

# Kamloops Public Safety Survey

A Comparison between 2006 and 2008

## Final Report

Adele Mahaffy

Jason Levine

Irwin Cohen

Darryl Plecas



School of Criminology and Criminal Justice  
University of the Fraser Valley

April 2008

## **Executive Summary**

This report presents the results of a public safety survey conducted by the School of Criminology and Criminal Justice at the University of the Fraser Valley for the Kamloops Detachment of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP). The survey is the second of two public surveys conducted by the University of the Fraser Valley for the Kamloops RCMP, the first of which was conducted in October, 2006. Like the first survey, the second one describes Kamloops residents' feelings about their own personal safety and the nature and extent of any victimization(s) in the most recent year. Conducted in March of 2008, the survey also sought to determine residents' level of satisfaction with the Kamloops RCMP. The survey involved mailing a questionnaire to 1070 randomly selected Kamloops residents, 42% of whom responded. The earlier survey involved a mailing to 1175 residents, 48% of who responded. The methodology employed for both surveys is identical.

Throughout this report, reference is made to the earlier survey for comparison purposes. Some highlights of the current survey findings are:

- Nearly all respondents (90% plus) reported feeling safe in their homes, neighborhood, and community during the day. Likewise, the vast majority of respondents reported feeling safe at night as well. As would be expected, respondents' feelings of safety decrease somewhat as they travel further away from their homes at night. These results are virtually identical to the results obtained in the 2006 survey.
- The vast majority of respondents reported that there was no change in their personal feelings of safety in either their neighborhood or the Kamloops area compared to one year ago. When asked to consider their feelings today as compared to five years ago, one-third of respondents (33 per cent) felt that their personal sense of safety in their neighborhood had declined; an even larger percentage (45 per cent) felt that their personal sense of safety in the Kamloops area had declined. Nonetheless, over the same time period, few respondents felt that their neighborhood or community overall was less safe than neighborhoods or municipalities elsewhere in British Columbia (13 per cent and 17 per

cent respectively). Again, these findings are essentially the same as those found in the survey conducted in 2006.

- Nearly one-quarter (23 per cent) of respondents indicated that they were victims of at least one crime in the community in the past year. Specifically, of the entire sample, 22% were victims of at least one property crime, 7% were victims of at least one violent crime, and 5% were victims of at least one violent and one property crime. Among those who reported being the victim of at least one crime in the past 12 months, 70% were satisfied with the police response. Once again, these results are almost identical to the results obtained in the 2006 survey.
- Non-reporting of victimization to police was high with 39% of those who were victimized in the past 12 months not reporting the crime to police. Notably though, the majority (62 per cent) of these victims indicated that they did not report their victimization because they felt that the police could not do anything about the incident. Nearly half (49 per cent) did not report the incident to police as they considered the incident too minor or not important enough to report.
- Satisfaction with the Kamloops RCMP continued to be high. Specifically, 93% of all respondents (as compared to 90% in 2006) reported being satisfied overall, and the vast majority of respondents still report being satisfied when specific aspects of police activity are considered.
- While the majority of respondents rated local RCMP officers highly on virtually all of nine qualities considered, a large percentage rated local officers as being “neither high or low” (a percentage range of 36 to 53 depending on the quality considered). Less than 5% of respondents to the 2008 survey (as compared to 11% from the 2006 survey) rated local RCMP officers low on any one of the qualities considered.
- Respondents identified a number of problems in their neighborhoods that they felt police should devote more resources and attention to. As with the 2006 survey, of primary concern was traffic related issues (48 per cent), followed by drug related issues (43 per cent). This level and nature of concern was virtually identical to that identified in the 2006 survey. One difference, however, was

with respect to a perception of gang problems. In the current survey, 25% expressed this concern, while just 17% expressed this concern in the 2006 survey.

- Slightly more than half (52 per cent) of respondents (compared to 36% in the 2006 survey) provided additional comments at the end of the questionnaire. As with the 2006 survey, the most frequently offered comments were focused on those issues respondents felt police should devote more attention to (i.e. traffic, drugs, and gangs). Moreover, respondents also volunteered comments related to what is perhaps best described as a general frustration with the judicial system. Very few respondents offered comments that were critical of the police.

## Table of Contents

Introduction .....	- 1 -
Methodology .....	- 1 -
Results .....	- 1 -
Characteristics of Respondents.....	- 1 -
Residents' Sense of Personal Safety.....	- 2 -
Respondents' Reported Victimization.....	- 4 -
Respondents' Reporting of Victimization to the RCMP.....	- 5 -
Respondents' Rating of and Satisfaction with the RCMP .....	- 10 -
Problems Identified by Respondents as Deserving More Police Resources and Attention .....	- 12 -
Conclusion.....	- 13 -

## List of Tables

Table 1: Selected Characteristics of Respondents.....	- 2 -
Table 2: Feelings of Personal Safety .....	- 2 -
Table 3: Perceptions of Personal Safety over Time.....	- 3 -
Table 4: Types of Victimizations.....	- 4 -
Table 5: Type of Victimization that had the Most Negative Impact on the Respondent .....	- 5 -
Table 6: Method that Victims Used to Contact the Kamloops RCMP in Response to their Most Serious Victimization .....	- 6 -
Table 7: Ways that the RCMP Responded to Victims .....	- 7 -
Table 8: Reasons for Not Reporting Victimizations to the Kamloops RCMP .....	- 8 -
Table 9: Reasons for having Direct Contact with the Kamloops RCMP .....	- 9 -
Table 10: Satisfaction with the Kamloops RCMP.....	- 10 -
Table 11: Ratings of Kamloops RCMP Officers by Respondents .....	- 12 -
Table 12: Problems the Kamloops RCMP should Devote more Resources and Attention to .....	- 13 -

## **Introduction**

This report describes the results of a public safety survey that was conducted by the School of Criminology and Criminal Justice at the University of the Fraser Valley for the Kamloops Detachment of the RCMP. The purpose of the survey was to assess Kamloops residents' feelings about their own personal safety and the nature and extent of any victimization in the past 12 months. The survey also sought to determine residents' level of satisfaction with the Kamloops RCMP. The overall aim of the survey was to provide the Kamloops RCMP with information helpful to improving the quality of local police services. In describing the survey results, this report provides a comparison to the results of an identical public survey conducted by the University of the Fraser for the Kamloops RCMP in 2006.

## **Methodology**

The methodology used in this survey involved mailing a questionnaire (see Appendix A) to a randomly selected sample of 1,200 residents of the Kamloops area in March 2008. The sample of residents was drawn using the Kamloops Area telephone directory. Follow-up telephone calls were made to residents immediately after the questionnaires were mailed to help maximize participation rates. Some questionnaires were undeliverable (i.e. resident had moved or the address in the directory was incorrect) which reduced the number of eligible respondents. Overall, the response to the survey was impressive with a total of 452 out of 1,070 residents who received a questionnaire returning it – a response rate of 42% (compared to a response rate of 48% in the 2006 survey).

## **Results**

### **Characteristics of Respondents**

As indicated by Table 1, respondents to both the 2006 and 2008 surveys were primarily male Caucasians and the mean age of the sample was 57 years old. In effect, the sample underrepresented females and younger people. However, respondents had lived for a long period of time in Kamloops. Specifically, respondents had lived in Kamloops for

approximately 15 years at the time of completing the survey. A slight majority were employed (58 per cent), nearly three-quarters (71 per cent) were married, and the large majority (65 per cent) had at least some post-secondary education.

*Table 1: Selected Characteristics of Respondents*

<b>Characteristics</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2008</b>
<b>Avg. # of Years Living in the Community</b>	14 Years	15 Years
<b>% Employed</b>	55%	58%
<b>% Married</b>	68%	71%
<b>% Male</b>	57%	54%
<b>Avg. Age</b>	57 Years Old	57 Years Old
<b>% Caucasian</b>	91%	91%
<b>% No Post-Secondary Education</b>	41%	35%

### **Residents' Sense of Personal Safety**

The results to the questions regarding residents' perceived levels of safety in their neighborhood were generally positive. Nearly all respondents reported feeling safe in their home, neighborhood, and in the community during the day. Further, a large percentage of respondents reported feeling safe at night, especially in their residence (89 per cent). As expected, the further away from their residence a respondent traveled at night, the more likely they were to report feeling unsafe (see Table 2). However, it is important to note that only a small majority of residents (53 per cent) felt safe at night outside of their neighbourhood, but still in Kamloops. In terms of yearly comparisons, there were no significant differences between the results from 2006 and the 2008 results.

*Table 2: Feelings of Personal Safety*

	<b>2006</b>	<b>2008</b>
<b>Daytime</b>	Feel Very or Somewhat Safe	Feel Very or Somewhat Safe
<b>At Residence</b>	97%	96%
<b>In Neighbourhood</b>	96%	95%
<b>In Kamloops</b>	90%	91%



<b>Night Time</b>		
<b>At Residence</b>	88%	89%
<b>In Neighbourhood</b>	79%	75%
<b>In Kamloops</b>	55%	53%

In terms of respondents' personal safety in various situations, most residents reported that there was no change in their feelings of personal safety in their neighborhood when compared to a year ago. However, compared to five years ago, more respondents felt that their level of safety had declined (see Table 3). There were similar results when respondents were asked about their safety in the Kamloops area in general. There was a noticeable difference when respondents were asked about their level of safety compared to other neighborhoods in their area, as well as compared to other municipalities in British Columbia. In both instances, very few respondents (17 per cent) felt their neighborhood or community was less safe than other neighborhoods or municipalities elsewhere. Once again, it can be seen that the results are essentially the same as found in the 2006 survey.

*Table 3: Perceptions of Personal Safety over Time*

	<b>Much or Somewhat Safer</b>		<b>No Change</b>		<b>Much or Somewhat Less Safe</b>	
	<b>2006</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2008</b>
<b>In Your Neighbourhood</b>						
Compared to 1 Yr. Ago	11%	8%	74%	77%	15%	15%
Compared to 5 Yrs. Ago	15%	15%	54%	52%	31%	33%
Compared to Other Neighbourhood	52%	47%	35%	36%	14%	17%
<b>In the Kamloops Area</b>						
Compared to 1 yr. Ago	9%	9%	62%	66%	30%	25%
Compared to 5 Yrs. Ago	12%	12%	40%	44%	48%	44%
Compared to other Neighbourhoods	51%	49%	32%	34%	17%	17%

## Respondents' Reported Victimization

Respondents were asked a series of questions about their recent victimization experiences. In order to measure more current victimization experiences, respondents were provided with a list of 13 possible crimes and asked which, if any, they had been the victims of within the Kamloops area during the past twelve months. Nearly one-quarter (23 per cent) of respondents reported that they were the victim of at least one crime in the past 12 months. More specifically, slightly more than one-fifth (22 per cent) were victims of at least one property crime, 7% were victims of at least one violent offence, and 5% were victims of at least one property and one violent crime. The crimes respondents were most commonly victims of were attempted theft of household property (13 per cent), vandalism (11 per cent), and attempted motor vehicle theft (7 per cent) (see Table 4). These victimization patterns and rates were essentially the same as the results obtained in the 2006 survey.

*Table 4: Types of Victimitizations*

	% of Respondents who Reported Specific Types of Victimization	
	2006	2008
Theft of Household Property	12%	13%
Vandalism	12%	11%
Attempted Motor Vehicle Theft	6%	7%
Break and Enter	4%	5%
Stalking or Harassment	3%	5%
Theft of Personal Property	6%	4%
Threats or Intimidation	5%	2%
Motor Vehicle Theft	3%	2%
Assault without a Weapon	2%	1%
Robbery or Attempted Robbery	0	1%
Assault with a Weapon	1%	0
Attempted Sexual Assault	0	0
Sexual Assault	0	0

Respondents were also asked to indicate which of the victimizations they experienced in the past 12 months had the most negative impact on them (Table 5). Of the proportion of respondents who reported being a

victim of any type of crime in 2008 (n = 101), approximately one-quarter (22 per cent) felt that theft of household property had the most negative impact on them, while one-fifth reported that vandalism had the most negative impact on them. In total, 12% of respondents reported that an instance of break and enter had the most negative impact. As indicated by Table 5, there were no statistically significant differences in the result of 2006 compared to 2008.

*Table 5: Type of Victimization that had the Most Negative Impact on the Respondent*

	% of Respondents who Reported Specific Types of Victimization	
	2006	2008
Theft of Household Property	26%	22%
Vandalism	21%	20%
Attempted Motor Vehicle Theft	6%	10%
Break and Enter	9%	12%
Stalking or Harassment	3%	3%
Theft of Personal Property	11%	8%
Threats or Intimidation	9%	8%
Motor Vehicle Theft	6%	6%
Assault without a Weapon	2%	3%
Robbery or Attempted Robbery	0	0
Assault with a Weapon	2%	0
Attempted Sexual Assault	0	1%
Sexual Assault	1%	1%

### **Respondents' Reporting of Victimization to the RCMP**

Of the respondents who reported being victimized in the last 12 months, slightly less than two-thirds (63 per cent) who identified a most serious victimization indicated that they reported this specific victimization to the

police. Among those who did contact the police, a slight majority (55 per cent) reported by telephoning the non-emergency phone number, more than one-quarter (28 per cent) called 9-11, and 8% visited the police headquarters station (Table 6). For the most part, these results were similar to those of the 2006 survey. The main differences were in the small proportions of victims who in 2008 were more likely to telephone 9-11 as opposed to the non-emergency number.

*Table 6: Method that Victims Used to Contact the Kamloops RCMP in Response to their Most Serious Victimization*

	% of Respondents who Used the Specified Method	
	2006	2008
Telephoned the Non-Emergency Number	61%	55%
Telephoned 9-11	20%	28%
Visited the Police Headquarters Station	9%	8%
The Police Initiated the Contact	1%	5%
Visited a Community Police Station	4%	3%
Flagged Down a Patrol Car	0	0
Approached a Police Officer in Person	0	0
Some Other Way	5%	2%

In terms of a police response, the RCMP handled contacts from victims in a variety of different ways. The most common response from the RCMP was to take the information from the victim (80 per cent). Other common responses were to send out a patrol car (56 per cent) or filing a report or conducting an investigation (34 per cent) (see Table 7). Regardless of how victims contacted the police or the actions taken by the police, slightly less than two-thirds of victims (64 per cent) reported being satisfied

with the way in which the RCMP responded to their victimization. This finding was comparable to the results of the 2006 survey in which approximately two-thirds of victims (66 per cent) reported being satisfied with the way the RCMP responded to their victimization.

*Table 7: Ways that the RCMP Responded to Victims*

	% of Respondents who Reported Specific Types of Victimization	
	2006	2008
Took the Information	66%	80%
Sent a Patrol Car	49%	56%
Made a Report of Conducted an Investigation	39%	34%
Gave a Warning or Arrested the Offender	8%	10%
Provided the Information Requested by Victim(s)	14%	8%
Asked the Victim(s) to Visit Police Headquarters	9%	5%
Referred the Victim(s) to Another Agency	8%	5%
Referred the Victim(s) to a Victim Service Worker	4%	5%
Asked the Victim(s) to Visit the Community Police Office	6%	3%
Put the Victim(s) in Touch with Community Services	3%	0

It is interesting to note that although a majority of victims who contacted the police were satisfied with the police response(s) they received, in only

a few cases (10 per cent), in 2008, did the police response include warning or arresting the offender(s). Similarly, a small proportion of victims reported that they were provided with the information they requested from the RCMP. As it is clear that the general lack of providing these two forms of responses did not affect victims' overall satisfaction with the Kamloops RCMP, this might reflect the public's general expectations of the police. In other words, given the nature of the victimizations reported in this study, citizens might simply not expect that the police will be forthcoming with information or to warn or arrest a suspect.

In terms of non-reporting, slightly more than one-third of victims (39 per cent) did not contact the police. Of some concern might be that there was an increase from 2006 to 2008 in the proportion of victims who did not contact the police about their most serious victimization because they felt that the police could not do anything (49 per cent in 2006 to 62 per cent in 2008). This finding is even more important when one considers the fact that there was a decrease in the proportion of victims in 2008 who did not contact the police because they felt the incident was too minor (49 per cent in 2008 compared to 60 per cent in 2006). With these two important exceptions, there were very similar results for the other main reasons for not reporting victimizations to the RCMP between 2006 and 2008 (see Table 8).

*Table 8: Reasons for Not Reporting Victimizations to the Kamloops RCMP*

	% of Respondents who Reported a Specific Reason for Not Reporting Victimization	
	2006	2008
Did Not Think the Police Could Do Anything	49%	62%
Incident was Too Minor or Not Important Enough	60%	49%
Police Would Not Help	8%	13%
Nothing was Taken or the Items were Recovered	10%	10%
Fear of Revenge by Offender(s)	8%	10%
Dealt with Incident in Some Other Way	4%	8%
Fear of Publicity or Media Coverage	0	8%
Did Not Want to get Involved with the Police or	4%	3%

<b>Courts</b>		
Did Not Want a Child or Children Arrested or Jailed	0	3%
Did Not Want Anyone to Find Out About the Incident	0	3%
Family Put Pressure on Victim to Not Contact Police	0	3%

In addition to inquiring about victims' contacts with the RCMP as a result of their most serious victimization over the past 12 months, respondents were asked to indicate whether they had any other contacts with the police over the same time period. Nearly one-quarter of the 2008 sample (23 per cent) reported having had at least one direct contact with the police in the past 12 months. Nearly half of these respondents (45 per cent) had only a single contact with Kamloops RCMP over the past year, while 11% reported having six or more such contacts. In 2008, the most common reasons for having direct contact with the police, aside from the option of "some other reason", was to report a traffic accident (23 per cent) or as part of a police traffic enforcement action (19 per cent). This finding was in contrast to the 2006 data in which the most common reason for direct police contact was to report a suspicious person (26 per cent) (see Table 9). Importantly, there was a decrease to a very small proportion for the number of respondents who had direct contact with the RCMP to report a violent crime (5 per cent in 2006 compared to 1 per cent in 2008) or to complain about police services (6 per cent in 2006 compared to 1 per cent in 2008).

*Table 9: Reasons for having Direct Contact with the Kamloops RCMP*

	% of Respondents who Reported a Specific Reason	
	2006	2008
To Report a Traffic Accident	15%	23%

<b>As Part of a Police Traffic Enforcement Action</b>	17%	19%
<b>To Report a Suspicious Person</b>	26%	15%
<b>To Request Information</b>	16%	13%
<b>To Report a Property Crime</b>	16%	10%
<b>To Be Questioned about a Possible Crime</b>	9%	3%
<b>To Complain about Police Services</b>	6%	1%
<b>To Report a Violent Crime</b>	5%	1%
<b>For Some Other Reason</b>	38%	50%

### **Respondents' Rating of and Satisfaction with the RCMP**

Similar to the findings of the 2006 survey, the vast majority of respondents were satisfied with the Kamloops RCMP. Notably, nearly all respondents (93 per cent) reported being satisfied overall. As indicated by Table 10, the vast majority of respondents were satisfied with the RCMP's ability to communicate with the public (90 per cent), their actions with respect to seeking public input (81 per cent), and the Kamloops RCMP's competency in solving crimes (88 per cent). A somewhat smaller proportion of respondents (64 per cent) were satisfied with the Kamloops RCMP's ability to prevent crime. An overwhelming majority of respondents were also satisfied with the professionalism of the Kamloops RCMP (93 per cent) and a majority of respondents were also satisfied with the number of officers on the street (60 per cent); however, on this issue, there were many respondents (40 per cent) who were not satisfied with the number of officers on the street. It is also very important to keep in mind that, although the results were very similar to the findings for the 2006 survey, in all areas targeted by the survey, there was a slight increase in the proportion of respondents who were satisfied with the Kamloops RCMP (see Table 10).

*Table 10: Satisfaction with the Kamloops RCMP*



	<b>% of Respondents who Reported Being Very or Mostly Satisfied</b>	
	<b>2006</b>	<b>2008</b>
<b>Professionalism of the Department</b>	91%	93%
<b>Ability to Communicate with the Public</b>	87%	90%
<b>Competence in Solving Crimes</b>	85%	88%
<b>Seeking of Public Input</b>	79%	81%
<b>Ability to Prevent Crimes</b>	62%	64%
<b>Number of Officers on the Streets</b>	58%	60%

The majority of respondents also gave high ratings when asked to rate the typical Kamloops RCMP officer. In effect, with the exceptions of 'being objective' and 'fairness', a majority of respondents rated the Kamloops RCMP officers as either 'high' or 'very high' all the characteristics presented in Table 11. Still, it is interesting to note that, while the drop was typically only a few percentage points, in all of the characteristics presented in Table 11, the public's attitude towards Kamloops RCMP officers declined in 2008 when compared to the 2006 findings. For example, while 65% of respondents in the 2006 gave high or very high ratings for the level of courtesy displayed by Kamloops RCMP officers, this rate dropped to 60% in 2008. Similarly, trustworthiness dropped from 60% to 56%, while concern for the public dropped from 62% in 2006 to 55% in 2008. The two characteristics with the great percentage point drop (7%) were honesty (62 per cent in 2006 compared to 55 per cent in 2008) and fairness (50 per cent in 2006 compared to 43 per cent in 2008). In considering these findings, however, it is important to consider that the proportion of respondents who rated the police as 'low' or 'very low' on these characteristics was extremely small in 2008. For example, only 4% of respondents rated that police as 'low' or 'very low' on courtesy, trustworthiness, concern for the public, honesty, reliability, hardworking, or fairness.

*Table 11: Ratings of Kamloops RCMP Officers by Respondents*

	% of Respondents who Rated the Police as 'High' or 'Very High'	
	2006	2008
Courtesy	65%	60%
Trustworthiness	60%	56%
Concern for the Public	62%	58%
Knowledge of the Law	60%	58%
Honesty	62%	55%
Reliability	58%	52%
Hardworking	61%	57%
Being Objective	51%	46%
Fairness	50%	43%

### **Problems Identified by Respondents as Deserving More Police Resources and Attention**

Respondents were asked if there were any problems in their neighbourhoods that they felt police should devote more resources and attention to. As indicated by Table 12, traffic related issues were most commonly cited (48 per cent) followed by drug related issues (44 per cent), and issues involving teen-agers (41 per cent). Very few respondents felt that more police resources should target vacant or deserted storefronts or houses (8 per cent), litter on the street (16 per cent), or adults causing trouble (17 per cent). Interestingly, only one-quarter of respondents indicated that more police attention and resources should be focused on gang-related crime.

*Table 12: Problems the Kamloops RCMP should Devote more Resources and Attention to*

	% of Respondents who Felt this was a Problem	
	2006	2008
Speeding and Other Traffic-Related Issues	47%	48%
People Selling or Using Drugs	43%	44%
Groups of Teens Hanging Out and Causing Trouble	38%	41%
Drinking in Public	22%	23%
Prostitution	19%	17%
Gang-Related Crime	18%	25%
Graffiti on Building or Walls	18%	22%
Litter on the Street or Sidewalks	16%	16%
Groups of Adults Hanging Out and Causing Trouble	16%	17%
Vacant or Deserted Storefronts or Houses	10%	8%

## **Conclusion**

The results of the 2008 survey indicated that the vast majority of respondents felt that their communities were safe places to live. As would be expected, feelings of safety decrease somewhat after dark and when respondents travelled further away from their homes. Further, while approximately one-third of survey respondents indicated that they felt less safe in 2008 than they did five years ago, very few described their area as being less safe than other municipalities in British Columbia. In fact, similar to the 2006 findings, only 17% of respondents described the Kamloops area as being less safe than other municipalities.

Respondents' feelings of personal safety were consistent with their reports of victimization. Specifically, nearly one-quarter (23 per cent) of respondents reported being victimized in the last year and the most

common type of victimization was some form of property crime. Moreover, while non-reporting of victimization was high (39 per cent), almost half (49 per cent) of those respondents felt that the incident was too minor or not important enough to involve the police.

Satisfaction with the Kamloops RCMP was high. Virtually all of the respondents reported being satisfied with their police, and the vast majority of respondents also reported being satisfied when considering specific police activities. The majority of respondents also gave high ratings to local RCMP officers. Less than 6% of respondents rated local RCMP officers low on any one of the qualities considered. However, the proportion of respondents who rated the police 'high' or 'very high' on all characteristics was slightly lower than in 2006.

Respondents identified a number of problems in their neighborhoods that they felt police should devote more resources and attention to. Most commonly cited were traffic-related issues (48 per cent) and drug use and selling (44 per cent).

For the most part, comments offered by respondents at the end of the questionnaire were focused on those issues they felt police should devote more attention to. Among respondents who offered comments, slightly more than one-third (37 per cent) mentioned their general satisfaction with police. Still, some common concerns included both a greater desire for more police patrols and for more police visibility, particularly in the downtown core and parks. Interestingly, nearly one-quarter of respondents (22 per cent) who provided additional comments expressed a general concern with the judicial system.

In sum, there was not much change in the rate and nature of victimization reported by respondents for 2006 and 2008. Similarly, attitudes towards the police were generally favourable and consistent over the two time periods. The rating of police officers and the nature of public concerns were also generally consistent over the two time periods. Considering all of the data, the public is generally satisfied with the Kamloops RCMP and has confidence in the police department as a whole and individual officers.

## Appendix

### Questionnaire

(With percentage results reported)

# Public Safety Survey

## Kamloops Area



**School of Criminology and Criminal Justice**

Dr. Irwin M. Cohen

Dr. Darryl Plecas

This document may not be reproduced in any manner, in whole or in part, without the written permission of the School of Criminology and Criminal Justice, University College of the Fraser Valley

## **INSTRUCTIONS**

We hope that you will find this questionnaire easy to follow. In most cases, all you have to do is circle or check the answer that best describes how you feel. The questionnaire should take you about 15 minutes to complete.

As you have been advised by the enclosed covering letter, your participation is voluntary, and your responses will be anonymous to the RCMP and the university researchers. In this regard, please remember that the questionnaires are returned directly to us at UCFV, all of the information is aggregated for reporting purposes, and we will not reveal individual responses to anyone.

In addition to your anonymity, you are free to not answer any question in the survey that you would rather not answer.

You will see that we have provided you with a pre-stamped envelope for the return of your questionnaire. We are hoping to have your questionnaire returned to us by

**Friday, March 28th, 2008.**

For the present, if you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me at the University College of the Fraser Valley at 604-854-4553. For any concerns regarding the administration of the survey, please contact Yvon Dandurand, Dean of Research and Industry Liaison at 604-864-4654.

Many thanks,

Dr. Darryl Plecas  
University Research Chair  
School of Criminology & Criminal Justice  
University-College of the Fraser Valley



## A. IS YOUR COMMUNITY A SAFE PLACE TO LIVE?

In this section, we would like you to tell us how safe you feel in your residence and neighborhood generally, at night and during the day. We would also like to know whether or not your sense of personal safety has changed since you have moved into your present neighborhood. By neighborhood, we mean the geographic area that is within a 15 minute walk in any direction from your home. *Please circle the numbers that best indicate how you feel.*

### 1. How safe do you feel in each of the following situations?

2008	Very Unsafe	Somewhat Unsafe	Somewhat Safe	Very Safe
In your residence during the daytime?	2%	2%	27%	70%
In your residence during the night?	3%	9%	41%	48%
In your neighborhood during the daytime?	2%	4%	32%	63%
In your neighborhood during the night?	5%	21%	42%	30%
In the Kamloops area during the daytime?	2%	7%	50%	41%
In the Kamloops area during the night?	8%	39%	43%	10%

2006	Very	Somewhat	Somewhat	Very
------	------	----------	----------	------

	Unsafe	at Unsafe	at Safe	Safe
In your residence during the daytime?	1%	2%	26%	71%
In your residence during the night?	2%	10%	43%	45%
In your neighborhood during the daytime?	1%	3%	30%	66%
In your neighborhood during the night?	5%	17%	52%	27%
In the Kamloops area during the daytime?	1%	9%	51%	39%
In the Kamloops area during the night?	7%	38%	47%	8%

## 2. What is your sense of personal safety in your neighborhood?

2008	Much Less Safe	Somewhat Less Safe	No Change	Somewhat Safer	Much Safer	Does Not Apply
Compared to one year ago?	2%	13%	77%	6%	2%	
Compared to five years ago?	6%	28%	52%	9%	5%	
Compared to other neighborhoods in your area?	4%	13%	36%	33%	15%	

2006	Much Less Safe	Somewhat Less Safe	No Change	Somewhat Safer	Much Safer	Does Not Apply

	Less Safe	Less Safe	e			Apply
Compared to one year ago?	1%	14%	74%	7%	4%	
Compared to five years ago?	8%	23%	54%	11%	4%	
Compared to other neighborhoods in your area?	3%	11%	35%	33%	19%	

**3. What is your sense of personal safety in the Kamloops area?**

2008	Much Less Safe	Somewhat Less Safe	No Change	Somewhat Safer	Much Safer	Does Not Apply
Compared to one year ago?	2%	23%	66%	8%	1%	
Compared to five years ago?	10%	35%	44%	10%	2%	
Compared to other municipalities in BC	4%	13%	34%	37%	12%	

2006	Much Less Safe	Somewhat Less Safe	No Change	Somewhat Safer	Much Safer	Does Not Apply

Compared to one year ago?	3%	27%	62%	6%	3%	
Compared to five years ago?	12%	36%	40%	8%	4%	
Compared to other municipalities in BC	3%	14%	32%	36%	15%	

## **B. HAVE YOU BEEN A VICTIM OF CRIME IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS?**

In this section, we would like you to tell us if you have been the victim of crime **in the Kamloops area** in the last 12 months. **If you have not been victimized in the last 12 months, please proceed to QUESTION 17.**

**4. In the past 12 months, have you been the victim of any of the following crimes. Check all that apply.**

	Yes 2008	Yes 2006
1. Vandalism (something was damaged on purpose)	11%	12%
2. Theft of household property or attempted theft of household property	13%	12%
3. Theft of personal property or attempted theft or personal property	4%	6%
4. Attempted motor vehicle theft (where something was damaged)	7%	6%
5. Motor vehicle theft	2%	3%
6. Break and enter or attempted break and enter	5%	4%
7. Threats or intimidation	5%	5%
8. Stalking or Harassment	2%	3%
9. Assault without a weapon, but no theft of property or attempted theft of property	1%	2%
10. Assault with a weapon, but no theft of property or attempted theft of property	0%	1%

11. Robbery or Attempted Robbery	0%	0%
12. Attempted Sexual Assault, Molestation, or Attempted Molestation	1%	0%
13. Sexual Assault where intercourse occurred	0%	0%

**IF YOU HAVE NOT BEEN THE VICTIM OF A CRIMINAL OFFENCE IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS IN THE KAMLOOPS AREA, PLEASE GOT TO QUESTION 17**

**5. Thinking about all the victimizations you just indicated, in general, did you report the incident(s) to the RCMP?**

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2006</u>	
1. No	36%	37%	<b>(GO TO QUESTION #7)</b>
2. Yes	64%	63%	<b>(GO TO QUESTION #6)</b>

**6. In general, were you satisfied with the police response?**

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2006</u>
1. No	30%	28%
2. Yes	70%	72%

**7. Thinking about all the victimizations you just indicated in Question 4, please indicate which one was the most serious in that it had the most negative impact on you. PLEASE ONLY SELECT ONE VICTIMIZATION.**

Yes 2008	Yes 2006
-------------	-------------

1. Vandalism (something was damaged on purpose)	20%	21%
2. Theft of household property or attempted theft of household property	22%	26%
3. Theft of personal property or attempted theft or personal property	8%	11%
4. Attempted motor vehicle theft (where something was damaged)	10%	10%
5. Motor vehicle theft	6%	6%
6. Break and enter or attempted break and enter	12%	9%
7. Threats or intimidation	8%	9%
8. Stalking or Harassment	3%	3%
9. Assault without a weapon, but no theft of property or attempted theft of property	3%	2%
10. Assault with a weapon, but no theft of property or attempted theft of property	0%	2%
11. Robbery or Attempted Robbery	0%	0%
12. Attempted Sexual Assault, Molestation, or Attempted Molestation	1%	0%
13. Sexual Assault where intercourse occurred	1%	1%

**8. Did you or anyone else report this particular crime to the police?**

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2006</u>	
1. No	39%	39%	<b>(GO TO QUESTION #12)</b>
2. Yes	61%	61%	<b>(GO TO QUESTION #9)</b>

**9. How did you contact the police? (Check only ONE response)**

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2006</u>
1. Telephoned 911	28%	20%
2. Telephoned the non-emergency number	55%	61%
3. Visited the police headquarters station	8%	9%
4. Visited a community police station	3%	4%
5. Flagged down a patrol vehicle	0%	0%
6. Approached a police officer in person	0%	0%
7. The police initiated the contact	5%	1%
8. Some other way	2%	5%

**10. How did your local police respond to your request? Please check all that apply.**

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2006</u>
1. Took information	80%	66%
2. Sent a patrol car	56%	49%



3. Asked you to visit the headquarters building	5%	
9%		
4. Asked you to visit the community police office	3%	6%
5. Provided the information you requested	8%	14%
6. Referred you to another agency	5%	8%
7. Made a report or conducted an investigation	34%	
39%		
8. Gave a warning or arrested the offender	10%	8%
9. Put you in touch with community services	0%	3%
10. Referred you to a Victim Service Worker	5%	4%

**11. How satisfied were you with the local police response?**

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2006</u>	
1. Very Unsatisfied	15%	17%	<b>(GO TO QUESTION #13)</b>
2. Somewhat Unsatisfied	20%	17%	<b>(GO TO QUESTION #13)</b>
3. Mainly Satisfied	42%	43%	<b>(GO TO QUESTION #13)</b>
4. Very Satisfied	23%	23%	<b>(GO TO QUESTION #13)</b>

**12. There are many different circumstances that may affect why people do not report their victimization to the police. Were any of the following reasons why you did not report this incident to the local police?**

	Yes 2008	Yes 2006
1. You did not want to get involved with the police or the courts.	3%	4%

2. Did not think that the police could not do anything about the incident.	62%	72%
3. Fear of revenge by the offender.	10%	8%
4. The incident was too minor or it was not important enough.	49%	60%
5. The incident was a personal matter and did not concern the police.	3%	0%
6. Nothing was taken or the items were recovered.	10%	10%
7. You dealt with it in another way.	8%	4%
8. You did not want anyone to find out about the incident.	3%	0%
9. Family member(s) put pressure on you to not contact the police.	3%	0%
10. The police would not help.	13%	8%
11. You did not want to get involved with police.	0%	0%
12. Fear of publicity or media coverage.	8%	0%
13. You did not want a child or children arrested or jailed.	3%	0%

### **C. HAS BEING A VICTIM OF CRIME AFFECTED YOU?**

In this section, we would like you to explain the extent to which you have been affected by the crime(s) referred to in Section B.

**13. Were you physically injured by any crime in Kamloops Area in the last 12 months?**

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2006</u>
1. No	96%	82%
2. Yes, but no medical attention was required	3%	14%
3. Yes and medical attention was required	1%	5%

**14. Did you suffer any financial losses for any crime in Kamloops that occurred in the last 12 months?**

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2006</u>
1. No 38%		34%
2. Yes, but insurance did not cover any of the losses 46%		37%
3. Yes, but insurance only covered a partial of the losses 14%		23%
4. Yes and insurance covered all of the losses 2%		7%

**15. Was an offender identified in your case?**

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2006</u>
1. No	79%	87%
2. Yes, but I did not know the offender	12%	6%
3. Yes and I knew the offender	9%	7%

16. To your knowledge, has anyone else in your household been a victim of crimes in Kamloops in the past 12 months?

		<u>2008</u>	<u>2006</u>
1.	No	73%	73%
2.	Yes	27%	27%

17. Have you been the victim of a criminal offence outside of the Kamloops area in the past 12 months?

		<u>2008</u>	<u>2006</u>
1.	No	98%	99%
2.	Yes	2%	1%

#### **D. HOW WOULD YOU RATE YOUR LOCAL POLICE?**

In this section, we would like to ask for your opinion regarding your local police. When responding to these questions, please **DO NOT** include any police contact you may have had that resulted from one of the victimization experiences you reported in Section B.

18. Other than police contact you may have had as a result of the incident(s) reported in Section B, have you had any other direct contact with the local police in the last 12 months?

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2006</u>
--	-------------	-------------

1. No	77%	69%
2. Yes	23%	31%

**19. How many times in the past 12 months have you had direct contact with the local police? Check all that apply.**

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2006</u>
1. 0-1	43%	47%
2. 2-3	41%	37%
3. 4-5	5%	8%
4. 6+	11%	9%

**20. What were the primary reasons you had direct contact with the local police? Check all that apply.**

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2006</u>
1. To report a property crime 16%		10%
2. To report a violent crime 5%		1%
3. To report a traffic accident 15%		23%
4. To report a suspicious person	15%	26%
5. To be questioned about a possible crime 9%		3%
6. To request information	13%	16%
7. To complain about police services 6%		1%

8. As part of a police traffic enforcement action 19%  
17%
9. For some other reason 50% 38%

**21. How satisfied are you with the following aspects of your local police?  
Please circle the one answer that best applies to each question.**

2008	Very Unsatisfied	Mostly Unsatisfied	Mostly Satisfied	Very Satisfied
The level of competence in solving crimes	2%	10%	78%	10%
The number of officers on the street	7%	33%	55%	5%
The ability to communicate with the public	2%	8%	73%	17%
The ability to prevent crimes	6%	30%	60%	4%
The seeking of public input	4%	14%	68%	14%
The professionalism of the department	2%	5%	69%	24%

2006	Very Unsatisfied	Mostly Unsatisfied	Mostly Satisfied	Very Satisfied
The level of competence in solving	2%	13%	75%	10%

crimes				
The number of officers on the street	8%	34%	52%	6%
The ability to communicate with the public	2%	11%	68%	18%
The ability to prevent crimes	7%	32%	56%	6%
The seeking of public input	3%	18%	67%	13%
The professionalism of the department	2%	8%	66%	25%

**22. How would you rate the typical local RCMP officer on the following qualities? Please circle the one answer that best applies to each question.**

2008	Very Low	Low	Neither High Nor Low	High	Very High
Fairness	1%	3%	53%	36%	7%
Courtesy	1%	3%	35%	48%	13%
Knowledge of the Law	0%	2%	39%	45%	14%
Trustworthiness	1%	3%	40%	41%	15%
Honesty	1%	4%	41%	40%	15%
Reliability	2%	2%	44%	39%	14%
Concern for the Public	1%	3%	38%	43%	15%
Hardworking	1%	3%	39%	41%	16%
Being Objective	1%	4%	50%	37%	8%

2006	Very Low	Low	Neither High Nor Low	High	Very High
Fairness	0%	5%	46%	43%	7%
Courtesy	1%	3%	31%	51%	14%
Knowledge of the Law	0%	2%	38%	48%	13%
Trustworthiness	1%	4%	35%	47%	13%
Honesty	1%	3%	35%	49%	13%
Reliability	1%	5%	36%	46%	12%
Concern for the Public	2%	3%	33%	47%	14%
Hardworking	1%	5%	33%	46%	15%
Being Objective	3%	7%	40%	41%	10%

**23. Overall, how satisfied are you with your local police?**

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2006</u>
1. Very Satisfied	23%	24%
2. Mainly Satisfied	70%	66%
3. Mainly Unsatisfied	6%	9%



4. Very Unsatisfied

1%

1%

**24. This is a list of some things which may be a problem in your neighborhood. Please indicate if you feel that this is a particular problem in you neighborhood that your local police should devote more resources and attention to.**

	Yes 2008	Yes 2006
1. Litter, broken glass, or trash on the sidewalks and streets	16%	16%
2. Graffiti on buildings or walls	22%	18%
3. Vacant or deserted houses or storefronts	8%	10%
4. Drinking in public	23%	22%
5. People selling or using drugs	44%	43%
6. Groups of teenagers hanging out in the neighborhood and causing trouble.	41%	38%
7. Groups of adults hanging out in the neighborhood and causing trouble.	17%	16%
8. Speeding or other traffic related issues.	48%	47%
9. Street people	20%	19%
10. Prostitution	17%	19%
11. Gang-related crime.	25%	18%

## **E. DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION:**

In this section, we need to ask you some basic background information about yourself to confirm that those responding to our survey are truly a representative cross-section of community residents.

**25. For how many years have you been living in your present neighborhood?**

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2006</u>
1. 1-5	24%	31%
2. 6-10	21%	17%
3. 11-15	17%	17%
4. 16-20	12%	11%
5. More than 20 years	26%	24%

**26. Are you currently an employee or volunteer with your local police?**

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2006</u>
1. No	99%	99%
2. Yes	1%	1%

**27. Which category best describes the type of residence in which you are currently living?**

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2006</u>
--	-------------	-------------

1. House	77%	70%
2. Apartment	5%	6%
3. Condominium	4%	4%
4. Townhouse	5%	7%
5. Duplex	4%	6%
6. Other	5%	6%

**28. What are the first 3 digits of your Postal Code?**

**29. How many individuals OVER the age of 18 years old currently reside with you?**

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2006</u>
1. 0	22%	26%
2. 1-2	67%	68%
3. 3-4	10%	5%
4. 5 or more	1%	0%

**30. How many individuals UNDER the age of 18 years old currently reside with you?**

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2006</u>
1. 0	76%	76%
2. 1-2	20%	20%
3. 3-4	4%	4%
4. 5 or more	0%	0%

**31. What is your gender?**

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2006</u>
1. Male	54%	57%
2. Female	46%	43%
3. Transgender	0%	0%

**32. What is your current age?**

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2006</u>
1. 19-29	2%	4%
2. 30-39	10%	9%
3. 40-49	18%	21%
4. 50-59	27%	23%
5. 60 or older	43%	43%

**33. What is the highest level of education that you have completed?**

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2006</u>
1. Less than high school	12%	17%
2. A high school diploma	24%	24%
3. Some college/university	29%	25%
4. A College/University diploma or degree	25%	23%
5. A graduate/professional degree	10%	11%

**34. What is your current employment status?**

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2006</u>
1. Employed full-time	42%	38%
2. Employed part-time	6%	7%
3. Self-Employed	11%	10%
4. Retired	38%	40%
5. Unemployed	1%	1%
6. Student	1%	1%
7. Other	1%	3%

**35. What is your current marital status?**

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2006</u>
1. Single-never married	5%	7%
2. Married- including common law	72%	68%
3. Divorced or separated	14%	14%
4. Widowed	9%	13%

**36. What is your annual level of income BEFORE taxes?**

2008					
1. No Income	1%	2. Less than \$10,000	1%	3. \$10,000 - \$19,000	7%
4. \$20,000 - \$29,000	17%	5. \$30,000 - \$39,000	11%	6. \$40,000 - \$49,000	14%

7. \$50,000 - \$59,000	13%	8. \$60,000 - \$69,000	11%	9. \$70,000 - \$79,000	8%
10. \$80,000 - \$89,000	5%	11. \$90,000 - \$99,000	3%	12. More than \$100,000	9%

2006					
1. No Income	1%	2. Less than \$10,000	4%	3. \$10,000 - \$19,000	10%
4. \$20,000 - \$29,000	17%	5. \$30,000 - \$39,000	14%	6. \$40,000 - \$49,000	14%
7. \$50,000 - \$59,000	11%	8. \$60,000 - \$69,000	7%	9. \$70,000 - \$79,000	8%
10. \$80,000 - \$89,000	5%	11. \$90,000 - \$99,000	4%	12. More than \$100,000	6%

**37. What do you consider to be your PRIMARY ethnic background?**

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2006</u>
1. Aboriginal	2%	2%
2. Caucasian	91%	91%
3. Asiatic	3%	2%
4. Black	0%	0%
5. East Indian/South Asian	1%	1%
6. Other	3%	4%
	<u>2008</u>	<u>2006</u>
Percentage of respondents offering	52%	36%

comments