.0
Laois/Offaly	7.2	DMR North	13.3
Longford/Westmeath	7.2	DMR East	13.6
Cork North	7.3	DMR North Central	15.3
Sligo/Leitrim	7.5	DMR South	17.6
Cork City	7.8	DMR South Central	17.7
Wexford/Wicklow	8.0	average	9.4

The most common crimes were domestic burglary (experienced by 28 per cent of victims) and criminal damage to car or other vehicle (15%). The most frequently cited crimes in the 2005 survey were domestic burglary and physical assault. The reported rate of burglary here was up by five percentage points on 2005, while the rate for physical assault was down by three percentage points on the 2005 rate. See Table 14.

Table 14 Type of crime in previous calendar year

Type of crime	Percentage victimised at least once	
	2006	2005
	%	%
burglary of home or outbuildings	28	23
burglary of business premises owned by respondent	5	4
theft of vehicle	12	11
theft from vehicle	10	10
theft of bicycle	5	4
criminal damage to car or other vehicle	15	11
criminal damage to home or other property	11	11
robbery involving force or threat (including mugging)	5	7
theft from person without force (e.g. pickpocket)	6	9
theft from home or outbuildings (other than burglary)	5	4
consumer fraud (e.g. swindling or false pretences)	1	1
physical assault (other than sexual or domestic)	11	14
sexual assault	1	1
domestic violence (physical)	1	2
other	8	7
total (n)	1251	1162

The majority of victims (86%) said that the most recent crime was reported to the Gardaí, which was consistent with previous surveys. See Table 15.

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

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

Where crimes were not reported, it was mostly because the respondent felt that the Gardaí could not have done anything, believed the Gardaí would not have been interested, thought there was no chance of recovering property or felt the crime was not serious enough. These were also the dominant reasons in the 2005 survey. See Table 16.

Table 16 Reasons for not reporting crime

Reason	2006	2005	2002
	%	%	%
not serious enough/no loss	19	27	30
no chance of recovering property	24	34	24
no insurance claim anticipated	7	5	9
believed Gardaí could not have done anything	38	42	45
believed Gardaí would not have been interested	25	29	20
felt the Gardaí would not believe you	4	5	-
no involvement wanted with the Gardaí	14	9	2
fear of reprisal	4	6	7
did not have time	2	1	6
other	18	9	20
number of respondents	130	198	203

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

Just over one in four victims (27%) who reported to the Gardaí indicated that they had received a letter acknowledging the report of the crime and giving the name of the Garda dealing with the case or other information. This finding was in keeping with the 2005 survey. See Table 17.

Table 17 Receipt of Garda letter about the crime

Receipt of letter		Yes	No	Total
		%	%	n
Survey	2006	27	73	807
	2005	25	75	889

Most recipients found the letter useful. See Table 18.

Table 18 Helpfulness of letter

Year	Very helpful	Helpful	Not much help	No help	Total
	%	%	%	%	n
2006	28	40	24	8	217
2005	30	38	26	6	218

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Less than half (46%) of victims who did not receive or did not recall receiving a letter said that they had been given the name of the Garda dealing with the case by some other means. See Table 19.

Table 19 Victim informed of Garda name by other means

Year	Yes	No	Total
	%	%	n
2006	46	54	755
2005	48	52	823

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

Table 20 Contact by Gardaí about significant developments

Receipt of letter		Yes	No	Total
		%	%	n
Survey	2006	13	87	811
	2005	12	88	880

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

Table 21 Helpfulness of update letter

Year	Very helpful	Helpful	Not much help	No help	Total
	%	%	%	%	n
2006	34	50	12	5	104
2005	41	53	6	1	100

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

A quarter (25%) of victims who did not receive or recall receiving an update letter reported that they had been informed by the Gardaí in some other way about significant developments in the case. See Table 22.

Table 22 Informed of significant developments by other means

Year	Yes	No	Total
	%	%	n
2006	25	75	802
2005	33	67	886

Forty-two per cent of respondents expressed satisfaction with being kept informed of progress with their case. This level of satisfaction is down by six percentage points on the 2005 figure.⁶ See Table 23.

Table 23 Satisfaction with being kept informed of progress

Survey	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Total
	%	%	%	%	n
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

Over four-fifths of those victimised said that they had not received information on victim support services from a member of the Garda Síochána (83%).⁷ See Table 24.

⁶ For the 2005 Report, the combined frequencies for “very satisfied” and “satisfied” sum to 48%. The individual categories in Table 23 sum to 49% due to rounding.

⁷ Replies reported here are of those respondents who answered either “you” or “both” to q2: “Were you or any member of your household the victim of a crime in 2005”?

Table 24 Informed of victim support services

Year	Yes	No	Don't know	Total
	%	%	%	n
2006	13	83	4	604
2005	8	87	5	6163

Satisfaction with being kept informed of progress varied widely between Garda Divisions and compared with the 2005 survey. The level of variation is due in large part to the small sample sizes, as the question was confined to those in each Division who reported a crime to the Gardaí. Respondent numbers varied from just 15 in Mayo and Cork West to 59 in DMR South (range was 13-66 in 2005). The results must therefore be interpreted with caution.

Table 25 Satisfaction with being kept informed of progress by Garda Division

Garda Division	Satisfied/very satisfied		
	2006	2005	Change
	%	%	percentage points
DMR East	39.6	67.4	-27.8
Galway West	38.2	66.7	-28.5
Roscommon/Galway East	39.1	61.0	-21.9
DMR South Central	45.3	57.4	-12.1
Cork North	26.9	57.1	-30.2
DMR South	55.9	56.8	-0.9
Laois/Offaly	43.5	56.3	-12.8
DMR West	45.5	53.0	-7.5
Cavan/Monaghan	47.2	52.9	-5.7
Waterford/Kilkenny	18.2	52.2	-34
Clare	59.1	50.0	+9.1
Cork West	46.7	46.7	0
Cork City	52.0	46.4	+5.6
Longford/Westmeath	11.5	46.3	-34.8
Tipperary	47.8	45.8	+2.0
DMR North Central	50.9	40.4	+10.5
Limerick	44.7	39.3	+5.4
Mayo	33.3	38.5	-5.2
Carlow/Kildare	43.2	37.5	+5.7
Wexford/Wicklow	33.3	36.8	-3.5
Louth/Meath	34.0	36.4	-2.4
Sligo/Leitrim	37.9	33.3	+4.6
DMR North	47.5	32.1	+15.4
Kerry	23.5	28.6	-5.1
Donegal	22.2	26.3	-4.1
average	39.5	46.6	-7.1

Ranked in terms of the percentages that were “satisfied” or “very satisfied”, Divisional satisfaction rates ranged from 59 per cent in Clare to 12 per cent in Longford/Westmeath. Compared with 2005, eight Divisions recorded an increase in satisfaction and 16, a decrease (one no change). The largest increases occurred in

DMR North (+15 percentage points), DMR North Central (+11) and Clare (+9). The largest decreases were recorded in Longford/Westmeath (-35 percentage points), Waterford/Kilkenny (-34) and Cork North (-30). See Table 25.

CONTACT WITH THE GARDAÍ

Forty-two per cent of respondents reported having had contact with the Gardaí in 2005, similar to the rate in the 2005 report (for year 2004). See Table 26.

Table 26 Contact with Gardaí in preceding calendar year

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

Most had contact on one occasion only (68%). Six per cent had four or more contacts during the year. See Table 27.

Table 27 Number of contacts with Gardaí in 2005

Survey 2006	1	2	3	4	5 or more	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	n
Those who had contact	68	20	7	3	3	4201

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

The main reasons for self-initiated contact were to have passport forms signed or to report a crime or disturbance, similar to the pattern in 2005. The main type of Garda-initiated contact was to carry out a routine vehicle check or to produce documents. See Table 28.

Table 28 Type of contact with Gardaí

Type of contact	2006	2005	2002
	%	%	%
Self-initiated contact			
to report a crime	20	19	16
to report a disturbance/nuisance	13	12	12
to report a traffic accident	7	5	9
to report a suspicious activity	7	6	7
to report lost/found property	4	5	3
to make a general inquiry	10	11	8
to make a complaint	8	8	4
to enquire about a person in custody	1	1	0
to be a witness	3	2	1
signing passports	34	28	17
to avail of other services	12	14	10
Garda-initiated contact			
to produce documents	8	8	4
to ask about a crime	5	5	8
to investigate a traffic collision	2	2	3
to investigate noise/disturbance	2	2	2
to carry out a routine vehicle check (on-street)	11	12	10
to take a witness statement	2	2	4
alleged speeding offence	3	2	5
alleged drink driving offence	1	0	1
alleged other driving/traffic offence	1	1	2
arrested, detained for questioning or searched	1	1	1
to receive summons	1	1	2
total (at least one contact as % of total sample)	42	43	38
total (number with at least one contact)	4201	4284	3942

Respondents could indicate more than one type of contact.

Most respondents had only one contact per type of contact, but sizeable minorities had more than one contact in the same category. For example, 17 per cent of those who were in contact to report a crime had contact under this heading more than once (although not necessarily in connection with the same incident). See Table 29.

Table 29 Frequency of contact by type of contact in 2005

Type of contact	Number of contacts		
	1	2	3 or more
	%	%	%
Self-initiated contact			
to report a crime	83	11	6
to report a disturbance/nuisance	60	16	24
to report a traffic accident	89	7	3*
to report a suspicious activity	74	14	12
to report lost/found property	90	8	2*
to make a general inquiry	83	9	8
to make a complaint	78	11	11
to enquire about a person in custody	60	20*	20*
to be a witness	86	11*	4*
signing passports	96	2	2
to avail of other services	90	8	3
Garda-initiated contact			
to produce documents	87	9	4
to ask about a crime	83	10	7
to investigate a traffic collision	94	5*	1*
to investigate noise/disturbance	83	9*	8*
to carry out a routine vehicle check (on-street)	44	29	27
to take a witness statement	89	3*	8*
alleged speeding offence	86	11	2*
alleged drink driving offence	74	21*	5*
alleged other driving/traffic offence	85	8*	8*
arrested, detained for questioning or searched	83	12*	5*
to receive summons	87	8*	5*
other reason	85	6	10

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

The form of the most recent contact is reported in Table 30. By far the most common forms of contact were a visit to a Garda station (61%) or a telephone call to the Gardaí (22%). Visits to a station were higher than in 2005 and substantially higher than 2002, while telephone calls to the Gardaí were lower than in 2005 and substantially lower than 2002. Contact on the street (patrol or checkpoint) was at the same levels in 2006, 2005 and 2002.

Table 30 Form of most recent contact

Form of contact	2006	2005	2002
	%	%	%
visit to Garda station	61	58	40
telephone call to the Gardaí (excluding 999/112 calls)	22	24	33
telephone call from the Gardaí	2	1	4
letter from the Gardaí	1	0	2
electronic means (email etc.)	1	-	-
spoke to Garda on patrol	3	3	3
spoke to Garda at checkpoint/vehicle stop	7	7	7
Garda called to home or work	4	5	8
other	2	2	2
total (n)	4151	4243	4077

Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

A sizeable majority of visitors to stations were dealt with more quickly than expected or within the time expected. Results were on a par with previous years, although compared with earlier surveys there was a decrease in the percentage that answered “quicker than expected”. This may reflect a change in respondents’ levels of expectation. See Table 31.

Table 31 How quickly were you dealt with on visiting a Garda Station?

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

The vast majority (91%) of those who telephoned the Gardaí, other than by emergency number, said that their call was answered promptly or following a short delay. This was on a par with previous years, with a decrease in the percentage answering “promptly”. See Table 32.

Table 32 How quickly was your telephone call answered?

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

Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Just over three-quarters (77%) of telephone callers said that the Garda gave the station name when answering while six per cent said that the station name was not given. The percentages were similar to earlier surveys other than the small-scale survey of 2003. See Table 33. Excluding “don’t know” answers, 93 per cent of respondents said that the Garda gave the station name.

Table 33 Was Garda station identified when telephone call was answered?

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

Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Respondents were asked about the helpfulness, competence, sensitivity, politeness and interest shown by the Garda with whom they spoke. The majority of respondents said that the Garda's manner met or exceeded their expectations, ranging from 91 per cent for helpfulness, competence and politeness, to 87 per cent for interest. Compared with previous surveys, the percentages saying that Garda performance was better than expected declined in all performance categories. However the decline was mostly reflected in an increase in the "as expected" category rather than the "worse than expected" category. Compared with both large-scale surveys (2005 and 2002), percentages in the "worse than expected" category declined or stayed the same in all cases except politeness. See Table 34.

Table 34 Garda manner

Service category	Performance category	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002
		%	%	%	%	%
Helpfulness	better than expected	21	25	30	31	28
	as expected	70	65	59	57	59
	worse than expected	10	10	10	11	13
Competence	better than expected	17	21	24	28	21
	as expected	74	70	63	64	66
	worse than expected	9	9	13	8	13
Sensitivity	better than expected	15	19	25	24	21
	as expected	74	70	65	66	66
	worse than expected	11	11	11	10	13
Politeness	better than expected	19	23	30	33	30
	as expected	72	69	66	60	63
	worse than expected	9	9	5	7	7
Interest	better than expected	17	21	24	27	23
	as expected	70	65	62	61	62
	worse than expected	14	14	14	12	15

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Table 35 presents the results for follow-up contact by Gardaí, focusing on the most recent contact by the respondent. Just over a fifth of those who made contact felt that a Garda should call to them. In three-quarters (76%) of these cases (not in Table 35), they were told that a Garda would call, and in the majority of these cases a Garda actually called (73%). Percentages are similar to 2005 as regards the Gardaí indicating that someone would call, calling where they said they would and indicating

how long it would take to call. There was a decrease of six percentage points as regards calling within the time indicated, compared with 2005.

Table 35 Follow-up contact by Gardaí (percentages reporting “yes”)

Aspect of follow-up contact	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002
	%	%	%	%	%
Do you think the matter required a Garda to call to your home (most recent contact)?	21	22	29	21	25
Did the Gardaí indicate that someone would call on you?	18	19	23	21	22
Did a Garda call on you?	85	86	76	78	82
Were you told how long it would be before someone would call on you?	52	53	40	52	48
Did a Garda call on you within the time indicated?	77	83	77	69	77

The Gardaí got in touch with just over one in five respondents about the outcome of their contact. The majority of respondents who were not contacted did not think contact was necessary. See Table 36.

Table 36 Follow-up contact by Gardaí regarding outcome

Aspect of follow-up contact	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002
	%	%	%	%	%
Did the Garda Síochána get in touch later to inform you about the outcome of your contact?	22	19	15	17	20
Do you think you should have been contacted?	21	19	*	*	27

*Not reported in 2003 and 2004.

EMERGENCY GARDA RESPONSE

One in twenty respondents sought an emergency Garda response in 2005 by dialling 999 or 112, a rate similar to previous surveys. See Table 37.

Table 37 Dialled 999 or 112 for an emergency Garda response in previous calendar year

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

Of those who did seek an emergency response, 80 per cent had their call answered within 10 seconds (excluding 15 per cent who couldn't remember). This rate was higher than in 2005 but lower than the rates in 2004, 2003 and 2002. See Table 38.

Table 38 Speed of answering telephone

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

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Where an emergency response was provided, it came mostly within 15 minutes. No emergency response was provided in 12 per cent of cases (but one may not always have been needed). See Table 39. In the 132 cases where response took more than 15 minutes, 64 per cent were within 30 minutes, 85 per cent within one hour and 95 per cent within two hours. Times longer than two hours were recorded in seven cases.

Table 39 Response time to call out to respondent

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

Not asked in 2003 and 2004.

A majority of respondents (70%) were satisfied with the emergency response received. This was similar to the finding in the 2005 report. See Table 40.

Table 40 Satisfaction with the emergency Garda service received

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

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Thinking of their overall contact with the Gardaí, 79 per cent of respondents expressed satisfaction ("very satisfied" and "satisfied" combined) and 20 per cent, dissatisfaction (Table 41). These rates are similar to those in 2005 (however, there

was a drop of five percentage points for those who reported being “very satisfied”). The percentage satisfied in 2006 was three percentage points down on 2002.

Table 41 Satisfaction with overall contact with the Garda Síochána

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

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

Satisfaction levels ranged from 87 per cent in Kerry to 69 per cent in Waterford/Kilkenny. Compared with results from the 2005 survey, increases were recorded in six Divisions and decreases in the other nineteen. The largest increase was in DMR North (+9 percentage points); the largest decrease in Wexford/Wicklow (-17.4 percentage points). The results have to be interpreted with caution as the sample sizes are small, restricted as they are to respondents who had contact with the Gardaí in the preceding calendar year. See Table 42.

Table 42 Satisfaction with overall contact with the Garda Síochána by Division

Garda Division	2006	2005	Change
	Satisfied/ Very satisfied	Satisfied/ Very satisfied	
	%	%	Percentage points
Kerry	86.8	79.2	+7.6
Carlow/Kildare	84.2	81.9	+2.3
Limerick	83.2	84.7	-1.5
Mayo	82.2	81.0	+1.2
Galway West	80.4	82.8	-2.4
Roscommon/Galway East	80.3	81.6	-1.3
Cork North	78.8	83.8	-5.0
Tipperary	78.2	85.8	-7.6
DMR North	77.8	68.8	+9.0
Cork City	77.6	79.8	-2.2
Cavan/Monaghan	76.6	82.3	-5.7
DMR South Central	76.4	71.6	+4.8
DMR East	76.3	83.5	-7.2
Cork West	76.0	78.8	-2.8
Louth/Meath	75.9	78.8	-2.9
DMR North Central	75.6	69.4	+6.2
DMR West	74.8	75.0	-0.2
Clare	74.8	75.6	-0.8
Sligo/Leitrim	73.5	79.0	-5.5
DMR South	73.4	80.0	-6.6
Donegal	73.1	76.3	-3.2
Longford/Westmeath	72.7	83.3	-10.6
Laois/Offaly	71.6	85.6	-14.0
Wexford/Wicklow	68.8	86.0	-17.4
Waterford/Kilkenny	68.5	79.8	-11.2
average	76.7	79.8	-3.1

Divisional sample sizes ranged between 107 in Mayo and 220 in DMR South Central.

Over three-quarters (77%) felt that the Garda service needed to be improved (73% and 64% in 2005 and 2002, respectively). Respondents were invited to make unprompted suggestions for improvements. The suggestions most frequently mentioned were for more Gardaí, more Gardaí on foot patrol, more contact with the community and longer station opening hours. See Table 43.

In relation to the call for more Garda foot patrols, it will be noted later that in assigning priorities to policing tasks, 86 per cent of respondents considered patrol by foot or bicycle to be a “very high” or “high” priority while 94 per cent assigned the same priority to patrol by car or van. Patrol on foot or bicycle ranked 20th of 28 tasks and patrol by car or van ranked 17th. Traffic law enforcement functions ranked 4th (for drink driving), 7th (for speed), 13th (for seat belts), 21st (for other traffic laws) and 22nd (for traffic flow).

Table 43 Suggested improvements to Garda service

Suggestion	Percentage of respondents		
	2006	2005	2002
greater manpower	60	56	34
more Garda foot patrols	54	52	41
more contact with the community	31	-	-
Garda stations open longer	24	21	6
enforce traffic laws more thoroughly	21	15	5
Gardaí to be friendlier	15	11	7
miscellaneous other	11	14	41

n=7720 in 2006, n=7350 in 2005 and n= 4294 in 2002; unprompted answers; telephone element only in 2002.

GARDA APPROACHABILITY

Respondents were asked “In general, how approachable do you think the Gardaí are at your local station?” Seventy-nine per cent said that they were approachable or very approachable. Just two per cent said that they were very unapproachable. See Table 44.

Table 44 Approachability of Gardaí at local station

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

For the purposes of comparison with previous years, categories have been amalgamated and “don’t know” answers excluded in Table 45. The 2006 survey result is similar to that in 2005. Results for 2006 and 2005 represent a deterioration on earlier years, with one in ten respondents now describing local Gardaí as unapproachable.

Table 45 Approachability of Gardaí at local station: 2006- 2002

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

In terms of age group and housing tenure, those in the 65+ cohort (95%) and those who owned their own houses (92%) reported the highest rates of Garda approachability. These rates were notably different from the lowest rates in each category, which were reported by those aged 18-24 (83%) and those in local authority housing (82%).

The number who consider the local Gardaí as “very approachable” varied from 49 per cent in Tipperary to 19 per cent in Waterford/Kilkenny. The number who consider the local Gardaí as “very unapproachable” varied from one per cent (in four Divisions) to four per cent in four other Divisions. See Table 46. The table is not rank ordered because the wide variation in the number of “don’t knows” would distort the results.

Table 46 Approachability of Gardaí at local station by Division

Garda Division	Very approachable	Approachable	Unapproachable	Very unapproachable	Don't know
	%	%	%	%	%
Carlow/Kildare	41	46	6	1	6
Cavan/Monaghan	21	44	5	2	28
Clare	31	42	9	2	17
Cork City	34	43	6	3	14
Cork North	21	55	6	3	16
Cork West	38	45	6	2	9
DMR East	31	51	7	4	8
DMR North	30	47	8	4	10
DMR North Central	31	42	8	3	17
DMR South	31	48	4	3	15
DMR South Central	29	55	5	3	9
DMR West	28	46	8	3	16
Donegal	34	44	10	4	8
Galway West	36	44	5	1	14
Kerry	38	46	6	4	6
Laois/Offaly	23	61	9	2	6
Limerick	39	43	4	2	12
Longford/Westmeath	23	59	6	2	10
Louth/Meath	21	49	7	2	21
Mayo	36	49	4	2	9
Roscommon/Galway E.	38	52	4	1	6
Sligo/Leitrim	39	42	4	2	14
Tipperary	49	37	5	1	8
Waterford/Kilkenny	19	51	10	3	17
Wexford/Wicklow	25	51	7	2	16
average	31	48	6	2	12

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Comparisons with 2005 are complicated by the variations in “don’t know” answers. To simplify, “don’t knows” have been excluded and comparisons have been based on the percentage who rate the local Gardaí as “approachable” or “very approachable”. Using this measure, nine Divisions showed an increase in perceived approachability compared with 2005. The largest increases were in the DMR South Central, Clare and Sligo/Leitrim Divisions (up by 9.2, 5.6 and 5.3 percentage points, respectively). The remaining 16 Divisions showed decreases in perceived approachability. The largest decreases were in Waterford/Kilkenny, Donegal and DMR East (down by 7.4, 5.9 and 5.6 percentage points, respectively). See Table 47.

Table 47 Approachability of Gardaí at local station by Division: 2006–2005

Garda Division	Approachable/ very approachable			Garda Division	Approachable/ very approachable		
	2006	2005	change		2006	2005	change
	%	%	% points		%	%	% points
Carlow/Kildare	92.3	94.0	-1.7	Galway West	92.6	93.5	-0.9
Cavan/Monaghan	90.6	91.9	-1.3	Kerry	89.1	90.1	-1.0
Clare	88.0	82.4	+5.6	Laois/Offaly	88.9	90.2	-1.3
Cork City	89.8	92.2	-2.4	Limerick	93.0	93.6	-0.6
Cork North	89.3	94.0	-4.7	Longford/Westmth	91.7	94.5	-2.8
Cork West	91.2	94.1	-2.9	Louth/Meath	89.2	94.0	-4.8
DMR East	88.8	94.4	-5.6	Mayo	93.6	92.9	+0.7
DMR North	86.7	83.4	+3.3	Roscom./Galway E	95.2	94.8	+0.4
DMR Nth Central	88.0	86.1	+1.9	Sligo/Leitrim	93.7	88.4	+5.3
DMR South	92.1	88.8	+3.3	Tipperary	93.4	90.6	+2.8
DMR Sth Central	91.0	81.8	+9.2	Waterford/Kilkenny	84.3	91.7	-7.4
DMR West	87.4	87.5	-0.1	Wexford/Wicklow	89.4	92.8	-3.4
Donegal	84.5	90.4	-5.9	average	90.2	90.7	-0.5

Percentages exclude “don’t know” responses.

Reasons why respondents thought the Gardaí were approachable or unapproachable are presented in Table 48. 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 “[you] can communicate with them” and “they have time for you”. 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”.

Table 48 Reasons for approachability or unapproachability

Reason why Gardaí were considered approachable	n=7921
very friendly/helpful	59%
respondent knows them	15%
very reassuring	14%
they have time for you	22%
they are members of the community	16%
can communicate with them	25%
other	4%
Reason why Gardaí were considered unapproachable	n=871
unfriendly/rude	35%
not always there/station frequently closed	21%
just not interested	40%
think they are superior/formal manner	34%
minor complaints dealt with more seriously	9%
unhelpful	24%
distance themselves from community	22%
other	7%

Four out of ten respondents said that they knew a Garda by name in their local station. This is a notable decrease on 2005. See Table 49.

Table 49 Do you know any Garda member by name in your locality?

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

UNACCEPTABLE BEHAVIOUR BY GARDA MEMBERS

Just under one in twelve respondents (8.6%) reported that a Garda had ever behaved towards them in a way they considered unacceptable. This figure represented a decrease from the four previous years. The type of unacceptable behaviour cited most frequently was being “disrespectful or impolite” (Table 50).

Table 50 Nature of any unacceptable behaviour

Nature of behaviour	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002
	%	%	%	%	%
was disrespectful or impolite	4.1	5.0	10.9	6.6	9.0
did not follow proper procedures	1.5	1.4	3.8	1.4	2.8
stopped or searched without reason	1.0	1.4	2.6	0.5	1.6
harassed	1.4	1.6	3.8	1.0	2.1
clearly was very lax in carrying out duty	1.2	1.4	5.3	1.1	2.7
used racist language	0.2	0.1	0.4	0	0.1
made wrongful accusation	1.4	1.5	4.5	1.7	2.9
behaved in a violent way (e.g. pushing)	0.7	0.9	2.6	0.9	1.2
discriminated due to age, gender, race or ethnicity	0.6	0.7	1.8	0.5	1.2
swore	0.6	0.8	3.3	0.9	1.6
searched house without reason	0.4	0.4	-	-	0.3
took an item of your property	0.2	0.3	0.5	0.2	0.4
other (incl. use of sexist or sectarian language)	1.2	1.2	2.9	0.4	1.5
any of the above	8.6	9.3	12.4	12.1	12.3

Rates of unacceptable behaviour ranged from 2.5 per cent in Sligo/Leitrim to 14.8 per cent in DMR North Central. Compared with the 2005 survey, the percentage of respondents answering that a Garda had ever behaved towards them in an unacceptable way was better in 15 Divisions and worse in ten.⁸ The biggest improvements were in Kerry (by 7 percentage points), DMR North and DMR South Central (by 5.6 percentage points each). Disimprovements were recorded in nine Divisions with the biggest in Galway West (by 4 percentage points), DMR West (3.1)

⁸ Note that a negative change in percentage points represents an improvement.

and DMR North Central (3). The national average improved by 1.2 percentage points. See Table 51.

Table 51 Unacceptable behaviour by Garda Division (percentage of respondents who said that a Garda had ever behaved towards them in a way that they considered unacceptable)

Garda Division	2006	2005	Change
	%	%	% points
Carlow/Kildare	7.5	8.3	-0.8
Cavan/Monaghan	6.3	6.1	+0.2
Clare	7.5	8.4	-0.9
Cork City	12.0	9.5	+2.5
Cork North	4.1	7.7	-3.6
Cork West	5.9	7.8	-1.9
DMR East	8.6	9.1	-0.5
DMR North	10.2	15.8	-5.6
DMR North Central	14.8	11.8	+3.0
DMR South	11.0	13.6	-2.6
DMR South Central	12.9	18.5	-5.6
DMR West	12.0	8.9	+3.1
Donegal	8.4	12.5	-4.1
Galway West	7.6	3.6	+4.0
Kerry	3.1	10.1	-7.0
Laois/Offaly	5.5	9.0	-3.5
Limerick	8.5	7.5	+1.0
Longford/Westmeath	6.5	8.8	-2.3
Louth/Meath	8.6	6.6	+2.0
Mayo	3.1	7.4	-4.3
Roscommon/Galway East	6.3	10.1	-3.8
Sligo/Leitrim	2.5	6.5	-4.0
Tipperary	7.7	7.5	+0.2
Waterford/Kilkenny	11.3	9.3	+2.0
Wexford/Wicklow	9.7	7.2	+2.5
average	8.1	9.3	-1.2

RACIST INCIDENTS

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

Overall, 2.6 per cent of respondents said that they had ever been subjected to a racist incident (n=265). Seventeen per cent of these had reported the most recent incident to the Gardaí (n=46). Of these, just over half were satisfied (53%) with the way the incident was handled. In the 2005 survey, 2.5 per cent reported having experienced a racist incident (n=252); 16 per cent reported it to the Gardaí (n=40) and 50 per cent were satisfied with the way it was handled (n=20).

The exclusion of respondents of Irish nationality, the vast majority (92%), produces a different picture. The rates of experience of racist incidents by non-Irish nationals are as follows: UK (6%), EU (18%), and non-EU (28%).

The main reasons for not reporting were that the incident was not serious enough (51%), that the Gardaí could not have done anything (23%) or that the Gardaí would not have been interested (17%). These were also the main reasons in 2005.

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

It is of interest that 62 per cent of respondents agreed with a statement in another section of the survey that “people who are different are likely to experience ridicule or personal attack on our streets”, while only 18 per cent disagreed.⁹

GARDA VISIBILITY AND ACTIVITY

As regards Garda visibility, 25 per cent of respondents reported seeing a Garda in their locality that day or the day before. More than half (54%) had seen a Garda in the previous week.

The proportion who remembered seeing a Garda on the day of their interview was the same as in 2005 (the 2005 figure had been the lowest of recent surveys).

The proportion who remembered seeing a Garda in the previous week is over two percentage points higher than in 2005 (the 2005 figure also had been the lowest of recent surveys).¹⁰ See Table 52.

Table 52 Garda visibility

Last sighting of Garda in locality	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002
	%	%	%	%	%
today	8	8	16	15	14
yesterday	17	16	13	17	15
3-7 days ago	29	28	26	27	26
1-4 weeks ago	19	19	15	14	18
longer ago	14	18	21	21	17
can't remember	14	12	8	6	10

Percentages may not sum to 100 or match exactly with figures in the text due to rounding.

⁹ The rest were undecided.

¹⁰ In 2005, the proportion who remembered seeing a Garda in the previous week was 51.5%. Here the proportion is 54.1%, a difference of 2.6 percentage points.

Fifty-nine per cent of respondents were satisfied with the level of Garda visibility in their locality. This represents a decrease of almost three percentage points on 2005 (where 62 per cent said they were satisfied or very satisfied).¹¹

The levels of satisfaction were higher than in the 2004 survey but lower than in 2003 and 2002. See Table 53.

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

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

Percentages may not sum to 100 or match exactly with figures in the text due to rounding.

Satisfaction with the level of local Garda visibility ranged from 74 per cent in Cavan/Monaghan and Mayo to 44 per cent in Waterford/Kilkenny. Compared with 2005, an improvement was registered in 12 divisions and satisfaction rates decreased in 13.

The largest increases in satisfaction rates were achieved in Mayo (+9.5 percentage points), Donegal (+8.9) and Clare (+8.3). The largest decreases were recorded in Cork West (-16.2), Waterford/Kilkenny (-15.1) and Limerick (-14.9). See Table 54.

¹¹ In 2005, the proportion satisfied was 61.5%. Here the proportion is 58.7%, a difference of 2.8 percentage points.

Table 54 Satisfaction with the level of Garda visibility in the locality by Division

Garda Division	Satisfied/very satisfied		
	2006	2005	Change
	%	%	Percentage points
Cavan/Monaghan	73.8	73.6	+0.2
Mayo	73.5	64.0	+9.5
Kerry	69.3	73.7	-4.4
Sligo/Leitrim	67.3	66.7	+0.6
Roscommon/Galway East	67.1	75.9	-8.8
Clare	66.3	58.0	+8.3
Donegal	64.5	55.6	+8.9
DMR South Central	63.4	71.2	-7.8
Tipperary	62.5	59.1	+3.4
Galway West	62.1	62.4	-0.3
DMR East	60.0	65.2	-5.2
DMR North Central	59.7	62.6	-2.9
DMR South	59.5	59.4	+0.1
Cork North	59.3	58.9	+0.4
Laois/Offaly	58.2	55.8	+2.4
DMR West	58.2	58.0	+0.2
Cork West	58.2	74.4	-16.2
Cork City	55.0	53.3	+1.7
DMR North	54.4	46.6	+7.8
Limerick	54.1	69.0	-14.9
Carlow/Kildare	54.0	57.9	-3.9
Longford/Westmeath	53.6	64.7	-11.1
Louth/Meath	51.1	52.1	-1.0
Wexford/Wicklow	50.0	53.9	-3.9
Waterford/Kilkenny	44.2	59.3	-15.1
average	60.0	62.1	-2.1

The majority of respondents felt that the general level of Garda activity (60%) and the level of foot patrol (61%) in the locality had decreased in the previous year. This is consistent with results from the 2005, 2004 and 2003 surveys and a major change on the 2002 survey.

In relation to the general level of Garda activity, the remaining responses were evenly divided between those who felt that the level of activity had increased and those who felt it was unchanged. There was a difference of four percentage points between those who felt that foot patrols had increased (12%) or stayed the same (16%). See Table 55.

Table 55 Perceived changes in Garda activity in the locality in the last year

Activity	Change	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002
		%	%	%	%	%
General Garda activity	increased	15	17	21	15	22
	about same	15	15	11	17	59
	decreased	60	60	60	57	10
	don't know	9	9	8	11	9
Foot patrol	increased	12	14	19	24	16
	about same	16	16	15	11	60
	decreased	61	60	59	60	14
	don't know	11	11	6	5	10

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Eight out of ten respondents (80%) rated the Garda performance in their locality as either “very good” (15%) or “fairly good” (65%). Compared with 2005, there is a notable decrease in the proportion of respondents who rated the Gardaí as “very good” (-7 percentage points). The performance rating is consistent with the satisfaction level with overall Garda service to the community (79%) reported in Section 1. Sixty-nine per cent of respondents felt that the Gardaí were doing a “very good” or “fairly good” job in their locality as regards road safety.¹²

Compared with 2005, there is a notable decrease in the proportion of respondents who rated the Gardaí as “very good” (-9 percentage points). See Table 56. Male and female respondents expressed similar levels of satisfaction on the two aspects of Garda performance. Those in the 65+ group expressed higher levels of satisfaction for both aspects of performance than those in other age categories.

Table 56 Garda performance in the locality

Performance	Rating	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002
		%	%	%	%	%
All in all, how good a job do the Gardaí do in your locality?	very good	15	22	22	27	24
	fairly good	65	62	62	59	63
	fairly poor	16	13	12	10	11
	very poor	4	3	4	4	2
How good a job do the Gardaí do in your locality as regards road safety?	very good	12	21	20	26	19
	fairly good	58	58	50	51	52
	fairly poor	24	17	20	16	22
	very poor	7	5	10	7	7

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Ratings for how good a job the Gardaí do in the locality ranged from 88 per cent “very good” or “fairly good” in Roscommon/Galway East to 63 per cent in Waterford/Kilkenny. See Table 57.

¹² The combined frequencies for “very good” and “fairly good” sum to 69%. The individual categories in Table 2 sum to 70% due to rounding.

Compared with 2005, 17 Divisions showed a drop in satisfaction ratings, with an average decrease among these 17 of 6.7 percentage points. The largest decreases occurred in Waterford/Kilkenny (-23.0 percentage points), Cork North (-15.0) and Longford/Westmeath (-9.3). Among the 8 Divisions that showed increases, the average was 2.5 percentage points. The largest increases were in Mayo (+6.7 percentage points), DMR South (+2.9) and Tipperary (+2.3).

Ratings for how good a job the Gardaí do locally as regards road safety ranged from 83 per cent “very good” or “fairly good” in DMR South to 51 per cent in Waterford/Kilkenny. Compared with 2005, 22 Divisions showed a decrease in satisfaction ratings, with an average drop among these 22 of 10.7 percentage points. The largest decreases occurred in Waterford/Kilkenny (-28.4 percentage points), Laois/Offaly (-19.6) and Wexford/Wicklow (-18.9). The Division of DMR North showed no change from 2005, while increases in satisfaction were recorded in Mayo (+3.6 percentage points) and DMR South (+3.4).

Table 57 Garda performance in the locality by Division

Garda Division	Overall			Road safety		
	very good / fairly good			very good / fairly good		
	2006	2005	change	2006	2005	change
	%	%	% points	%	%	% points
Roscommon/Galway East	88.4	92.1	-3.7	76.2	85.7	-9.5
Tipperary	87.2	84.9	+2.3	74.3	79.9	-5.6
Cork West	87.1	90.4	-3.3	67.9	80.1	-12.2
DMR South	86.5	83.6	+2.9	82.6	79.2	+3.4
Cavan/Monaghan	85.6	86.5	-0.9	80.1	85.1	-5.0
Kerry	83.9	81.8	+2.1	72.2	83.8	-11.6
Carlow/Kildare	83.5	86.7	-3.2	63.5	81.3	-17.8
Mayo	83.0	76.3	+6.7	68.5	64.9	+3.6
Clare	82.2	80.5	+1.7	71.0	80.6	-9.6
DMR West	81.4	79.6	+1.8	80.0	82.3	-2.3
Cork City	81.3	89.4	-8.1	66.3	79.6	-13.3
Galway West	81.1	82.0	-0.9	70.3	77.2	-6.9
DMR South Central	80.8	79.3	+1.5	71.3	79.6	-8.3
Laois/Offaly	80.1	86.9	-6.8	67.3	86.9	-19.6
Sligo/Leitrim	79.5	81.8	-2.3	69.8	73.4	-3.6
DMR East	79.4	87.6	-8.2	70.4	71.7	-1.3
DMR North Central	78.7	82.4	-3.7	75.8	85.7	-9.9
Limerick	78.6	85.7	-7.1	72.1	80.9	-8.8
Longford/Westmeath	78.4	87.7	-9.3	68.0	78.6	-10.6
Donegal	76.4	78.5	-2.1	60.6	64.3	-3.7
Cork North	75.9	90.9	-15.0	63.3	82.1	-18.8
Wexford/Wicklow	75.1	83.5	-8.4	59.8	78.7	-18.9
DMR North	74.4	73.7	+0.7	66.7	66.7	0
Louth/Meath	73.4	80.7	-7.3	66.6	77.0	-10.4
Waterford/Kilkenny	63.3	86.3	-23.0	51.2	79.6	-28.4
average	80.2	84.0	-3.7	69.4	78.6	-9.2

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

In 2006, there was greater variation in ratings according to housing type than in 2005. Ratings ranged from 68-82 per cent, compared with 77-87 per cent in 2005. In 2006, occupants of local authority housing gave a lower rating than other respondents, with 68 per cent saying they thought the Gardaí did a “very good” or “fairly good” job in their locality. Compared with 2005, rating of Garda performance locally was down in all housing types, with the biggest decrease being for those in local authority housing (- 9.3 percentage points). See Table 58.

Table 58 Local Garda performance by housing tenure

2006 Survey		2005 Survey	
Housing type	%	Housing type	%
owner occupied	81.5	owner occupied	84.7
local authority housing	67.5	local authority housing	76.8
rented privately	81.5	rented privately	86.9
other	77.9	other	86.7

ROAD TRAFFIC COLLISIONS

Four per cent of respondents said that they were involved in the previous year in road traffic collisions dealt with by the Gardaí (compared with three per cent in the 2005 survey). The majority (64%) believed that the other party was at fault, while 20 per cent felt they themselves were at fault. Fourteen per cent felt that both parties were; two per cent did not know who was at fault. Levels of satisfaction with the service provided were higher than in the 2005 survey, with 78 per cent expressing satisfaction compared with 73 per cent in 2005. See Table 59.

Table 59 Satisfaction with the Garda investigation of road traffic collisions

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

Respondents who expressed dissatisfaction were invited to give a reason. The number of respondents was small. Responses were not prompted and the reasons that were cited are summarised in Table 60.

Table 60 Dissatisfaction with Garda investigation of road traffic collision

Reason for dissatisfaction	Mentioned (n)
Garda withheld information	6
nothing was/has been done	25
nobody came to the scene	14
Garda took very long time to come to scene	27
Garda wrongfully charged the respondent	6
very bad service	26
were not interested in incident	34
other	9

POLICING PRIORITIES

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

The top priority for respondents was *ensuring an immediate response to emergencies*, followed by tasks related to drugs, organised crime, sexual violence and investigating crime. Supervision of licensed premises, advice on personal safety and crime prevention advice to businesses were the lowest ranked tasks. See Table 61.

Table 61 Respondents' policing priorities

Task	Very high priority	High priority	Low priority	Rank
	%	%	%	
ensure immediate response to emergencies	73	26	1	1
enforce laws relating to drugs	73	25	3	2
target organised crime	70	28	2	3
enforce drink driving laws	69	29	2	4
investigate crime	68	32	1	5
deal with crimes of sexual violence	66	31	2	6
enforce speed laws	65	32	3	7
deal with youths racing around in cars	63	33	4	8
deal with underage drinking on the streets	62	34	5	9
tackle the sale of alcohol to those under age	60	35	6	10
deal with domestic violence incidents	57	38	5	11
deal with underage drinking in pubs	57	36	7	12
enforce laws relating to wearing seat belts	52	43	5	13
deal with vandalism	47	47	6	14
enforce laws relating to fraud and white collar crime	45	48	8	15
provide help and support to victims of crime	45	48	8	16
patrol by car/van	43	51	8	17
deal with public annoyances (e.g. loud music, fights)	40	52	9	18
ensure State security	42	47	11	19
patrol on foot or bicycle	40	46	14	20
enforce other traffic laws	36	55	9	21
ensure effective traffic management and flow	36	53	11	22
enforce immigration laws	38	49	13	23
work with community groups	34	56	10	24
patrol by motorcycle	34	50	16	25
supervise licensed premises	33	48	19	26
advise on personal safety and home security	28	54	18	27
advise businesses/shops on crime prevention	28	54	19	28

Percentages may not sum to 100 because of rounding. "Don't know" answers are excluded – they ranged from 0.5% to 1.4% of respondents. Tasks are ranked by mean scores, with very high priority = 1, high priority =2 and low priority =3; values are shown in Table 63, to two places of decimal; ranking is based on 4 places of decimal.

The majority of respondents assign a “very high” or “high” priority to all tasks, even the lowest-ranked tasks. The percentages assigning these levels of priority ranged from 82 per cent for *providing crime prevention advice to businesses* to 99 per cent for *ensuring an immediate emergency response*. It should also be noted that differences in rank can reflect very small differences in levels of priority, especially for tasks that are ranked closely together. It would be unwise, therefore, to attach too much importance to, say, the first-ranked task over the second, or the second over the third, and so on, or to over-emphasise relatively minor changes from one year to the next.

The priorities that respondents perceive the Gardaí assign to tasks are presented in Table 62. 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 closely followed by *ensuring immediate emergency response*, *targeting organised crime* and *ensuring State security*.

Table 62 Respondents’ perceptions of Garda priorities, ranked by mean score

Task	very high priority	high priority	low priority	very low priority	Rank
	%	%	%	%	
investigate crime	27	55	16	3	1
ensure immediate response to emergencies	30	47	18	5	2
target organised crime	27	48	19	6	3
ensure State security	26	50	19	6	4
enforce laws relating to drugs	26	46	21	6	5
enforce drink driving laws	23	49	24	5	6
enforce speed laws	24	47	24	5	7
deal with crimes of sexual violence	21	53	21	6	8
enforce laws relating to wearing seat belts	19	48	27	6	9
deal with domestic violence incidents	16	48	27	8	10
enforce immigration laws	13	47	29	10	11
enforce other traffic laws	13	46	35	7	12
patrol by car/van	13	44	34	9	13
enforce laws on fraud/white collar crime	13	44	32	11	14
ensure effective traffic management and flow	13	42	37	9	15
deal with youths racing around in cars	15	38	33	14	16
provide help and support to victims of crime	11	41	38	11	17
deal with vandalism	10	42	37	11	18
deal with public annoyances	9	40	40	11	19
deal with underage drinking on the streets	13	33	39	15	20
deal with underage drinking in pubs	13	32	41	14	21
supervise licensed premises	10	35	41	15	22
tackle the sale of alcohol to those under age	12	32	40	16	23
work with community groups	8	35	42	14	24
advise businesses/shops crime prevention	8	32	44	17	25
advise on personal safety and home security	8	29	44	20	26
patrol by motorcycle	8	28	42	23	27
patrol on foot or bicycle	8	22	42	29	28

Percentages may not sum to 100 because of rounding. “Don’t know” answers are excluded – they ranged from 1.5% to 4.5% of respondents. Mean scores are calculated on the basis of “very high priority” = 1, “high priority” = 2, “low priority” = 3 and “very low priority” = 4; mean scores are shown in Table 63, to two places of decimal; ranking is on the basis of 4 places of decimal.

The perceived Garda priority order is generally different from respondents' own priorities. The rankings are the same for three activities: dealing with *organised crime*, *speeding laws* and *community groups*. The difference in rankings is small for up to two thirds of the remainder, but the others differ by seven or more ranking places. The more significant mismatches arise in respect of underage drinking, patrol on foot or bicycle and youths racing around in cars (to which the public attach a higher ranking than they perceive the Gardaí do) and State security, traffic and immigration (to which the public attach a lower ranking than they perceive the Gardaí do). The largest differences occur in respect of *ensuring State security* and *enforcing immigration laws* which the public rates 15 and 12 places respectively lower than it perceives the Gardaí do, and *tackling the sale of alcohol to those under age* and *dealing with underage drinking on the street* which the public rates 13 and 11 places respectively higher than it perceives the Gardaí do. See Table 63.

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

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

Without exception, respondents assign a higher priority to activities than they perceive the Gardaí do. This is so even when an activity appears in the same ranking position in both respondent and Garda lists. The largest differences occur in respect of *tackling the sale of alcohol to juveniles, dealing with underage drinking on the streets and in pubs, and dealing with youths racing around in cars*. Sizeable differences also appear in respect of *patrol on foot or bicycle, dealing with vandalism, patrol by motorcycle and providing help and support to victims of crime*. See Table 64.

Table 64 Comparison of respondents' priorities and their perception of Garda priorities – mean scores

Task	Desired priority	Perceived Garda priority	Difference
	mean score	mean score	mean score
tackle the sale of alcohol to those under age	1.46	2.44	-0.98
deal with underage drinking on the streets	1.43	2.40	-0.97
deal with underage drinking in pubs	1.50	2.42	-0.92
deal with youths racing around in cars	1.41	2.32	-0.91
patrol on foot or bicycle	1.73	2.63	-0.90
deal with vandalism	1.59	2.38	-0.79
patrol by motorcycle	1.82	2.57	-0.75
provide help and support to victims of crime	1.63	2.38	-0.75
deal with domestic violence incidents	1.47	2.19	-0.72
work with community groups	1.76	2.48	-0.72
enforce drink/driving laws	1.33	2.05	-0.72
deal with public annoyances (e.g. loud music, fights)	1.69	2.41	-0.72
enforce laws relating to drugs	1.30	2.01	-0.71
deal with crimes of sexual violence	1.36	2.05	-0.69
enforce speed laws	1.38	2.06	-0.68
enforce laws relating to fraud/white collar crime	1.63	2.30	-0.67
advise on personal safety and home security	1.89	2.56	-0.67
patrol by car/van	1.64	2.30	-0.66
target organised crime	1.32	1.98	-0.66
ensure immediate response to emergencies	1.28	1.93	-0.65
advise businesses/shops on crime prevention	1.91	2.52	-0.61
enforce laws relating to wearing seat belts	1.54	2.14	-0.60
supervise licensed premises	1.87	2.46	-0.59
ensure effective traffic management and flow	1.74	2.33	-0.59
investigate crime	1.34	1.92	-0.58
enforce other traffic laws	1.73	2.29	-0.56
enforce immigration laws	1.75	2.26	-0.51
ensure State security	1.70	1.99	-0.29

Mean scores 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, 5965 said "very high", 3458 "high" and 567 "low", giving a mean score of $[(5965 \times 1) + (3458 \times 2) + (567 \times 3)] / [5965 + 3458 + 567] = 14582 / 9990 = 1.4696$.

With a small number of exceptions, the public's own rankings have been remarkably consistent in the surveys since 2002, when the last large-scale survey was conducted. Comparing first with 2005, *enforce speeding, drink/driving, and other traffic laws* achieved the greatest jumps in rankings, while *work with community groups* recorded the largest falls. Comparing with earlier years, the changes are generally less dramatic, with the exception perhaps of *dealing with youths racing around in cars*: this was top priority in 2003 but slipped to 6th in 2005 (and 2004) and to 8th in 2006. In the light of frequent reports of public calls for greater number of Gardaí on the beat, it is of interest that the task of *patrol on foot or bicycle* was ranked 20th of 26 tasks in 2006 and 2005; 19th in 2004 and 21st in 2003 and 2002. This would suggest that while the public would like to see more Gardaí on the beat, but not at the expense of other tasks. See Table 65.

Table 65 Respondents' priorities: 2006 - 2002

Task	Year	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002
	Sample size	n ¹	n ²	n ³	n ⁴	n ⁵
ensure immediate response to emergencies		1	1	2	2	1
enforce laws relating to drugs		2	2	5	2	3
target organised crime		3	3	3	2	2
enforce drink/driving laws		4	8	3	5	3
investigate crime		5	5	7	7	6
deal with crimes of sexual violence		6	4	1	-	-
enforce speed laws		7	12	8	9	7
deal with youths racing around in cars		8	6	6	1	3
deal with underage drinking on the streets		9	7	9	6	8
tackle the sale of alcohol to those under age		10	9	12	8	9
deal with domestic violence incidents		11	10	-	-	-
deal with underage drinking in pubs		12	11	15	10	11
enforce laws relating to wearing seat belts		13	16	10	13	10
deal with vandalism		14	13	16	14	13
enforce laws relating to fraud/white collar crime		15	14	14	11	12
provide help and support to victims of crime		16	15	13	12	14
patrol by car/van		17	17	17	15	16
deal with public annoyances (e.g. loud music, ...)		18	19	20	19	17
ensure State security		19	18	11	15	15
patrol on foot or bicycle		20	20	19	21	21
enforce other traffic laws		21	24	21	15	18
ensure effective traffic management and flow		22	23	24	20	18
enforce immigration laws		23	22	23	23	22
work with community groups		24	21	18	18	20
patrol by motorcycle		25	25	21	22	23
supervise licensed premises		26	26	26	26	26
advise on personal safety and home security		27	27	25	25	24
advise businesses/shops on crime prevention		28	28	27	24	25

Table includes two tasks, "*Investigating crimes involving sexual violence*" added in 2004 and "*Dealing with domestic violence incidents*" added in 2005.

n¹ =10,000; n² =10,000; n³ =1,000; n⁴ = 1,000; n⁵ = 10,000. Rankings prior to 2005 were based on mean scores to two places of decimal and joint rankings occurred in several instances.

FURTHER VIEWS ON THE GARDA SÍOCHÁNA

The survey sought to elicit the public's views about other aspects of the relationship between the Gardaí and the community and to give an indication of 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 66 Relationship between the Gardaí and the community

Statement	Agree	Neither	Disagree
	%	%	%
Anyone in Garda custody would have their rights fully respected	70	14	16
If my rights were infringed, I could rely on the Gardaí to help me	69	16	15
The Gardaí carry out their role in a fair and impartial manner	65	19	16
I would encourage a friend or relative to join the Gardaí	65	19	16
Gardaí are representative of the communities they serve	64	18	18
Gardaí are sensitive to the needs of vulnerable people	62	21	18
The Garda organisation is made up of honest/honourable people	61	22	17
People like me would be welcome in the Gardaí as a member	63	16	21
Anyone in Garda custody would be well treated	50	31	19
The local Gardaí reflect the make-up of my local community	53	23	25
The Gardaí provide good leadership in the guidance and direction of our young people	51	24	26
Garda management fully support community policing (e.g. assigning Community Guards to area)	48	28	24
The local Gardaí are fully answerable to the people for their actions and conduct	51	17	32
The Gardaí never blame victims of crime	42	32	27
The Gardaí serve the interests of the rich more than the poor	39	21	40
When people are dissatisfied with what the Gardaí do, it is easy to have the matter corrected	32	21	47
The people around here have a real say in deciding what is important for the Gardaí to attend to	27	22	51
The Gardaí discriminate against immigrants	16	30	54
Domestic Violence is a private matter, not a Garda matter	17	13	70

Table is ranked by mean score, calculated from the original five-point scale. Questions were rotated in four groups and sample sizes ranged from 2455 to 2513. Percentages may not add to 100 because of rounding.

The results are summarised in Table 66 showing simply agreement, disagreement or neither.¹³

The highest levels of agreement were as regards confidence that anyone in Garda custody would have their rights fully respected, and that domestic violence is a Garda matter not just a private matter. Agreement was also high as regards confidence that Gardaí would help if a person's rights were being infringed, that the Gardaí carry out their role in a fair and impartial manner, and preparedness to encourage a friend or relative to join the Garda Síochána. Minorities who disagreed with these statements ranged from 15-16 per cent. A similar level of disagreement attached to confidence that the Gardaí do not discriminate against immigrants (54% agreed).

The results are along broadly expected lines in most cases, with majorities agreeing where agreement is desirable or disagreeing where disagreement is desirable. There were two notable exceptions. Majorities disagreed that "the people around here have a real say in deciding what is important for the Gardaí to attend to" and that "when people are dissatisfied with what the Garda do, it is easy to have the matter corrected". These were also exceptions in the 2002 and 2005 surveys, although the level of agreement was higher in 2005 and 2006. Respondents similarly agreed (39%) and disagreed (40%) with the statement that "the Gardaí serve the rich more than the poor".

A comparison from 2002 to 2006 is set out in Table 67. Sixteen statements were common to both surveys, four showed continued improvement and four showed continued deterioration. The most noteworthy improvement was in respect of the statement that "when people are dissatisfied with what the Gardaí do, it is easy to have the matter corrected" (to 32%). The most noteworthy decrease was in respect of the statements that "anyone in Garda custody would be well treated" (to 50%), "if my rights were infringed, I could rely on the Gardaí to help me" (to 69%) and "I would encourage a friend or relative to join the Gardaí" (to 65%).

Improvement from 2002 to 2005 with respect to the statement that "Anyone in Garda custody would have their rights fully respected" (70%) was sustained in 2006 not

¹³ A measure of the strength of agreement is provided by the mean scores, which range theoretically between a minimum of 1 (all respondents strongly agree) and maximum of 5 (all respondents strongly disagree). 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").

withstanding the decline in the percentage agreeing that “Anyone in Garda custody would be well treated”. The decrease with respect to the statements “People like me would be welcome in the Gardaí as a member” (63%) was sustained in 2006.

From 2005 to 2006 the most noteworthy decline was in respect of the statement agreeing, “Garda management fully support community policing” showed a drop (to 48%). This decline was also down on the 2002 survey (52%). The other changes were relatively insignificant, with a maximum difference between surveys of five percentage points.

Table 67 Relationship between the Gardaí and the community: 2006–2002

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

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

PUBLIC SAFETY AND FEAR OF CRIME

Seven in ten respondents (71%) said that they felt safe out walking in their neighbourhood after dark, but three in ten felt unsafe, similar to the picture that emerged in 2002 and 2005. Feelings of security were lowest in cities other than Dublin (Cork, Galway, Limerick and Waterford) and in large and small towns. It is of note that feelings of safety in Dublin were quite similar to those expressed in villages

and rural areas. An average of six per cent of respondents felt very unsafe in their neighbourhood after dark, rising to one in nine in cities outside Dublin. See Table 68.

Table 68 How safe do you feel walking in your neighbourhood after dark?

Type of area	Very safe	Safe	Unsafe	Very unsafe	Total
	%	%	%	%	n
Dublin	18	56	18	8	2374
other city	11	52	27	11	1110
large town (10,000)	16	49	27	8	807
town (1-10,000)	17	50	27	6	1578
village, rural, open country	22	55	20	4	3565
all	18	53	22	6	9434

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

The vast majority of respondents (86%) felt secure alone in their homes at night, although on average twelve per cent felt unsafe, and two per cent felt very unsafe. Dublin stands out with greater feelings of safety than village/rural areas, large and smaller towns and other cities. The other cities had a smaller percentage that felt “very safe” (17%) and a greater percentage that felt “unsafe” (16%). See Table 69.

Table 69 How safe do you feel alone in your home at night?

Type of area	Very safe	Safe	Unsafe	Very unsafe	Total
	%	%	%	%	n
Dublin	25	65	8	2	2375
other city	17	64	16	3	1110
large town (10,000)	21	61	15	4	806
town (1-10,000)	21	61	14	3	1577
village, rural, open country	26	61	12	2	3565
all	23	63	12	2	9433

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Feelings of safety varied substantially by Division, ranging from 83 per cent who felt “safe” or “very safe” in Roscommon/Galway East to 56 per cent in Limerick. Of the Divisions that occupy the six lowest positions in the survey, three (Limerick, Cork City and Waterford/Kilkenny) contain “Other cities” consistent with the results in the preceding tables. See Table 70.

As regards feeling safe at home at night, the proportions feeling “safe” or “very safe” ranged from 95 per cent in Clare and 73 per cent in Laois/Offaly.

Table 70 Feelings of safety by Garda Division

Garda Division	Out walking after dark		Home alone at night	
	safe/very safe	unsafe/very unsafe	safe/very safe	unsafe/very unsafe
	%	%	%	%
Roscommon/Galway East	83	18	94	6
Clare	80	20	95	5
DMR East	79	21	88	12
Cavan/Monaghan	77	23	86	14
Longford/Westmeath	77	23	83	17
DMR South Central	77	23	90	10
Louth/Meath	76	24	87	13
Tipperary	76	24	89	11
DMR North	75	25	93	7
Mayo	74	26	89	11
Donegal	74	26	84	16
Kerry	73	27	90	10
Galway West	73	27	87	13
Cork West	72	28	93	7
Sligo/Leitrim	71	29	85	15
Cork North	71	29	83	17
Wexford/Wicklow	69	31	81	19
Carlow/Kildare	69	31	75	25
DMR North Central	68	32	85	15
DMR West	68	32	88	12
Waterford/Kilkenny	67	33	77	23
DMR South	67	33	82	18
Cork City	62	38	88	12
Laois/Offaly	60	40	73	27
Limerick	56	44	78	22
average	72	28	86	14

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

Compared with the 2005 survey, feelings of safety when out walking after dark were higher in 17 Divisions and lower in eight. The largest increases were recorded in Louth/Meath, Galway West and Carlow/Kildare. See Table 71.

From 2002 to 2006, feelings of safety when out walking after dark have shown continuous improvement in six Divisions (DMR East, Longford/Westmeath, DMR South Central, Tipperary, DMR North Central and DMR South) and continuous deterioration in four Divisions (Wexford/Wicklow, Waterford/Kilkenny, Laois/Offaly and Limerick). The greatest improvements were recorded in DMR North Central, DMR East, DMR South Central and Tipperary. The greatest deteriorations were recorded in Limerick, Laois/Offaly, Waterford/Kilkenny, Mayo and Donegal.

Compared with the 2005 survey, feelings of safety in the home at night were higher in 16 Divisions and lower in nine. The largest increases were recorded in Roscommon/Galway East, Louth/Meath and Mayo. From 2002 to 2006, feelings of

safety in the home at night have shown continuous improvement in one Division (Clare) and continuous deterioration in seven Divisions (Laois/Offaly, Waterford/Kilkenny, Limerick, Wexford/Wicklow, DMR South, Cork North and Sligo/Leitrim).

The greatest deteriorations were recorded in Laois/Offaly, Waterford/Kilkenny and Limerick. In four Divisions, a decrease in feelings of safety alone at home at night occurred, even though an increase had been recorded as regards feeling safe when out walking after dark (DMR East, DMR South, Cork North and Cavan/Monaghan).

The gap continues to reduce between feeling safe in the neighbourhood after dark and at home alone at night.

Table 71 Feelings of safety by Garda Division: 2006, 2005 and 2002 surveys

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

Table ordered according to values in column 2. Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Respondents' own views on changes in feelings of security are consistent with the earlier figures showing a slight improvement in levels of perceived safety when out walking after dark. Almost a quarter of respondents (23%) felt less safe when out

walking than a year ago, while 29 per cent felt less safe than 6 years ago. The figures are similar in the 2006 and 2005 surveys as regards perceived changes over the preceding year and six years previous.

Compared with 2002 survey the number of people who saw no difference compared with six years previously (52% in 2006) continued to increase, whereas the number who felt less safe than six years before showed a similar reduction. See Table 72.

Table 72 Do you feel more safe or less safe out walking in your area now than before?

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

Four in ten respondents were worried about becoming a victim of crime themselves, and just under half (49%) were worried about other family members and friends. Respondents being worried about themselves, their family and friends becoming a victim of crime continues to decline on levels in previous surveys. See Table 73.

Table 73 Do you worry that you or a family member or friend might become a victim of crime?

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

Seven out of ten respondents were just as worried about personal injury crime as property crime (69% for themselves, 69% for family members or friends). Of the remainder, 16 per cent worried about themselves being subject to personal injury only and 15 per cent about themselves being subject to property theft or damage. The corresponding figures for family and friends were 25 per cent and seven per cent respectively. See Table 74.

Table 74 Do you worry that you or a family member or friend might become a victim of personal injury or property theft/damage?

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

Fear of personally becoming a victim of crime ranged from 24 per cent in Mayo to 56 per cent in Limerick. Compared with 2005, fear levels were lower in nineteen Divisions and higher in six. The largest improvements were registered in DMR North (16 percentage points), Roscommon/Galway East (15 points) and Cork City (14 points). The largest deteriorations were recorded in Waterford/Kilkenny (11 percentage points) and Cork West (8 points). See Table 75.

From 2002 to 2006, fear of personally becoming a victim of crime has shown continuous improvement in eleven Divisions. The greatest increase was conveyed in DMR South Central (23 percentage points).

Fear of a family member or friend becoming a victim of crime ranged from 30 per cent in Mayo and Clare to 67 per cent in Limerick. Compared with 2005, improvements were recorded in 21 Divisions. The largest improvements were in Mayo (17 percentage points), DMR North (16 points) and Sligo/Leitrim (15 points). See Table 74.

From 2002 to 2006, fear of a family member or friend becoming a victim of crime has shown continuous improvement in twenty-one Divisions. The greatest improvement was recorded in DMR South Central (23 percentage points).

Table 75 Worry about crime victimisation by Garda Division (percentage “yes”)

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

Table ordered according to values in column 2.

In an attempt to get specific information from respondents on their perception of particular crimes, respondents were asked how worried they were about specific types of personal injury and property theft/damage crimes. Respondents indicated slightly greater concern with crimes with respect to property theft/damage compared to personal injury. “Having your home broken into and something stolen” (91%) was identified as one of the major concerns. See Table 76.

Table 76 How worried are you about the following crimes?

Personal injury	Very	Fairly	Not very	Not at all
	%	%	%	%
being mugged or robbed	37	48	12	3
being raped	21	26	27	27
being physically attacked by stranger	34	49	14	3
being insulted or pestered by anybody in street/public place	22	37	28	14
being subject to physical attack because of your religion/race/skin colour	14	17	23	46
Property theft/damage	Very	Fairly	Not very	Not at all
	%	%	%	%
having your home broken into and something stolen	49	42	8	1
having your car stolen	40	39	12	9
having things stolen from your car	37	39	15	10
having your property vandalised	45	39	12	3

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Sample sizes ranged from 6757 to 6654.

While fear of crime varies depending the nature of the crime, the majority of respondents indicated fear did not affect their quality of life significantly. Twenty five percent indicated fear of crime affected them moderately, thirty one percent reduced quality of life a little and twenty nine percent no effect at all.

Few respondents thought crime was decreasing or was not a problem in Ireland. Over eight in ten (86%) thought crime was increasing in Ireland, although a majority of respondents were more optimistic about their own area, with just over half thinking it was increasing in their locality. See Table 77.

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

Where	Increasing	Decreasing	Staying the same	Total
	%	%	%	n
in Ireland	86	2	12	9922
in your area	53	4	43	9872

Over eight in ten (85%) thought crime was a serious or very serious problem in Ireland. See Table 78.

Table 78 How would you describe crime in Ireland today?

A very serious problem	A serious problem	A fairly serious problem	Not a serious problem	Not a problem	Total
%	%	%	%	%	n
48	37	13	1	0	9885

Percentages may not sum to 100 or agree with figures in the text due to rounding.

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

Considerably more respondents thought crime and offending behaviour were a major problem in the country as a whole than in their own area. Drug crime featured highest in both categories. Close to nine out of ten respondents thought it was a major problem in the country as a whole, while for their own area 42 per cent thought drug abuse was a major problem and 35 per cent thought other drug crimes were a major problem. At the national (77%) and local level (31%), juvenile crime was third most prominent of the categories. See Table 79.

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

Where you live	Major problem	Minor problem	Not a problem	Don't know
	%	%	%	%
juvenile/teenage crime	31	45	21	3
drug abuse	42	34	17	7
other drug crimes	35	32	22	11
public drunkenness	27	42	28	3
public nuisance	22	44	31	4
race/hate crime	10	29	51	10
violent crime	18	31	45	6
property crime	26	45	24	5
car crime	28	43	25	5
white collar crime	11	30	36	24
rape-sexual assault	11	29	45	15
domestic violence	13	31	31	25
In the country as a whole	Major problem	Minor problem	Not a problem	Don't know
	%	%	%	%
juvenile/teenage crime	77	19	1	2
drug abuse	89	8	1	2
other drug crimes	87	9	2	2
public drunkenness	64	30	3	2
public nuisance	54	39	4	3
race/hate crime	51	36	8	5
violent crime	76	20	2	3
property crime	67	27	3	4
car crime	71	25	2	3
white collar crime	53	31	5	11
rape-sexual assault	63	28	3	6
domestic violence	55	32	3	11

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding; n =10046.

VIEWS ON CRIME AND THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM

Respondents were asked about what they believed was the main cause of crime. They were pressed to give only one answer but some respondents gave more than one. Interviewers showed a list of possible answers to respondents to avoid introducing bias. Six in ten respondents (60%) believed that crime could be attributed to drugs or drink or both. This was up from 58 per cent in the 2005 survey. The next most frequent answer was a lack of parental control (10%). See Table 80.

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

Cause	2006	2005	2002
	%	%	%
drugs	18	18	29
drink/alcohol	8	7	4
drugs and drink	34	32	19
reduction in moral standards	7	5	5
human greed and individual deviance	5	5	6
an unequal society – unfair distribution of wealth	5	5	6
insufficient education, health and welfare provision	3	4	3
lack of parental control	10	11	7
the Irish system of criminal justice	4	4	2
poor policing	2	2	1
lenient penal system	3	4	2
other (specify)	2	2	12
don't know	1	2	3
Total	-	-	100

n = 10046 in 2006 and 2005 surveys, and n=10315 in 2002 survey.

A majority of respondents felt that the predominant response to juvenile offending and drug abuse should be treatment rather than punishment, but attitudes would appear to be hardening somewhat since the 2002 survey (Table 81).

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

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

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Over 80 per cent felt that the criminal justice system was too lenient on offenders, a considerable increase on the 2005 survey. See Table 82.

Table 82 Criminal justice system treatment of offenders

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

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

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

Two-thirds (65%) disagreed that penalties for possession of cannabis or ecstasy should be more lenient, while half (50%) disagreed that penalties for possession of “soft” and “hard” drugs should be the same. On the other hand, while over half (54%) agreed that young people caught in possession of cannabis or ecstasy should be treated as criminals, near six out of ten (58%) agreed that they should be cautioned for a first offence.

Table 83 Views on the criminal justice system and public safety

Statement	Agree	Neither	Disagree
	%	%	%
Prison does not prevent re-offending	79	11	10
People who are different are likely to experience ridicule or personal attack on our streets	63	19	18
Alternatives to prison, such as fines, community service and probation, should be used for all but the most serious crimes and offenders	62	15	23
Young people who are caught in possession of cannabis/ecstasy should be cautioned, for first offence	58	12	29
The better off you are, the better you are treated by the criminal justice system	55	17	29
Young people who are caught in possession of cannabis/ecstasy should be treated as criminals	54	19	28
Victims of crime get a raw deal from the courts	50	23	27
The criminal justice system treats crimes of violence committed by strangers as different to those committed by people known to the victim	40	31	29
Irish culture accepts violence as a means to resolve problems	39	15	45
Penalties for possession of so-called “soft” and “hard” drugs should be the same	36	14	50
Penalties for people caught in possession of cannabis/ecstasy should be more lenient	21	13	65

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding. Mean scores are calculated from the original five-point scale. Questions were rotated in four groups and sample sizes ranged from 2482 to 2509.

NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH AND COMMUNITY ALERT

Less than a third (29%) of respondents said that they were in Neighbourhood Watch or Community Alert schemes, with just under half (48%) saying they were not; close to a quarter (24%) were unsure. The percentage that said they were in schemes is down compared with previous years, largely attributable to an increase in “don’t know” responses. See Table 84.

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

Survey	Yes	No	Don’t know	Total
	%	%	%	n
2006	29	48	24	10046
2005	33	49	18	10046
2004	40	52	7	1016
2003	47	49	4	1007
2002	45	46	9	10149

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

Of those who said they were covered by schemes, 15 per cent were kept informed regularly about criminal activity in their area, down on 2005 and 2004. See Table 85.

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

Survey	Regularly	Occasionally	Never	Total
	%	%	%	n
2006	15	45	40	2773
2005	18	38	44	3267
2004	24	30	46	394
2003	24	35	41	429
2002	15	36	50	4336

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

The level of information provision has been somewhat higher than recorded in 2005 and 2002. Nearly four in ten (37%) said they knew the name of at least one of the scheme co-ordinators, up slightly on 2005. See Table 86.

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

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

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

About four in ten respondents (42%) felt that the schemes were successful or very successful in preventing crime, down on most previous years. Over a quarter felt that the schemes made no difference (28%), also down on most previous years. The decreases under all three headings are accounted for by an increase in "don't knows", at almost a third. See Table 87.

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

Year	Very successful	Successful	Make no difference	Don't know	Total
	%	%	%	%	n
2006	8	34	28	30	10046
2005	9	33	26	32	10046
2004	16	37	36	11	1016
2003	15	40	34	11	1007
2002	10	42	31	17	10062

Percentages may not sum to 100 due to rounding.

The results were more positive from respondents who had said they were in a scheme. See Table 88.

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

2006 Survey	Very successful	Successful	Make no difference	Don't know	Total
	%	%	%	%	n
all respondents	8	34	28	30	10046
those in schemes	12	46	31	11	2867

Appendix 1

Survey questionnaire

Questionnaire
No.

41105269

() () () () ()

Version No:

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

PUBLIC ATTITUDES TO THE GARDA SÍOCHÁNA

2006

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

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

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

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

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

- ? Garda Divisional Office (list provided)
- ? Millward Brown IMS (Conor Hughes – (01) 6344277)
- ? Garda Research Unit - Sergeant Patrick Kennedy at (0504) 35428

PUBLIC ATTITUDES TO THE GARDA SÍOCHÁNA

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

1. How satisfied or dissatisfied overall were you with the service provided to the community by the Garda Síochána during 2005 (circle one only).

Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
1	2	3	4

The following set of questions relate to any experience of being the victim of crime in 2005

2. Were you or any member of your household the victim of a crime in 2005? (circle one only).

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

SHOW CARD "A"

3. a) What type of crime did you or a household member experience in 2005?
 b) How many times did you experience this in 2005?
 c) Which incident was the most recent? (Single code only)

	(A)		(B)	(C)
	Type of crime		No. of Occasions in 2005	Most Recent
Yes	No			
burglary of your home or outbuildings (breaking and entering and stealing or attempting to steal)	1	2		1
burglary of your business premises (owned by you)	1	2		2
theft of car or other vehicle	1	2		3
theft from car or other vehicle	1	2		4
theft of bicycle	1	2		5
criminal damage to car or other vehicle	1	2		6
criminal damage to home or other property	1	2		7
Robbery involving force or threat of force (including mugging)	1	2		8
theft from your person without force (e.g. pickpocket)	1	2		9
theft from your home or outbuildings, other than burglary	1	2		10
consumer fraud , such as swindling or obtaining payment using false pretences	1	2		11
physical assault (other than domestic or sexual)	1	2		12
sexual assault	1	2		13
domestic violence (physical)	1	2		14
Other (please specify)	1	2		15

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

Yes	1	
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	2
Don't know/can't remember	3

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SHOW CARD "B"

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

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

SHOW CARD "C"

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

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

ASK ALL:

The following questions relate to various forms of contact you personally may have had with the Gardaí in 2005

SHOW CARD "D"

9. a) Have you had contact with the Garda Síochána in 2005 for any of these reasons?
 b) How many times have you had contact with the Gardaí for that reason? (Repeat for each contact)
 c) What was the most recent contact? (Single code only)

(A) (B) (C)

	Yes	No	No. of Occasions in 2005	Most recent contact
Contact initiated by you				
to report a crime	1	2		1
to report a disturbance/nuisance	1	2		2
to report a traffic incident	1	2		3
to report suspicious activity	1	2		4
to report lost/found property	1	2		5
to make a general enquiry	1	2		6
to make a complaint	1	2		7
to enquire about a person in custody	1	2		8
to be a witness	1	2		9
signing passports	1	2		10
to avail of other services (witness documents etc.)	1	2		11
Garda-initiated contact				
to produce documents	1	2		12
to ask about a crime	1	2		13
to investigate a traffic collision	1	2		14
to investigate noise/disturbance	1	2		15
to carry out a routine vehicle check (on public street)	1	2		16
to make a witness statement	1	2		17
alleged speeding offence	1	2		18
alleged drink driving offence	1	2		19
alleged other driving/traffic offence	1	2		20

Arrested, detained for questioning or searched	1	2		21
to receive summons	1	2		22
any other reason (please specify)	1	2		23
.....				
.....				
If 'no' to all above please go to Q25(a)				

SHOW CARD "E"

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

Visit to a Garda station	1	?	go to Q11
Telephone call to Gardaí (excluding 999/112 calls)	2	?	go to Q12
Telephone call from Gardaí	3	?	go to Q14
Letter from Gardaí	4	?	go to Q15
Electronic means (email, etc)	5	?	go to Q15
Spoke to Garda on patrol	6		
Spoke to Garda at checkpoint/vehicle stop	7		
Garda called to my home/work	8	?	go to Q14
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 telephoned, was your call answered... (circle one only)

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

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

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

SHOW CARD "F"

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

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

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

Yes	1
No	2

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

Yes	1
No	2

17. Did a Garda call on you?

Yes	1
No	2

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

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

Yes	1	
No	2	? go to Q20.

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

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

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

Yes	1	? go to Q22(a)
No	2	

21. Do you think you should have been contacted?

Yes	1
No	2

- 22(a). Have you dialled 999 or 112 and asked for emergency Garda response in 2005?

Yes	1	
No	2	? Go to Q24

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

Yes	1
No	2
Not sure	3

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

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

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

minutes

SHOW CARD "G"

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

Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
1	2	3	4

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

SHOW CARD "G" AGAIN

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

Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
1	2	3	4

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

Yes	1	
No	2	? go to Q26

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

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

The next questions deal with Garda approachability and behaviour

SHOW CARD "H"

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yes	1
No	2

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

Yes	1	
No	2	? go to Q31

SHOW CARD "I"

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

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

ASK ALL

The next set of questions are about racism

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

Yes	1	
No	2	? go to Q36

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

Yes	1	
No	2	? go to Q34

SHOW CARD "J"

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

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

34. Why did you not report the incident? SHOW CARD "J1"

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

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

Yes	1
No	2

ASK ALL

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

SHOW CARD "K"

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

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

SHOW CARD "L"

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

Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
1	2	3	4

SHOW CARD "M"

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

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

SHOW CARD "M" AGAIN

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

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

SHOW CARD “N”

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

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

SHOW CARD “N” AGAIN

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

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

41. Were you involved in a road traffic collision as a driver of a vehicle (e.g. car, bus, lorry, motorcycle etc), a pedestrian or a cyclist in 2005 which was dealt with by the Gardaí?

Yes	1		
No	2	?	go to Q44.

42. If yes, who was most at fault?

You	1
The other party	2
Both equally	3

SHOW CARD “O”

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

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

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

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

SHOW CARD “P”

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

	Very high priority	High priority	Low priority
Investigate crime	1	2	3
Patrol on foot or bicycle	1	2	3
Patrol by car/van	1	2	3
Patrol by motorcycle	1	2	3
Enforce drink/drive laws	1	2	3
Enforce speed laws	1	2	3
Ensure effective traffic management and flow	1	2	3
Enforce laws relating to wearing of seatbelts	1	2	3
Enforce other traffic laws	1	2	3
Advise on personal safety and home security	1	2	3
Advise businesses/shops on crime prevention	1	2	3
Enforce laws relating to drugs	1	2	3
Ensure immediate response to emergencies	1	2	3
Deal with public annoyances (e.g. loud music, street fights)	1	2	3
Deal with vandalism	1	2	3
Provide help and support to victims of crime	1	2	3
Supervise licensed premises	1	2	3
Work with community groups (e.g. Neighbourhood Watch/Community Alert, youth clubs, schools, senior citizens)	1	2	3
Ensure State security	1	2	3
Enforce immigration laws	1	2	3
Deal with under-aged drinking in 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 actually give to the following policing tasks? **ROTATE STARTING POINT.**

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

ASK ALL

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

SHOW CARD "R"

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

	strongly agree	agree	neither	disagree	strongly disagree
The 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
Gardai are representative of the communities they serve	1	2	3	4	5
The local Gardai reflect the make-up of my local community	1	2	3	4	5
Gardai 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 Gardai to attend to	1	2	3	4	5

ASK ALL

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

SHOW CARD "R"

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

	strongly agree	agree	neither	disagree	strongly disagree
When people are dissatisfied with what the Gardai do, it is easy to have the matter corrected	1	2	3	4	5
The Gardai 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 Gardai provide good leadership in the guidance and direction of our young people	1	2	3	4	5
Anyone in Garda custody would be well treated	1	2	3	4	5

ASK ALL

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

SHOW CARD "R"

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

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

ASK ALL

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

SHOW CARD "R"

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

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

SHOW CARD "S"

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

Very safe	Safe	Unsafe	Very Unsafe
1	2	3	4

SHOW CARD "S" AGAIN

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

Very safe	Safe	Unsafe	Very Unsafe
1	2	3	4

SHOW CARD "T"

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

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

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

Yes	1	
No	2	? go to Q51(a)

SHOW CARD "U"

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

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

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

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

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

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

50(e) 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

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 "U" AGAIN

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

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

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

Increasing	Decreasing	Staying the same
1	2	3

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

Increasing	Decreasing	Staying the same
1	2	3

SHOW CARD "V"

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 "W"

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

ROTATE STARTING POINT.

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

SHOW CARD “W” 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 “X”

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 “Y”

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

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

ASK ALL:

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

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

Yes	1	? go to Q62
No	2	
Don't know	3	

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

Regularly	Occasionally	Never
y	y	
1	2	3

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

Yes	1
No	2
Not sure / Dont know	3

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

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

ASK ALL

These final questions are general background questions used for basic analysis

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

--	--

& CODE:-

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

B2. Record...

Male	1
Female	2

SHOW CARD “Z1”

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 "Z2"

B4. What is your nationality?

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

SHOW CARD "Z3"

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

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

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

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

B7. Do you have any dependent children?

Yes	1
No	2

SHOW CARD "Z4"

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

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

SHOW CARD "Z5"

B9. Employment status (circle one only):

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

B10. Have you ever had a paid job?

Yes	1	
No	2	? go to B13

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

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

--	--	--

INTERVIEWER RECORD CLASS

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

 GARDA REGION CODE:

 GARDA DIVISION:

B13. Do you have a telephone land-line?

Yes	1
No	2

Finally, do you have any further comments

If no suggestions, please tick box

ASSIGNMENT NUMBER

 LENGTH OF INTERVIEW
 MINS

 INTERVIEWER NUMBER

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

SIGNED

DATE

Appendix 2

Survey methodology

The *Garda Public Attitudes Survey 2006* is the eight in a series of national surveys of the adult population commissioned by the Garda Síochána. The main focus of the surveys is on satisfaction with Garda service, policing priorities and experiences and fear of crime.

Previous surveys were carried out in 2005, 2004, 2003, 2002, 2000, 1998 and 1993/1994. Sample size was 10,000 in 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 2006 survey was carried out by Mill ward 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. A number of new questions were added this year dealing with worry about being subject to particular personal injury or property theft/damage crime and how much fear of crime affected the quality of life.

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 10 April and 7 July 2006. In all, 10,046 interviews were completed.

The sampling frame was created by MBIMS by matching Electoral Divisions contained in a dataset of Garda Divisions supplied by the Garda Research Unit with the complete list of Electoral Divisions 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 and over. Social class was recorded on the basis of the occupation of the chief income earner in the

household and then later coded according to the standard list of AIMRO occupations (see under).

A total of 1,250 sampling points were selected nationwide; 50 sampling points per division. The interviewers received two copies each of four different colour coded questionnaires for each sampling point. This allowed specific questions to be rotated between respondents. The ordering of certain questions was also rotated to avoid possible position bias (see questionnaire).

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. Show cards helped speed the interview and were only used selectively (see questionnaire).

On completion of the interview, the interviewer collected personal information such as name and telephone number. These were collected for verification purposes, as 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 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. The dataset was then exported to an SPSS file for analysis by the Garda Research Unit.

Results were subsequently weighted by the Garda Research Unit 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 Millward Brown IMS state that the true population values are likely to lie within a range of ± 1 per cent of these point estimates at the national level and within a ± 4.9 per cent error margin at the Divisional level. Thus, for example, the true value of the national sample satisfaction rate of 79 per cent could vary between 78 and 80 per cent, while the true value of a similar Divisional satisfaction rate could lie between 74.1

and 83.9 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

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

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

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

Grade "A" (cont'd)

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

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

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

 Fire Officer (Chief)

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

 Headmaster/mistress - large secondary school

 Insurance underwriter

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

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

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

Guide to Grade "B" Households

Middle Class

Accountant - Qualified; no practice; employed as Executive
 Architect - Qualified; no practice; employed as Executive

 Bank Manager (small branch office - up to 12 employees)
 Business Proprietor (with 3-12 employees)

 Captain - Army/Air Corps
 Civil Servant (Principal Officer/Assistant Principal Officer)
 Commandant - Army/Air Corps
 Computer Consultant (with 3– 12 Employees)

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

 Fire Officer (Assistant Chief)

 Garda - Superintendent/Inspector

 Headmaster/mistress in primary or Secondary smaller school

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

 Journalist - not senior enough for Grade "A"

 Lecturer - University or Technical College

Grade "B" (cont'd)

Librarian - Senior, Qualified; in charge of small branch library
 Lieutenant, First - Army
 Lieutenant - Commander - Irish Naval Service
 Local Government Officer - Senior

 Manager of Factory/Business/Hotel/ Department responsible for 6-12 persons
 Matron - Non-Teaching Hospital

 Parish Priest (or equivalent in any denomination)
 People, with smaller private incomes than Grade "A" living less luxuriously
 People (retired); H/H before retirement would have been Grade "B"
 Pharmacists - Qualified (University degree); own business with 3-12 employees
 Professional people - not yet established; qualified less than 3 years

 Sales Manager(Area) responsible for 6-12 persons
 Sister/Tutor in large hospital
 Solicitor - Qualified; no practice; employed as Executive, not Grade "A"
 Surveyor - Qualified; no practice; employed as Executive, not Grade "A"

 Teacher - Senior Secondary; in charge of Department
 Technician - with degrees in Electronics/Computers/Aircraft/Chemicals/Nuclear Energy

<p>Grade "C1" (cont'd)</p> <p>Machine (Office) Operator (Punch Card, Calculating, Accounting only) Manager of Factory/Business/Hotel/Office/ Department - responsible for 1-5 persons Midwife</p> <p>Nun - any denomination; but not those with special responsibilities Nurse - Student, Staff, Sister- all State Registered</p> <p>People (retired) who before retirement would have been Grade "C1"; who have pensions rather than State or very modest private means Petty Officer - Irish Naval Service Physiotherapist Proprietor - Shop or Business - with 1-2 paid employees</p> <p>Radiographer Receptionist</p> <p>Secretary Sergeant - Army Student in any third level institution</p> <p>Teacher - Primary, Secondary, Vocational - without special responsibilities Technician/Engineer - (no degree but Technical/Professional qualification) Telegraphist Telephonist Telex Operator Typist</p> <p>Warrant Officer - Irish Naval Service</p>	<p>Guide to Grade "C2" Households</p> <p>Skilled Working Class</p> <p>AA Patrolman Ambulance Driver</p> <p>Baker Barber Barman - Head - in charge of others Blacksmith Brewer Bricklayer Butcher</p> <p>Cabinet Maker Carpenter Charge - Hand Chef Coach Builder Cobbler (Shoemaker) Composer Coppersmith Corporal - Army</p> <p>Dental Mechanic/Technician Driver - Bus Driver - Long Distance Heavy Lorry Driver and Shunter (Engine) Driver - Taxi, Who owns his own taxi Dressmaker</p> <p>Electrician Electrotyper Engraver (Process) Excavator (Crane Driver)</p> <p>Filler Finisher - Paper and Board Manufacturer Fireman - not leading Fitter - Electrical Fitter - Mechanical</p>

SOCIAL CLASS DEFINITIONS

Grade "C2" (cont'd)	Guide to Grade "D" Households
<p>People (retired) who before retirement would have been Grade "C2"; very modest private means; small pensions other than state</p> <p>Plasterer Plater Plumber Prison Officer Proprietor - small shop; no paid employees Putter</p> <p>Riveter</p> <p>Seaman - Able - Irish Naval Service Security Officer (e.g. Securicor etc.) Self-employed - Skilled; no paid employees - unskilled; 1-4 employees</p> <p>Setter Shipwright Shop Assistant - Head - in charge of others Signalman Sorter - Post Office Smelter Sprayer Stereotyper Stevedore</p> <p>Tailor - Cutter and fitter Telephone installer Toolmaker Turner Typesetter</p> <p>Upholsterer</p> <p>Vehicle Builder</p> <p>Waiter - Head - in charge of others Weaver Welder</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Other Working Class</p> <p>Apprentices (those apprenticed to skilled trade) Assembler Attendant in hospital</p> <p>Barman (no special training/responsibilities) Blender Boilerman Bottler Breadman</p> <p>Carder Caretaker Chimney Sweep Cleaner Comber Conductor (Bus) Cook</p> <p>Docker (Dock Worker) Domestic Servant Dough Mixer Doubler Drawer Dustbin man/refuse collector Dyer</p> <p>Fisherman Forestry Worker</p> <p>Gardener/Groundsman (not in charge of others) Gardener (Market) - no employees</p> <p>Housekeeper (Not in charge of others)</p>

SOCIAL CLASS DEFINITIONS

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

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 10046.

Table A1

Housing tenure	n	%
owner occupied with loan	3827	38.1
owner occupied without loan	3636	36.2
being purchased from a local authority	348	3.5
rented from a local authority	684	6.8
rented privately unfurnished	200	2.0
rented privately furnished	888	8.8
occupied free of rent	170	1.7
other	293	2.9
total	10046	100

Table A2

Gender	n	%
male	4979	49.6
female	5067	50.4
total	10046	100

Table A3

Marital status	n	%
single never married	3166	31.5
married	5137	51.1
cohabiting/living together	695	6.9
separated	296	2.9
divorced	112	1.1
widowed	605	6.0
refused/not stated	35	0.4
total	10046	100

Table A4

Social Class	n	%
AB middle/upper middle class	903	9.0
C1 lower middle class	3017	30.0
C2 skilled working class	2529	25.2
D other working class	1979	19.7
E lowest subsistence level	307	3.1
F farmer	773	7.7
refused/not stated	538	5.3
total	10046	100

Table A5

Age	n	%
18-24	1384	13.8
25-44	4319	43.0
45-64	2980	29.7
65+	1362	13.5
total	10046	100

Table A6

Dependent children	n	%
Yes	4060	40.4
No	5986	59.6
total	10046	100

Table A7

Employment status	n	%
self-employed	1160	11.5
working full-time	4217	42.0
working part-time	971	9.7
seeking work for first time	31	0.3
unemployed (having lost or given up job)	194	1.9
home (domestic) duties	1211	12.1
unable to work due to permanent illness or disability	126	1.3
not working, seeking work	128	1.3
not working, not seeking work	83	0.8
on govt. training/education scheme	22	0.2
on govt. employment scheme	7	0.1
retired	1217	12.1
student, further education	443	4.4
other	59	0.6
refused, not stated	175	1.7
total	10046	100

Table A8

Nationality	n	%
Irish	9269	92.3
UK	251	2.5
EU State	220	2.2
Other non EU country	231	2.3
Refused/not stated	74	0.7
total	10046	100

Table A9

Highest educational qualification	n	%
primary education	916	9.1
lower secondary	1518	15.1
technical or vocational	757	7.5
leaving certificate	3249	32.3
both technical/vocational and leaving certificate	622	6.2
non-degree qualification	827	8.2
primary degree	926	9.2
professional qual. at least primary degree level	382	3.8
primary degree and professional qualification	315	3.1
postgraduate degree	258	2.6
no formal qualification	90	0.9
refused/not stated	185	1.8
total	10046	100

Table A10

Locality	n	%
Dublin City	2374	23.6
other city	1109	11.0
town (pop. 10,000 – 40,000)	806	8.0
town (pop. 1,000 – 10,000)	1578	15.7
village, rural, open country	3565	35.5
refused, not stated	614	6.1
total	10046	100