



EDMONTON POLICE SERVICE 2009 CITIZEN SURVEY

Prepared by: Office of Strategy Management
Date: June 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES
LIST OF FIGURES

	<u>PAGE</u>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
I. INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND	1
PURPOSE	1
LIMITATIONS	1
II. METHODOLOGY	2
CHANGES TO THE 2009 SURVEY PROJECT	2
SURVEY ADMINISTRATION	2
RESPONSE RATE	3
DESCRIPTION OF SAMPLE	3
III. SURVEY RESULTS	4
A. CONTACT WITH THE EDMONTON POLICE SERVICE	4
1. RESPONDENT-INITIATED CONTACT	5
2. POLICE-INITIATED CONTACT	11
B. VICTIMIZATION	12
1. VEHICLE/PARTS THEFT	13
2. DELIBERATE VEHICLE DAMAGE	13
3. DELIBERATE PROPERTY DAMAGE	14
4. BREAK AND ENTER	14
5. THEFT OF PROPERTY	15
C. PERCEPTIONS OF CRIME AND SAFETY	16
1. NEIGHBOURHOOD PROBLEMS	16
2. FEAR OF CRIME	17
3. PERCEPTIONS OF CRIME	19
D. VIEWS OF THE EDMONTON POLICE SERVICE	20
1. CITY-WIDE ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED BY EPS	20
2. CONFIDENCE IN EPS	21
3. EPS PERFORMANCE RATINGS	23
4. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVED SERVICE	23
5. OVERALL SATISFACTION WITH EPS SERVICE	25
E. EDMONTON POLICE COMMISSION	27
APPENDIX 1 – CALL DISPOSITION	29
APPENDIX 2 – DESCRIPTION OF SAMPLE	30
APPENDIX 3 – EDMONTON POLICE SERVICE 2009 CITIZEN SURVEY	31

LIST OF TABLES

		<u>PAGE</u>
TABLE 1	TYPE OF TELEPHONE CONTACT (2001 – 2009)	6
TABLE 2	PERCEIVED CALL URGENCY (2001 – 2009)	6
TABLE 3	MAIN REASONS FOR VERY/SOMEWHAT SATISFIED RATINGS OF TELEPHONE CONTACT	7
TABLE 4	PERCEIVED URGENCY OF STATION VISIT (2001 – 2009)	9
TABLE 5	VEHICLE/PARTS THEFT - OCCURRENCE AND REPORTING	13
TABLE 6	DELIBERATE VEHICLE DAMAGE - OCCURRENCE AND REPORTING	13
TABLE 7	DELIBERATE PROPERTY DAMAGE - OCCURRENCE AND REPORTING	14
TABLE 8	BREAK AND ENTER - OCCURRENCE AND REPORTING	14
TABLE 9	THEFT OF PROPERTY - OCCURRENCE AND REPORTING	15
TABLE 10	FEELINGS OF SAFETY WHEN WALKING ALONE (2001 – 2009)	18
TABLE 11	AVOID GOING OUT BECAUSE OF CRIME (2001 – 2009)	18
TABLE 12	TOP ISSUES OF CONCERN (2001 – 2009)	20
TABLE 13	CONFIDENCE IN EPS (2001 – 2009)	21
TABLE 14	MAIN REASON FOR CONFIDENCE INCREASING	22
TABLE 15	MAIN REASON FOR CONFIDENCE DECREASING	22
TABLE 16	TOP FIVE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVED SERVICE (2001 – 2009)	24
TABLE 17	UNDERSTANDING OF THE EDMONTON POLICE COMMISSION'S ROLE	27

LIST OF FIGURES

		<u>PAGE</u>
FIGURE 1	CONTACT WITH THE EPS IN THE PAST YEAR	4
FIGURE 2	TYPE OF CONTACT WITH THE EPS	4
FIGURE 3	REASONS FOR CONTACTING THE EPS	5
FIGURE 4	SATISFACTION WITH EPS HANDLING OF TELEPHONE CALL	6
FIGURE 5	SATISFACTION WITH DISPATCH SERVICE	8
FIGURE 6	EXPECTED WAIT TIME FOR ON-SCENE ARRIVAL	9
FIGURE 7	SATISFACTION WITH SERVICE AT POLICE STATION	10
FIGURE 8	REASONS FOR POLICE-INITIATED CONTACT	11
FIGURE 9	NEIGHBOURHOOD CRIME AND DISORDER	16
FIGURE 10	NEIGHBOURHOOD CRIME AND DISORDER – “SOME/BIG” PROBLEM (2001 – 2009)	17
FIGURE 11	PERCEIVED CHANGES IN NEIGHBOURHOOD CRIME LEVEL (2001 – 2009)	19
FIGURE 12	PERCEIVED COMPARABILITY OF EDMONTON CRIME LEVELS TO OTHER CANADIAN CITIES (2001 – 2009)	19
FIGURE 13	TOP THREE ISSUES OF CONCERN TO BE ADDRESSED BY EPS	20
FIGURE 14	CHANGES IN CONFIDENCE IN THE EPS OVER THE PAST 12 MONTHS	21
FIGURE 15	EPS PERFORMANCE RATINGS	23
FIGURE 16	OVERALL SATISFACTION WITH SERVICE PROVIDED BY THE EPS	25
FIGURE 17	AWARENESS OF THE EDMONTON POLICE COMMISSION	27
FIGURE 18	AWARENESS OF SPECIFIC EPC ROLES	28

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BACKGROUND

The Edmonton Police Service (EPS) Citizen Survey is conducted in accordance with the related standard set out by the provincial Police Act (Policing Standard OM1.1) and by the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA) (45.2.4). Although historically the survey has been conducted every three years, a shortened survey cycle was approved to reflect changes to the EPS's business planning and reporting cycle.

The EPS 2009 Citizen Survey was conducted by *Pivotal Research Inc.* between November 3 – 16, 2009. One adult (18+) per sampled household was randomly selected to participate in the telephone survey, for a total of 1,141 completed surveys. The response rate was 16.6%.

Survey results are presented to EPS management and the Edmonton Police Commission. This way, issues identified in the survey are reflected in the EPS strategic priorities.

HIGHLIGHTS

Contact with the Edmonton Police Service

Approximately one-third (34%, 389) of respondents reported *formal contact* with the EPS. The three most common reasons for respondent-initiated contact were to *report a crime*, *report a neighbourhood concern* and to *report suspicious activity*. Whether the contact was by telephone, a station visit or with a dispatched officer, satisfaction ratings ranged from 83% - 89%. Among the 102 survey respondents reporting police-initiated contact, the most common reason was *for the police to ask for information about a crime*, followed by *traffic violations*.

Victimization

The most common form of victimization in 2008/09, at 14% of respondent households, was *vehicle/parts theft*. The most notable variance in victimization levels compared to 2007 was *theft of property*, with a five percentage point decrease (14% to 9%). In 2009, reporting to police varied from a low of 36% for *theft of property* to a high of 61% for *break and enter*. Changes of note for reporting levels between 2007 and 2009 included *deliberate property damage* (increasing from 34% to 39%) and *theft of property* (decreasing from 41% to 36%).

Perceptions of Crime and Safety

The top three neighbourhood problems – as in previous surveys - were *speeding and careless driving*, *people breaking into homes* and *vandalism other than graffiti*. Almost two-thirds (66%) reported *feeling safe* when walking alone in their neighbourhood after dark. While a strong majority perceived crime in their neighbourhood to have *stayed the same* or *decreased* (70% and 6% respectively), almost one-quarter (23%) felt that crime had *increased*.

The majority of respondents (61%) continue to perceive Edmonton as having *the same amount of crime as other Canadian cities*.

Views of the Edmonton Police Service

The top three city-wide problems respondents felt should be addressed by the EPS were *traffic, gangs/organized crime and drugs*.

A significant majority – 89% – indicated some level of agreement with the statement *I have a lot of confidence in the EPS*. When asked if the EPS was doing a *good, average or poor job* in six performance areas, the most common response was a *good job*, ranging from 44% to 67% of responses.

The main themes in respondents' recommendations for how the EPS could improve services related to the *number of officers/police presence, communication/contact with the public, focus of enforcement and faster, more efficient response to calls*. When asked to rate their satisfaction with the service provided by the EPS, 82% were *satisfied* with EPS's service, while 4% were *dissatisfied*.

Edmonton Police Commission

Almost three out of four respondents (74%) were *aware that Edmonton has a police commission*. When asked about awareness of specific Commission roles, awareness was highest regarding *overseeing police officer conduct* (77%) and lowest regarding the Commission's role in *setting and monitoring the budget for EPS* (53%).

I. INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

The Edmonton Police Service (EPS) Citizen Survey is conducted in accordance with the related standard set out by the provincial Police Act and by the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA).

Provincial Policing Standard OM 1.1

Formally consult with the community every four years (at a minimum) to identify community needs, concerns and expectations regarding policing. The process shall address at minimum:

- a. the performance of the police service.*
- b. the conduct of police personnel.*
- c. the interaction of police officers with citizens.*
- d. public perceptions regarding safety and security in the community.*
- e. recommendations for improvement.*
- f. citizens' level of satisfaction.*

CALEA 45.2.4

A documented survey of citizen attitudes and opinions is conducted at least once every three years with respect to:

- a. overall agency performance;*
- b. overall competence of agency employees;*
- c. citizens' perception of officers' attitudes and behavior;*
- d. community concern over safety and security within the agency's service area; and*
- e. citizens' recommendations and suggestions for improvements.*

Although historically the survey has been conducted every three years, a shortened survey cycle was approved to reflect changes to the EPS's business planning and reporting cycle.

PURPOSE

Survey results are presented to EPS management and the Edmonton Police Commission. This way, issues identified in the survey are reflected in the EPS strategic priorities.

LIMITATIONS

Based on the Canadian Marketing Research and Intelligence Association's (MRIA) standard for calculating response rates, the EPS survey achieved a response rate of 16.6%. It is important to note that sample quality can influence the accuracy of estimates based on the sample. For example, people who chose to participate in the EPS survey may have responded differently (i.e. had different experiences, held different opinions) than those who could not be contacted or refused to participate.

II. METHODOLOGY

CHANGES TO THE 2009 SURVEY PROJECT

Minor changes made to the 2009 survey included:

Introduction: The Introduction was modified to comply with the City of Edmonton's requirements for informed consent. This involved notifying potential participants that if they had questions about how the survey or its results would be used, an EPS contact could be provided to them before deciding to participate. For those who wanted to verify the authenticity of the survey or had any other related questions, a general number with voice mail was provided. Any messages left were responded to promptly by the EPS project manager.

The Introduction was also modified to confirm that an Edmonton telephone number had been reached.

Question Order: The question related to overall satisfaction with EPS service was placed later in the survey for a more logical flow. Additionally, demographic questions were moved to the end of the survey.

The questionnaire is provided in Appendix 3.

Sampling: The 2009 project returned to the larger, random sample methodology used in earlier surveys (a smaller, quota sample was drawn for the 2007 survey). This change was primarily intended to increase confidence in the results (see Response Rate below for further detail).

Reporting: Report content has been streamlined as compared to previous reports. Trend analysis is restricted to survey results received for the period 2001 – 2009. As the City of Edmonton population and the EPS's policing model have changed significantly in recent years, trends within this time frame are more meaningful.

Previous reports included results from other surveys; the scope of this report is restricted to results received through the Edmonton Police Service 2009 Citizen Survey, supplemented by the above noted trend analysis.

It should be noted that throughout the report percentages may not total 100 due to rounding.

SURVEY ADMINISTRATION

The EPS 2009 Citizen Survey was conducted by *Pivotal Research Inc.* between the dates of November 3 – 16, 2009. Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) was used to administer the survey to a random sample of 1,141 Edmontonians. The sample was comprised of randomly selected telephone listings (90%) for the City of Edmonton as well as

randomly generated phone numbers (10%), which allowed for the possibility of reaching unlisted households. Five callbacks were made to each listing prior to excluding it from the final sample and replacing it with an alternate selection. To randomize respondent selection within a household, the adult (aged 18+) having the next birthday was interviewed. Call outcomes are shown in Appendix 1. Interviews took 11.7 minutes on average, and had a median length of 11 minutes.

RESPONSE RATE

Applying the response rate calculation as recommended by the Marketing Research and Intelligence Association (MRIA) determined a response rate of 16.6% was achieved.

A total of 1,141 interviews were completed. The targeted sample size of 1,100 yields city-level results accurate to within +/- 3%, 19 times out of 20.

DESCRIPTION OF SAMPLE

Appendix 2 shows the comparability of the 2009 sample and the City of Edmonton population as described by the 2006 federal census (the most current census data). Notable differences include younger cohorts (18 – 24, 25 – 34) being under-represented in the results. This may be attributable to the data collection method, as younger cohorts are less likely to have landlines for which comprehensive directories are available. Higher proportions of older respondents likely account for differences in reported home ownership and levels of education.


To some degree the timing of data collection also may have impacted results as three years separate the Citizen Survey from the Statistics Canada Census. Additionally, as is the case with any survey results collected from a sample rather than a population, results are estimates and as such are subject to error.

III. SURVEY RESULTS

A. CONTACT WITH THE EDMONTON POLICE SERVICE

As shown in Figure 1, almost two-thirds (750) of respondents had no formal¹ contact with the EPS over the past year. The remaining 34% (389) of respondents had experienced some type of formal contact with the EPS in the 12 months prior to the survey.


Figure 1



Type of contact with EPS

Respondents could have come into contact with the EPS if they initiated contact with police (e.g. to report a crime), and/or if police initiated contact with them (e.g. Check Stop).

Figure 2



Of the respondents who said they had contact with the EPS, 74% (287) had initiated contact with the EPS, 18% (71) said the EPS had initiated contact with them, and 8% (31) had both contacted police *and* been contacted by police (Figure 2).


¹ Excludes informal contact with police (e.g. friend, social event).

1. RESPONDENT-INITIATED CONTACT

Reason(s) for contacting EPS

The respondents who said they had contacted the EPS over the past year (318 or 28% of survey participants) were asked about their reason(s) for contacting the EPS (multiple responses possible).

Figure 3



As shown in Figure 3, the rank ordering of the main reasons for contact was the same for the 2004, 2007 and 2009 surveys.

How did respondents contact EPS?

Respondents who said they had contacted EPS over the past year were asked *how* they had made contact: by telephone, through a police dispatch to their home or business, or at a police station.

Seventy-six percent of respondents made contact by telephone, 34% made contact with the EPS through a police dispatch, and 55% made contact with the EPS at a police station.²

² The sum of these percentages exceeds 100% as some respondents contacted EPS multiple times using different methods.

Telephone Contact

Approximately three-quarters (241 of 318) of respondents initiating police contact had contacted the EPS by telephone.

Type of telephone contact

Table 1 shows respondents' type of telephone contact in their *most recent* telephone call to police.

Table 1 – Type of Telephone Contact (2001 – 2009)				
<i>Last time you phoned EPS, did you call ...</i>	2001	2004	2007	2009
911	18%	22%	19%	28%
EPS non-emergency number	38%	43%	53%	47%
Police station	39%	29%	23%	18%
Officer's pager or cell phone	3%	4%	1%	6%
Don't know/no response	2%	3%	4%	1%

Trend analysis shows that calls to 911 have increased significantly, as calls to *police stations* have declined. To date there has been no clear trend with respect to calls to the *non-emergency number*, nor for reported calls to *officers' pagers and cell phones*.

Perceived call urgency

Table 2 shows the perceived urgency of respondents' *most recent* call to police.

Table 2 – Perceived Call Urgency (2001 – 2009)				
<i>Was your most recent telephone call to EPS ...</i>	2001	2004	2007	2009
Extremely urgent	9%	7%	5%	11%
Urgent	35%	49%	40%	52%
Routine	55%	44%	54%	34%
Don't know/ no response	1%	1%	1%	2%


Overall, *urgent* calls appear to be up with a corresponding decrease in *routine* calls.

Telephone satisfaction ratings

Figure 4 shows respondents' satisfaction with how the EPS handled their *most recent* telephone call. A strong majority (83%) of respondents were satisfied with how the EPS handled their call.

Figure 4

Satisfaction with EPS Handling of Telephone Call (N=239)



Main reasons for satisfaction ratings: telephone call to EPS

Of the 198 respondents who were *very* or *somewhat satisfied* with their most recent call to the EPS, 191 provided a reason for their rating. It should be noted that there were instances where the reason was inconsistent with the satisfaction rating. For example, 11 respondents who indicated that they were *very* or *somewhat satisfied* also reported that the EPS's response to their call was slow.

Table 3 - Main Reasons for Very/Somewhat Satisfied Ratings of Telephone Contact	
Response time	
Response was fast	53
Response was slow	11
Unspecified comments regarding response time	7
Total	71
Helpfulness of response	
Response was helpful, issue was resolved, questions were answered	42
Response was not helpful	7
Total	49
Attitude and professionalism of response	
Officer was friendly, caring and/or understanding	14
Officer was professional	10
Officer listened, showed concern	7
Unspecified or neutral	3
Total	34
Police responded and/or followed up on the call	
Police responded to call	12
Police followed up after resolving issue	7
Total	19
Police were unable to help	6
Problems with the phone system or communication	6
Other	4
Caller knew the officer(s)	2

Respondents who were dissatisfied with how their call was handled (41) cited these reasons:


- EPS did not respond or return call (16),
- Response was slow (13),
- Response was not helpful (6),
- Outcome of call was unsatisfactory (3),
- Officer was rude or unsympathetic (2) and
- Other (1).

Dispatch contact

Thirty-four percent of respondents initiating contact with police (109 of 318) said that a police officer had been dispatched to their home or business over the past 12 months. The majority of these respondents (80 of 109) had personally made the phone call that resulted in police being dispatched.

Dispatch satisfaction ratings

Of the 109 respondents who had a police officer dispatched to their home or business, 104 provided a satisfaction rating.



As shown in Figure 5, the majority of respondents were *somewhat* or *very satisfied* with *how the responding officer handled the matter when they arrived on-scene* (85%) with the majority being *very satisfied* (66%).

Main reasons for satisfaction ratings: dispatch service

Of the 89 respondents who were satisfied with the on-scene dispatch service, 83 provided reasons why, including:


- Matter was resolved promptly (23),
- Responding officer was polite/attentive/understanding (20),
- Police handled the matter professionally (15),
- The outcome of the matter was satisfactory (13),
- The response was appropriate (6), and
- The response or outcome was not completely satisfactory (6).

The fifteen dissatisfied respondents identified the follow reasons for their rating:

- Response time was too long (6),
- Did not take concern seriously (3),
- Outcome was unsatisfactory (3), and
- Other (3).

Wait time for police to arrive on-scene

When asked about the wait time for police to arrive on-scene, 101 of 109 respondents were able to comment on their expectations of response time and actual time on-scene. The results are shown in Figure 6.

Figure 6**Expected Wait Time for On-Scene Arrival (N=101)****Police station contact**

Fifty-five percent of respondents initiating contact (175 of 318) reported visiting a police station.

Perceived urgency of station visit**Table 4 – Perceived Urgency of Station Visit (20010 – 2009)**

<i>Was your most recent visit to the EPS station ...</i>	2001	2004	2007	2009
Extremely urgent	3%	2%	10%	3%
Urgent	30%	30%	20%	29%
Routine	65%	65%	68%	67%
Don't know/no response	2%	3%	2%	1%


Based on Table 4, 2007 results appear anomalous as 2009 results are consistent with the 2001 and 2004 findings. This indicates that the distribution of station visits by perceived urgency is relatively stable.

Station satisfaction ratings

When asked about satisfaction with the way police handled their concern or issue during their *most recent* station visit, the vast majority (89%) of respondents were satisfied.

Figure 7

Satisfaction with Service at Police Station (N=174)



Main reasons for satisfaction ratings: police station

Of the 154 respondents who were satisfied, 149 provided a reason for their rating, including the following:

- Matter was resolved promptly and/or professionally (62),
- Police were helpful/courteous/understanding (35),
- The outcome was satisfactory/police did all they could (24),
- Outcome was less than satisfactory (8),
- Wait was too long (6),
- Reception at station was not friendly (5), and
- Unrelated responses/other (9).

Dissatisfied respondents (20) cited the following reasons:

- Not helpful (6),
- No follow up (6),
- Could not assist (3),
- Did not care (2), and
- Other (3).


2. POLICE-INITIATED CONTACT

Nine percent of respondents (102 of 1,141) said that police had initiated contact with them over the past year.

Reasons police made contact

Respondents were asked to identify from a list the reasons why police had contacted them over the past year.

Figure 8



The total number of reasons in Figure 8 exceeds the number of respondents as some reported having more than one type of police-initiated contact.

Satisfaction with police-initiated contact

Due to a programming error within the interviewer software, Question 21 (*How satisfied were you with the way the police handled the matter?*) was not asked of all respondents for whom the question was applicable (25 out of 102 eligible respondents were asked).

As results were not collected from a statistically valid population, misleading conclusions could be drawn from the results, therefore, they are not included in this report.

B. VICTIMIZATION

Questions on victimization and reporting were adapted from Statistics Canada's General Social Survey (GSS) on Victimization, which has been conducted every five years since 1988, most recently in 2009. It should be noted that selected results from earlier Edmonton Police Service Citizen Surveys have been compared in previous reports to GSS results; however, as the most recent GSS results available at the time of writing were collected in 2004, such comparisons are not made in this report.

Respondents were asked about crimes experienced by members of their household over the past 12 months *within the City of Edmonton*, and whether or not the crime was reported to police. Only those households identified as having owned or leased a vehicle in the past 12 months (866) were asked questions related to *vehicle/parts theft* and *deliberate vehicle damage*. All respondents (1,141) were asked questions related to *deliberate property damage*, *break and enter* and *theft of property*.

For each experience of victimization mentioned, respondents were asked *if* the incident(s) was reported to the police. Those indicating that some or all incidents of a specified crime type were not reported to police were asked to provide the main reason for not reporting.

Highlights from the results by crime type on the following pages include:

- The most common form of victimization in 2008/09, at 14% of respondent households, was *vehicle/parts theft*.
- The most notable variance in victimization levels compared to 2007 was *theft of property*, with a five percentage point decrease (14% to 9%).
- In 2009, reporting to police varied from a low of 36% for *theft of property* to a high of 61% for *break and enter*.
- Changes of note for reporting levels between 2007 and 2009 included *deliberate property damage* (increasing from 34% to 39%) and *theft of property* (decreasing from 41% to 36%).

Table 5 – Vehicle/Parts Theft Occurrence and Reporting (includes attempts)




Table 6 - Deliberate Vehicle Damage Occurrence and Reporting




Table 7 - Deliberate Property Damage Occurrence and Reporting




Table 8 - Break and Enter Occurrence and Reporting (includes attempts)





Table 9 - Theft of Property Occurrence and Reporting (includes attempts)



C. PERCEPTIONS OF CRIME AND SAFETY

Respondents were asked about problems in their neighborhood, their fear of crime, and their perception of crime - both in their neighborhood and in the City of Edmonton compared to other cities in Canada.

NEIGHBOURHOOD PROBLEMS

All respondents were asked whether there was *no problem*, *some problem*, or a *big problem* in their neighborhood for 11 crime and disorder issues. Related questions were adapted from various versions of the Chicago CAPS³ Citywide Resident Survey. Those who answered *don't know* or did not respond were removed from the results.

Figure 9





Figure 9 shows that *speeding and careless driving* was by far the most commonly identified neighbourhood problem, with almost three-quarters of respondents indicating it was either *some* or a *big problem* in their neighbourhood.

³ CAPS refers to the Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy.

Figure 10

Neighbourhood Crime and Disorder - "Some" or "Big" Problem (2001 - 2009)



As shown in Figure 10, the rank ordering of responses was similar in 2004, 2007 and 2009. Again in 2009, the top three neighborhood problems were perceived to be *speeding and careless driving*, *people breaking into homes* and *vandalism*.

FEAR OF CRIME

All respondents were asked the following three questions about their personal safety: (a) *How safe do you feel from crime when walking alone in your neighbourhood after dark?* (b) *If unsafe, what is the main reason you feel unsafe?*, and (c) *How often do you avoid going out after dark because of crime?*

How safe do you feel from crime when walking alone in your neighbourhood after dark?⁴

Table 10 – Feelings of Safety When Walking Alone (2001 – 2009)

	2001 ⁵	2004	2007	2009
Very safe	29%	25%	19%	22%
Reasonably safe	41%	41%	50%	44%
Somewhat unsafe	14%	14%	16%	16%
Very unsafe	5%	5%	7%	8%
Respondent does not walk alone (unread)	12%	14%	9%	8%
Don't know/not stated	<1%	<1%	<1%	1%

The majority of respondents continue to feel safe (*very* or *reasonably*) from crime when walking alone in their neighbourhood after dark (66% of total respondents in 2009).

What is the main reason you feel unsafe?

Of the 278 respondents who reported feeling *somewhat* or *very unsafe*, 271 identified the following reasons for their response:

- Homeless, drunk or otherwise suspicious people (86),
- Fear of crime in general, media reports (44),
- Because of specific crimes committed (35),
- Drug dealers, drug users and drugs in general (19),
- Unsafe area, or area with unsafe characteristics (18),
- Respondent is female, older or disabled (16),
- Fear of the dark (14),
- Fear of walking alone at night (unspecified) (13),
- Previous experiences of crime or intimidation (12),
- Gang activity (6),
- Other (6), and
- Not enough police presence (2).

How often do you avoid going out after dark because of crime?

Table 11 – Avoid Going Out Because of Crime (2001 – 2009)

	2001	2004	2007	2009
Never	65%	60%	56%	56%
Some of the time	19%	22%	25%	25%
Most of the time	15%	17%	17%	18%
Don't know/no response	2%	2%	1%	2%

In 2009, as in previous surveys, the majority of respondents (56%) answered that they *never* avoid going out after dark because of crime.

⁴ This question is from Statistics Canada's General Social Survey (GSS) on Victimization.

⁵ In 2001 the unread response category *does not walk alone* was added in order to match the GSS response categories.


PERCEPTIONS OF CRIME

Perception of crime in Edmonton neighborhoods

All respondents were asked how long they had lived in their neighbourhood. Those who reported living in their neighbourhood less than a year (56) were excluded from the question about their opinion of whether crime in their neighborhood had *decreased*, *stayed about the same*, or *increased* over the past 12 months.

Figure 11

Perceived Changes in Neighbourhood Crime Level
(2001 - 2009)




From among the 1,032 respondents able to provide an opinion (53 respondents either did not know or did not respond), the most common response was that neighbourhood crime had *stayed the same* over the past year (70% of respondents in 2009). As shown in Figure 11, responses in 2009 represented a return to 2001 levels.

Perception of crime in Edmonton compared to other cities

Respondents were also asked their opinion on whether Edmonton has *less crime*, the *same amount of crime*, or *more crime* compared to other cities in Canada.

Figure 12

Perceived Comparability of Edmonton Crime Levels to Other
Canadian Cities (2001 - 2009)



Among those who provided a rating (1,040) the most common answer was that Edmonton has about the *same amount of crime* as other Canadian cities (61%). Figure 12 also shows that over the past decade, perceptions of Edmonton's crime levels have varied considerably.

D. VIEWS OF THE EDMONTON POLICE SERVICE

All respondents were asked their opinion on the following: city-wide issues that should be addressed by the EPS, confidence in the EPS, EPS performance, and recommendations for how the EPS could improve services.

CITY-WIDE ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED BY EPS


Respondents were asked, *What in your opinion are the three most important issues in the City of Edmonton that should be addressed by the Edmonton Police Service today?* and to list them in order of priority, starting with the most important. As the question was open-ended, respondents were not prompted with response categories. Although 13% of respondents (151) responded *don't know*, and an additional 2% (22) did not respond, 968 respondents identified at least one city-wide issue to be addressed by EPS.

2001 Rank	2004 Rank	2007 Rank	2009 Rank	Issues to be addressed by EPS	Number of 2009 Responses
2	1	1	1	Traffic ⁶	377
1	2	3	2	Gangs/organized crime	351
3	3	2	3	Drugs	342
4	4	4	4	More police visibility/availability/more officers	236
6	5	unknown	5	General policing activities	190

In 2009, the top three issues of concern remained the same as for the previous three surveys, returning to the same rank ordering received in 2004.

Figure 13

Top Three Issues of Concern to be Addressed by EPS



⁶ Includes speeding, street racing, careless driving, reckless driving, traffic enforcement, traffic violations, traffic safety. Does not include drunk driving.

Figure 13 shows that although *traffic* issues were mentioned most often overall, *gangs/organized crime* and *drugs* were more often top of mind (i.e. first response). For example, of the total number of times *gangs/organized crime* was mentioned, 62% (216 of 351) were first mentions, and 42% (144 of 342 mentions) for *drugs*. In contrast, only 27% of the *traffic* responses were respondents' first priority.

CONFIDENCE IN EPS

Level of confidence in the EPS

Respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement with the statement: *I have a lot of confidence in the EPS.*


Table 13 – Confidence in EPS (2001 – 2009)				
	2001	2004	2007	2009
Strongly agree	52%	50%	46%	52%
Somewhat agree	32%	34%	37%	37%
Somewhat disagree	8%	8%	9%	5%
Strongly disagree	7%	5%	6%	5%
Don't know/not stated	2%	3%	2%	1%

As shown in Table 13, the most common response continues to be *strongly agree* (52% in 2009).

Change in level of confidence in the EPS over the past year

Figure 14

Changes in Confidence in the EPS Over the Past 12 Months (2001 - 2009)



As in previous years, when asked whether their confidence in EPS had *gone down*, *stayed the same*, or *gone up* over the past year, a strong majority of 2009 respondents (76%) said their confidence had *stayed the same* (Figure 14).

Main reasons for changes in confidence in the EPS

Of the 139 respondents indicating that their confidence in the EPS had increased over the past year, 129 provided reasons for the change in confidence; responses directly related to the question are shown in Table 14 below:

Table 14 - Main Reason for Confidence Increasing	
Visibility or presence	37
Positive experience with police	25
Police do a good job	17
Positive relations or communication with the public	7
More integrity/trusted/respected	6
Enforcement is effective	6
Police have improved	5
Leadership	5
Appears to be less crime, more security	5
Other	8

Of the 113 respondents indicating that their confidence in the EPS had decreased, 110 explained the change in their confidence.

As the comments were much more specific than those noted above, the themes and subthemes are outlined in Table 15.

Table 15 - Main Reasons for Confidence Decreasing	
Perceptions of police	
Perceived corruption, misconduct or lack of integrity	17
Media (unspecified)	9
Perceived internal conflict or lack of morale	6
Police are poorly managed	4
Police are ineffective	3
Total	39
Public interaction and response	
Police didn't respond to a call or complaint	13
Police appear disinterested, unhelpful or rude	9
Interaction was unsatisfactory	6
Response times were too slow	3
Total	31
Resources	
Insufficient resources (staff, equipment, budget)	7
Police should patrol more, be more visible	6
Insufficient training or recruitment qualifications	4
Police should focus resources differently	3
Total	20
Crime is increasing/too high	11
Other	9


The majority of comments were represented by the themes of *perception of police*, *public interaction and response* and *resources*.

EPS PERFORMANCE RATINGS

Respondents were asked their opinion on whether “*the EPS does a good job, an average job, or a poor job of ...*”

- enforcing the laws,
- promptly responding to calls,
- being approachable and easy to talk to,
- supplying information to the public on ways to reduce crime,
- ensuring the safety of citizens, and
- treating people fairly.

Figure 15



As shown in Figure 15, the most common response across each of the six performance areas was that the EPS was doing a *good job* (44% to 67% of responses).

For each performance area a very small proportion of respondents (between 3% and 8%) said that the EPS was doing a *poor job*. The areas of *promptly responding to calls* and *supplying information* received the highest percentage of *poor* ratings (8% in both cases). A notable percentage of *don't know* responses was received for *promptly responding to calls* (18%).

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVED SERVICE

Starting in 2001, respondents were asked, “*If you could make just one recommendation to the EPS about how they could improve their services, what would it be?*” Seventy-three percent (838 of 1,141) of respondents provided a recommendation (the remainder either indicated *don't know* or did not respond). The top five⁷ recommendations are shown in Table 16.

⁷ First response only, consistent with the question asked.

Table 16 – Top Five Recommendations for Improved Service (2001 – 2009)					
2001 Rank	2004 Rank	2007 Rank	2009 Rank	Recommendations	Number of 2009 Responses
2	1	1	1	More officers	185
3	3	5	2	Improve communication/contact with public	162
1	2	2	3	More visible police presence	160
-	-	-	4	Focus of enforcement	106
6	5	4	5	Faster, more efficient response to calls	70
4	4	3	n/a	*Improve officers' behaviour	-

*It should be noted that a number of comments related to officer behaviour were collated under *improve communication/contact with the public*.

Other major themes in the comments included:

- Integrity, accountability and conduct (22),
- Legal system (21),
- Police recruitment and training (20), and
- General compliment (18).

Below is a selection of respondent comments relating to the top five recommendations. The recommendations for more officers (#1) and a more visible police presence (#3) are linked; from a respondent's perspective, having more police officers would presumably result in a more visible police presence on the street.

#1 More officers

"they need to have more people on the force."

"I think they need more people. The government needs to supply funding to get more officers."

"not too sure if there are enough police on the street."

"hire more cops, they are overworked."

#2 Improve communication/contact with the public

"get to know the neighbours in the neighbourhood."

"they should communicate with people more"

"treat everybody equally"

"they should have special regard for dealing with minorities and disadvantaged youth and adults."

#3 More visible police presence

"more units on the roads."

"a larger presence especially in higher crime areas."

"to be more visible in the neighbourhood."

"increase foot patrols to impress upon the public that police interested in community issue and don't just drive cars."

#4 Focus of enforcement

“take more responsibility for traffic violations away and give it to the peace officers.”
“improve traffic safety around red lights and cross walks.”
“be more attentive to drugs and gangs.”
“bit more focus on how to prevent crime.”

#5 Faster, more efficient response to calls

“when I call and leave a voice message, please call me back within a reasonable amount of time.”
“have more email so people can use email to report suspicions..”
“response times are a little slow. I called the police and it took longer than I thought.”


Overall Satisfaction with EPS service

The following question was adapted⁸ from the City of Edmonton’s Citizen Satisfaction Survey: *Overall, how satisfied are you with the service provided by the Edmonton Police Service?*

This question was asked of all respondents regardless of whether they had contact with the EPS. It should be noted that historical results are available only from 2004 onwards, the project year this question was included in the EPS survey.

Figure 16

Overall Satisfaction with Service Provided by the EPS (2004 - 2009)



In 2009, 82% (936) of respondents were satisfied *overall* with the service provided by the EPS, while 4% (42) were dissatisfied (Figure 16).

⁸ Adapted from the City’s question, “Overall, how satisfied are you with the services provided by the City of Edmonton?”

Dissatisfied respondents were asked to explain their rating and provided the following reasons (in some cases, more than one reason was given):

- Lack of response or slow response time (13),
- Unsatisfactory interaction with the public (8),
- Inappropriate or inefficient use of resources (7),
- Unsatisfactory response to a specific incident (4),
- Police don't treat people fairly or equally (4),
- Police are unprofessional, incompetent or unhelpful (4),
- Other (4),
- Poor management or discipline (3), and
- Accountability, officer conduct (3).


E. EDMONTON POLICE COMMISSION

At the request of the Edmonton Police Commission (EPC), several questions were added in 2007 to gauge respondents' awareness of the Commission and its role.

Awareness of the Edmonton Police Commission

Figure 17

**Aware that Edmonton has a Police Commission
(N=1141)**



As shown in Figure 17, the majority of respondents (74%, 844) were aware of the EPC. This is the same result found during the 2007 survey.

Understanding of the Edmonton Police Commission's role

Respondents who were aware that Edmonton has a police commission were asked, *Based on your understanding, what is the role of the Edmonton Police Commission?* The question was open-ended, so respondents were not prompted with response categories.

The most common answer was *I don't know*, received from 23% (196) of respondents. An additional eight respondents did not provide any further response. The responses from the remaining 640 respondents are shown in Table 17. It should be noted that multiple responses were permitted.


Table 17 – Understanding of the Edmonton Police Commission's Role	
<i>Based on your understanding, what is the role of the EPC?</i>	Number of 2009 Responses
To oversee or supervise police force	425
To investigate or adjudicate on complaints or internal police matters	83
To set policies and procedures or budget	73
To communicate, mediate or liaise between public and police	55
To act as liaison or mediator between police and governments	27
To hire the Chief or make other personnel decisions	24
<i>General/vague/unrelated/other responses</i>	33
To ensure that police treat citizens fairly and equally	4
Total Responses	724

Awareness of specific aspects of the Edmonton Police Commission's role

Those who were aware that Edmonton has a police commission were also asked a series of five closed-ended questions to gauge their awareness of specific aspects of the Commission's role (Figure 18).

Figure 18

Awareness of Specific EPC Roles (N=844)



Overall, a majority of respondents indicated an awareness of various roles of the Edmonton Police Commission.

APPENDIX 1

The table below illustrates the response rate calculation as recommended by the Marketing and Research Intelligence Association (MRIA). The response rate was 16.6%.

2009 Call Dispositions	Number	Percent
Total numbers attempted	11,000	100
Invalid Not in service, fax/modem, business/non-residence	2,321	21
Unresolved (U) Busy, no answer, answering machine	4,554	41
In-Scope: non-responding (IS) Language problem Illness, incapable Selected respondent not available Household refusal Respondent refusal Qualified respondent break off	2,683	24
In-Scope: responding units (R) Language disqualify No one 18+ Other disqualify Completed interviews	1,442	13
Response Rate = R/(U+IS+R)	16.6%	

APPENDIX 2

Respondent Characteristics:	2009 EPS Survey (November 3 -16, 2009)	2006 Federal Census Data: City of Edmonton (May 16, 2006)
Gender		
Male	45%	49%
Female	55%	51%
Age (18+)		
18-24	7%	15%
25-34	16%	20%
35-44	17%	19%
45-54	23%	19%
55-64	17%	12%
65-74	12%	8%
75+	8%	7%
Home ownership		
Own	71%	63%
Rent	28%	37%
Don't know/No response	1%	n/a
Level of educational attainment by highest level of certificate, diploma or degree		
High school	22%	26%
Trades certificate or diploma	4%	11%
College certificate or diploma	19%	18%
University (bachelor level or above)	29%	18%
Household size		
1 person	18%	26%
2 persons	37%	33%
3 persons	18%	16%
4 persons	16%	15%
5+ people	10%	9%

APPENDIX 3

Edmonton Police Service 2009 Citizen Survey

INTRODUCTION

Hello, my name is _____. I'm calling on behalf of the Edmonton Police Service from Pivotal Research. We're conducting a survey of randomly selected households in Edmonton to collect opinions on policing issues.

Can I confirm that I've reached an Edmonton household?

PARTICIPANT SELECTION

May I please speak with the person in your household aged 18 or older whose birthday comes next?

INFORMED CONSENT

Once contact made with potential participant:

- Repeat INTRODUCTION
- Provide the following information:
All responses are completely anonymous and only group results will be reported. If you have any questions about the survey or how the results will be used I can provide an EPS contact to answer your questions. Would you like that information?

[If yes,

EPS Research and Evaluation Unit
780-421-2001

Leave a message and your call will be returned as soon as possible.

Would you like to proceed with the survey now?]

Section 1: User Satisfaction

The first set of questions asks about any **formal** contact you may have had with the Edmonton Police Service. Please **do not** include bylaw or parking control people, or receiving a ticket in the mail *unless* you made a follow-up call. We are interested **only** in your contact with the **Edmonton Police Service - not** police from other jurisdictions. Also, please **do not** include *informal* contacts with police officers who are friends, classmates or colleagues.

1. In the past 12 months (since October 2008) have you had **any formal** contact either by phone or in person with the **Edmonton Police Service**? [Do not read]
 - 1 Yes
 - 2 No (*Go to Section 2*)
 - 8 Don't know (*Go to Section 2*)
 - 9 No response (*Go to Section 2*)

2. Did **you** yourself **initiate contact** with the Edmonton Police Service for any reason? [Do not read]
 - 1 Yes
 - 2 No
 - 8 Don't know
 - 9 No response

3. Did the Edmonton Police Service **initiate contact** with you, or stop **you** for any reason? [Do not read]

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 8 Don't know
- 9 No response

The following skip patterns to be built into CATI for Section 1:

<i>If Q1=Yes and ...</i>	Q2	Q3	
	Yes	Yes	ask Q4-Q22
	Yes	No	ask Q4-Q18 then skip to Section 2
	Yes	Don't know	ask Q4-Q18 then skip to Section 2
	Yes	No response	ask Q4-Q18 then skip to Section 2
	No	Yes	ask Q19-Q22
	No	No	Logic error (i.e. Q1=Y). Clarify answer to Q1
	No	Don't know	Clarify answers to Q1-Q3
	No	No response	Clarify answers to Q1-Q3
	Don't know	Yes	ask Q19-Q22
	Don't know	No	Clarify answers to Q1-Q3
	Don't know	Don't know	Clarify answers to Q1-Q3
	Don't know	No response	Clarify answers to Q1-Q3
	No response	Yes	ask Q19-Q22
	No response	No	Clarify answers to Q1-Q3
	No response	Don't know	Clarify answers to Q1-Q3
	No response	No response	Clarify answers to Q1-Q3

4. I'm now going to read a list of reasons why someone might contact the police. As I read the list, please tell me "yes" or "no" to indicate the reason or reasons *you* contacted the Edmonton Police Service over the last year. Did you contact the Edmonton Police Service to... (*Read, multiple responses allowed*)

- a) Report a crime? (1=Yes, 2=No, 8=Don't know, 9=No response)
- b) Report a traffic accident or medical emergency?
- c) Report a neighborhood problem or concern?
- d) Report something suspicious?
- e) Obtain a permit? ([Only read if necessary] e.g. firearm, alarm)
- f) Obtain a security clearance?
- g) Ask for information or advice?
- h) Any other reason? 4h2) What other reason? _____

Now I'm going to ask you about the various *types* of contact you may have had with the Edmonton Police Service over the past year...

5. In the past 12 months, did you **telephone** the Edmonton Police Service for any reason? [Do not read]

- 1 Yes
- 2 No (*Go to Q10*)
- 8 Don't know (*Go to Q10*)
- 9 No response (*Go to Q10*)

6. The **last time** you phoned police, did you call ... [read]
- 1 911
 - 2 The police **non-emergency** number (423-4567)
 - 3 A police station
 - 4 A police officer's cell phone or pager
 - 8 [Do not read] Don't know
 - 9 [Do not read] No response
7. Would you say your **most recent** phone call to police was ... [read]
- 1 Extremely urgent
 - 2 Urgent, or
 - 3 Routine
 - 8 [Do not read] Don't know
 - 9 [Do not read] No response
8. Still thinking about your **most recent** phone call to the Edmonton Police Service, how satisfied were you with the way your call was handled? Were you... [read]
- 1 Very satisfied
 - 2 Somewhat satisfied
 - 3 Somewhat dissatisfied
 - 4 Very dissatisfied
 - 8 [Do not read] Don't know (*Go to Q10*)
 - 9 [Do not read] No response (*Go to Q10*)
9. Can you tell me the **main reason** you were _____ (response above)?
- 88 Don't know
 - 99 No response
10. In the past 12 months was a police officer **dispatched** to your home or business? [Do not read]
- 1 Yes
 - 2 No (*Go to Q15*)
 - 8 Don't know (*Go to Q15*)
 - 9 No response (*Go to Q15*)
11. Thinking back to the **last time** police were dispatched to your home or business, did you *yourself* make the phone call that resulted in police being dispatched? [Do not read]
- 1 Yes
 - 2 No
 - 8 Don't know (*Go to Q15*)
 - 9 No response(*Go to Q15*)

12. Between the time the call was made and the responding officer arrived on scene, would you say the wait was ... [read]

- 1 Longer than you expected
- 2 About the amount of time you expected, or
- 3 Less time than you expected?
- 8 [Do not read] Don't know
- 9 [Do not read] No response

13. Still thinking about the **last time** police were dispatched to your home or business, how satisfied were you with the way the responding officer handled the matter when they arrived? Were you... [read]

- 1 Very satisfied
- 2 Somewhat satisfied
- 3 Somewhat dissatisfied
- 4 Very dissatisfied
- 8 [Do not read] Don't know (*Go to Q15*)
- 9 [Do not read] No response (*Go to Q15*)

14. Can you tell me the **main reason** you were _____ (response above)?

- 88 Don't know
- 99 No response

15. In the past 12 months, did you go to a **police station** for any reason? [Do not read]

- 1 Yes
- 2 No (*Go to Q19 if Q3=Yes; Go to Section 2 if Q3=No, Don't Know, No Response*)

16. Would you say that your **most recent** visit to a police station was ... [read]

- 1 Extremely urgent,
- 2 Urgent, or
- 3 Routine
- 8 [Do not read] Don't know
- 9 [Do not read] No response

17. Still thinking about your **most recent** visit to a police station, how satisfied were you with the way police handled your concern or issue? Were you... [read]

- 1 Very satisfied
- 2 Somewhat satisfied
- 3 Somewhat dissatisfied
- 4 Very dissatisfied
- 8 [Do not read] Don't know (*Go to Q19 if Q3=Yes; Go to Section 2 if Q3=No, Don't Know, No Response*)
- 9 [Do not read] No response (*Go to Q19 if Q3=Yes; Go to Section 2 if Q3=No, Don't Know, No Response*)

18. Can you tell me the **main reason** you were _____ (response above)? (Go to Q19 if Q3=Yes; Go to Section 2 if Q3=No, Don't Know, No Response)
 88 Don't know (Go to Q19 if Q3=Yes; Go to Section 2 if Q3=No, Don't Know, No Response)
 99 No response (Go to Q19 if Q3=Yes; Go to Section 2 if Q3=No, Don't Know, No Response)
19. In the past 12 months, did the Edmonton Police Service **initiate contact with you, or stop you**, for any of the following reasons... (Read, multiple responses allowed)
- To ask for information in connection with a crime that had been committed (1=Yes, 2=No, 8=Don't know, 9=No response)
 - To investigate a traffic accident in which you were involved or witnessed
 - To deal with a ringing burglar alarm
 - To investigate other noise or disturbance
 - To return missing property
 - To search your property
 - To charge you with an offence or arrest you
 - For a Check Stop
 - For a traffic violation ([Only read if necessary] e.g. speeding, red light violation, seat belt violation, traffic signal/sign violation)
 - Any other reason 19j2) What was the other reason? _____
20. [Ask ONLY if more than one contact] Which of these contacts where police initiated contact with you was the **most recent**?
- 1-10, corresponding with Q19 a-j
 88 [Do not read] Don't know (Go to Section 2)
 99 [Do not read] No response (Go to Section 2)
21. [Use this preface ONLY if police made more than one contact with respondent: Thinking about your **most recent** contact,] How satisfied were you with the way the police handled the matter? Were you... [read]
- Very satisfied
 - Somewhat satisfied
 - Somewhat dissatisfied
 - Very dissatisfied
 - [Do not read] Don't know (Go to Section 2)
 - [Do not read] No response (Go to Section 2)
22. Can you tell me the **main reason** you were _____ (response above)?
 88 Don't know
 99 No response

Section 2: Neighborhood Safety

Now I'm going to ask about your perceptions of crime and personal safety in your neighborhood.

23. How long have you lived in your present neighborhood?

_____ Number of years (888=Don't know, 999=No response) *(If less than one year record '0' and go to Q25. Round to closest year, round half years down) [program as drop down box – whole numbers only.]*

24. In your opinion, over the past 12 months, do you think that crime in your neighborhood has ... [read]

- 1 Increased
- 2 Decreased, or
- 3 Stayed about the same
- 8 [Do not read] Don't know
- 9 [Do not read] No response

25. How safe do you feel from crime when walking **alone** in your neighborhood after dark? Do you feel... [read]

- 1 Very safe *(Go to Q27)*
- 2 Reasonably safe *(Go to Q27)*
- 3 Somewhat unsafe, or
- 4 Very unsafe
- 5 [Do not read] Respondent does not walk alone after dark *(Go to Q27)*
- 8 [Do not read] Don't Know *(Go to Q27)*
- 9 [Do not read] No response *(Go to Q27)*

26. Can you tell me the **main** reason you feel unsafe? _____ (88=Don't know, 99=No response)

27. In general, how often do you *avoid* going out after dark because of crime? Would that be ... [read]

- 1 Never
- 2 Some of the time, or
- 3 Most of the time
- 8 [Do not read] Don't know
- 9 [Do not read] No response

28. Now I'm going to read a list of things that you **may** think are problems in your neighborhood. After I read each one, please tell me whether you think it's a big problem, some problem, or no problem in your neighborhood. *(Time reference is now. Randomize and read)*

- 1 No problem
 - 2 Some problem
 - 3 A big problem
 - 8 [Do not read] Don't know
 - 9 [Do not read] No response
- a) Noisy neighbors, loud music, late parties. Is that ...
 - b) People breaking in or sneaking into homes to steal things
 - c) Suspicious people hanging out in the streets

- d) People being attacked or robbed
- e) Sale or use of drugs in public places
- f) Drinking or drunkenness in public places
- g) Speeding and careless driving
- h) Panhandling or being asked for money
- i) Graffiti, that is writing or painting on walls or buildings
- j) Vandalism, other than graffiti
- k) Gang activity

29. Generally speaking, compared to other cities in Canada, do you think that Edmonton has a higher amount of crime, about the same or a lower amount of crime? [Do not read]

- 1 Higher
- 2 About the same
- 3 Lower
- 8 Don't know
- 9 No response

Section 3: Victimization

The next few questions ask about your household's experiences with crimes **that occurred within the City of Edmonton** over the past 12 months (since October 2008).

30. First, I'd like to ask if over the past 12 months, you or anyone in your household *owned or leased* a motor vehicle, such as a car, truck, motorcycle, etc. [Do not read]

- 1 Yes
- 2 No (*Go to Q41*)
- 8 Don't know (*Go to Q41*)
- 9 No response (*Go to Q41*)

31. In the past 12 months, did anyone **steal** or try to steal one of these vehicles or a part of one of them, such as a battery, hubcap, or radio? [Do not read]

- 1 Yes
- 2 No (*Go to Q36*)
- 8 Don't know (*Go to Q36*)
- 9 No response (*Go to Q36*)

32. How many times did this happen in the past 12 months? _____ (88=Don't Know, 99=No Response)

33. Was this [*If Q32>1, Were all of these*] incidents reported to the police? [Do not read]

- 1 Yes (*Go to Q36*)
- 2 No
- 8 Don't know (*Go to Q36*)
- 9 No response (*Go to Q36*)

34. How many incidents were not reported? _____ (88=Don't Know, 99=No Response)

35. To the best of your knowledge, what was the main reason this incident was (*If Q34>1, these incidents were*) not reported to police? [Do not read]

- 1 Dealt with another way (e.g. reported to another official/landlord/manager, took care of myself)
- 2 Fear of revenge by offender
- 3 Police couldn't do anything about it (e.g. didn't find out until too late, lack of proof, couldn't recover/ identify property, couldn't find/identify offender)
- 4 Police wouldn't help (e.g. wouldn't think important enough, biased, police would be inefficient/ineffective, offender was police officer)
- 5 Did not want to get involved with police
- 6 Not important enough to respondent (e.g. minor crime, small loss, child offender, no intended harm)
- 7 Incident was a personal matter and did not concern police
- 8 Fear of publicity/news coverage
- 9 Insurance wouldn't cover (no insurance, loss less than deductible etc.)
- 10 Nothing taken /items were recovered
- 11 Other 35i) _____
- 88 Don't know
- 99 No response

36. In the past 12 months, did anyone **deliberately damage** one of these vehicles, such as slashing tires? [Do not read]

- 1 Yes
- 2 No (*Go to Q41*)
- 8 Don't know (*Go to Q41*)
- 9 No response (*Go to Q41*)

37. How many times did this happen in the past 12 months? _____ (88=Don't Know, 99=No Response)

38. Was this [*If Q37>1, Were all of these*] incidents reported to the police? [Do not read]

- 1 Yes (*Go to Q41*)
- 2 No
- 8 Don't know (*Go to Q41*)
- 9 No response (*Go to Q41*)

39. How many incidents were not reported? _____ (88=Don't Know, 99=No Response)

40. To the best of your knowledge, what was the main reason this incident was (*If Q39>1, these incidents were*) not reported to police? [Do not read]

- 1 Dealt with another way (e.g. reported to another official/landlord/manager, took care of myself)
- 2 Fear of revenge by offender
- 3 Police couldn't do anything about it (e.g. didn't find out until too late, lack of proof, couldn't recover/ identify property, couldn't find/identify offender)
- 4 Police wouldn't help (e.g. wouldn't think important enough, biased, police would be inefficient/ineffective, offender was police officer)
- 5 Did not want to get involved with police
- 6 Not important enough to respondent (e.g. minor crime, small loss, child offender, no intended harm)
- 7 Incident was a personal matter and did not concern police
- 8 Fear of publicity/news coverage

- 9 Insurance wouldn't cover (no insurance, loss less than deductible etc.)
- 10 Nothing taken /items were recovered
- 11 Other 40i) _____
- 88 Don't know
- 99 No response

41. In the past 12 months, did anyone **deliberately damage** or **destroy** any **other property** belonging to you, or anyone in your household, such as a window or a fence? [Do not read]

- 1 Yes
- 2 No (*Go to Q46*)
- 8 Don't know (*Go to Q46*)
- 9 No response (*Go to Q46*)

42. How many times did this happen in the past 12 months? _____ (88=Don't Know, 99=No Response)

43. Was this [*If Q42>1, Were all of these*] incidents reported to the police? [Do not read]

- 1 Yes (*Go to Q46*)
- 2 No
- 8 Don't know (*Go to Q46*)
- 9 No response (*Go to Q46*)

44. How many incidents were not reported? _____ (88=Don't Know, 99=No Response)

45. To the best of your knowledge, what was the main reason this incident was (*If Q44>1, these incidents were*) not reported to police? [Do not read]

- 1 Dealt with another way (e.g. reported to another official/landlord/manager, took care of myself)
- 2 Fear of revenge by offender
- 3 Police couldn't do anything about it (e.g. didn't find out until too late, lack of proof, couldn't recover/ identify property, couldn't find/identify offender)
- 4 Police wouldn't help (e.g. wouldn't think important enough, biased, police would be inefficient/ineffective, offender was police officer)
- 5 Did not want to get involved with police
- 6 Not important enough to respondent (e.g. minor crime, small loss, child offender, no intended harm)
- 7 Incident was a personal matter and did not concern police
- 8 Fear of publicity/news coverage
- 9 Insurance wouldn't cover (no insurance, loss less than deductible etc.)
- 10 Nothing taken /items were recovered
- 11 Other 45i) _____
- 88 Don't know
- 99 No response

46. In the past 12 months, did anyone illegally **break into** or attempt to break into your residence or any other building on your property? [Do not read]

- 1 Yes
- 2 No (Go to Q51)
- 8 Don't know (Go to Q51)
- 9 No response (Go to Q51)

47. How many times did this happen in the past 12 months? _____ (88=Don't Know, 99=No Response)

48. Was this [If Q47>1, Were all of these] incidents reported to the police? [Do not read]

- 1 Yes (Go to Q51)
- 2 No
- 8 Don't know (Go to Q51)
- 9 No response (Go to Q51)

49. How many incidents were not reported? _____ (88=Don't Know, 99=No Response)

50. To the best of your knowledge, what was the main reason this incident was (If Q49>1, these incidents were) not reported to police? [Do not read]

- 1 Dealt with another way (e.g. reported to another official/landlord/manager, took care of myself)
- 2 Fear of revenge by offender
- 3 Police couldn't do anything about it (e.g. didn't find out until too late, lack of proof, couldn't recover/ identify property, couldn't find/identify offender)
- 4 Police wouldn't help (e.g. wouldn't think important enough, biased, police would be inefficient/ineffective, offender was police officer)
- 5 Did not want to get involved with police
- 6 Not important enough to respondent (e.g. minor crime, small loss, child offender, no intended harm)
- 7 Incident was a personal matter and did not concern police
- 8 Fear of publicity/news coverage
- 9 Insurance wouldn't cover (no insurance, loss less than deductible etc.)
- 10 Nothing taken /items were recovered
- 11 Other 50i) _____
- 88 Don't know
- 99 No response

51. Other than any incidents already mentioned, did anyone **steal** or attempt to steal money or property belonging to you or anyone in your household in the past 12 months? [Do not read]

- 1 Yes
- 2 No (Go to Q56)
- 8 Don't know (Go to Q56)
- 9 No response (Go to Q56)

52. How many times did this happen in the past 12 months? _____ (88=Don't Know, 99=No Response)

53. Was this [*If Q52>1, Were all of these*] incidents reported to the police? [Do not read]

- 1 Yes (*Go to Q56*)
- 2 No
- 8 Don't know (*Go to Q56*)
- 9 No response (*Go to Q56*)

54. How many incidents were not reported? _____ (88=Don't Know, 99=No Response)

55. To the best of your knowledge, what was the main reason this incident was (*If Q54>1, these incidents were*) not reported to police? [Do not read]

- 1 Dealt with another way (e.g. reported to another official/landlord/manager, took care of myself)
- 2 Fear of revenge by offender
- 3 Police couldn't do anything about it (e.g. didn't find out until too late, lack of proof, couldn't recover/ identify property, couldn't find/identify offender)
- 4 Police wouldn't help (e.g. wouldn't think important enough, biased, police would be inefficient/ineffective, offender was police officer)
- 5 Did not want to get involved with police
- 6 Not important enough to respondent (e.g. minor crime, small loss, child offender, no intended harm)
- 7 Incident was a personal matter and did not concern police
- 8 Fear of publicity/news coverage
- 9 Insurance wouldn't cover (no insurance, loss less than deductible etc.)
- 10 Nothing taken /items were recovered
- 11 Other 55i) _____
- 88 Don't know
- 99 No response

Section 4: Views of EPS

Now I'd like to ask about your views of the Edmonton Police Service.

56. In your opinion, what are the **three** most important issues in the City that should be addressed by the Edmonton Police Service today? Please list them in order of importance, starting with the most important: (88=Don't know, 99=No response)

- 1. _____
- 2. _____
- 3. _____

57. I will read a statement, and please tell me if you strongly disagree, somewhat disagree, somewhat agree, or strongly agree. *"I have a lot of confidence in the Edmonton Police Service."* [Do not read]

- 1 Strongly disagree
- 2 Somewhat disagree
- 3 Somewhat agree
- 4 Strongly agree
- 8 Don't know
- 9 No response

58. Thinking back over the past 12 months, would you say that your confidence in the Edmonton Police Service has . . . [read]

- 1 Gone down
- 2 Stayed the same (*Go to Q60*) or
- 3 Gone up
- 8 [Do not read] Don't know (*Go to Q60*)
- 9 [Do not read] No response(*Go to Q60*)

59. What is the **main** reason your confidence has changed? _____ (88=Don't know, 99=No response)

60. The next questions deal with your perceptions of the work that is being carried out by the Edmonton Police Service. Do you think the Edmonton Police Service does a **good** job, an **average** job, or a **poor** job of ... (*Randomize and read*)

- a) Enforcing the laws
- b) Promptly responding to calls
- c) Being approachable and easy to talk to
- d) Supplying information to the public on ways to reduce crime
- e) Ensuring the safety of citizens
- f) Treating people fairly

- 1 Good job
- 2 Average job
- 3 Poor job
- 8 [Do not read] Don't know
- 9 [Do not read] No response

61. If you could make just **one** recommendation to the Edmonton Police Service about how they could **improve** their services, what would it be? _____ (88=Don't know, 99=No Response)

62. **Overall**, regardless of your own use, how satisfied are you with the service provided by the Edmonton Police Service? Would you say you are ...? (READ LIST)

- 1 Very satisfied (*Go to Section 5*)
- 2 Somewhat satisfied (*Go to Section 5*)
- 3 Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (*Go to Section 5*)
- 4 Somewhat dissatisfied
- 5 Very dissatisfied
- 8 [Do not read] Don't know (*Go to Section 5*)
- 9 [Do not read] No response (*Go to Section 5*)

63. What specific aspects of the police service dissatisfied you? _____ (88=Don't know, 99=No response)

Section 5: Edmonton Police Commission

64. Are you aware that Edmonton has a Police Commission?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No (*Go to Q67*)

65. Based on your understanding, what is the role of the Edmonton Police Commission?

_____ (88=Don't know, 99=No response)

For the next several questions, please answer "yes" or "no":

66. Are you aware that ...

- a) ...the Edmonton Police Commission appoints the Chief of Police for Edmonton?
- b) ...the Edmonton Police Commission sets and monitors the budget for Edmonton's Police Service?
- c) ...the Edmonton Police Commission establishes policies that govern policing in Edmonton?
- d) ...the Edmonton Police Commission oversees police officer conduct?
- e) ...the Edmonton Police Commission holds public meetings?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

Section 6: Demographic Information

The final few questions will be used for classification purposes only.

67. How long have you lived in Edmonton? _____ years (*Record '0' if less than one year*) (888=Don't know, 999=No response) [Program as drop down box, whole numbers only. Round down half years]

68. What age group are you in? Would it be . . . [read]
- 1 18 to 24
 - 2 25 to 34
 - 3 35 to 44
 - 4 45 to 54
 - 5 55 to 64
 - 6 65 to 74
 - 7 75 or over
 - 9 [Do not read] refused
69. What is the highest level of education you completed? [Do not read]
- 1 Less than grade 9
 - 2 Grades 9 to 13 *without* high school graduation certificate
 - 3 Grades 9 to 13 with high school graduation certificate
 - 4 Trades certificate or diploma
 - 5 College *without* certificate or diploma
 - 6 College with certificate or diploma
 - 7 University without degree
 - 8 University with bachelor's degree or higher
 - 88 Don't know
 - 99 Not stated
70. Do you currently own or rent your living accommodation? [Do not read]
- 1 Own
 - 2 Rent
 - 8 Don't know
 - 9 No response
71. In total, how many people, *including adults and children*, live in your household?
_____ (88=Don't know, 99=No response)
72. What is your postal code? _____ (88 = Don't know. 99 = No response)
73. Gender (*do not ask*)
- 1 Male
 - 2 Female

Those are all the questions I have. On behalf of the Edmonton Police Service, I'd like to thank you for taking part in this survey.