**Rural Attitudes and Perceptions of Crime,
Policing and Victimization: Preliminary
Findings from a Survey of a Rural
Counties in Nova Scotia**




Christopher Murphy
Donald Clairmont

Atlantic Institute of Criminology: Research Group

Chris Murphy, Survey Coordinator
Donald Clairmont, Research Director
Bob Kaill, Research Administrator
Tony Thomson, Principal Researcher
Lynda Clairmont, Survey Director

July 31, 1990

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Acknowledgements

List of Tables

# LIST OF TABLES

**CHAPTER 1**

**INTRODUCTION**

As a result of increasing public concern, about
neighbourhood crime and order problems, the cost effectiveness
of criminal justice programs, and changing attitudes towards
issues such as domestic violence, studies of public attitudes
and victimization experience have become an important basis for
policy and program development in criminal justice.  Large scale
international (I.C.S., 1989) national victimization surveys
(Solicitor General, 1983 ; Statistics Canada, 1988) and a number
of community-based police studies (Murphy and de Verteuil, 1986;
Murphy and Lithopolos, 1988) have provided a new source of data
on a variety of crime and policing issues.  However virtually
all victimization and community – police surveys done in Canada,
have been conducted in urban settings.  As the majority of
police jurisdictions in Canada are in small town or rural
settings, and a large proportion of the population live in rural
communities, there has been growing interest in developing rural
based victimization and policing studies.[1]  Consequentially, the

---

[1]    In Canada, there are over 9,457 towns or villages (average pop. 473) and 148 small cities

Solicitor Generals Department funded the Atlantic Institute of Criminology to develop a rural based victimization and policing survey to study attitudes and perceptions of crime, victimization and policing.

The Atlantic Institute of Criminology is a criminology research institute at Dalhousie University in Nova Scotia, which has had as its primary research focus the development of criminology research on rural crime and criminal justice in the Maritimes. It has conducted an extensive review of the literature on rural crime and criminal justice (Kaill, 1981) and is currently involved in an extensive study of rural and urban policing styles, including a victimization and police survey in Halifax (Clairmont, 1988).

The A.I.C. and the Research Division of the Police and Security Branch of the Federal Solicitor General established the following research objectives for this rural victimization – policing survey.

a)   Provide descriptive information on various aspects of crime victimization in a rural population;

b)   Explore attitudes towards victimization and intervention strategies regarding family or domestic violence;

---

(26,000) and 23 large cities, about 7 or 8 million people live in rural or small towns and 72% of all police departments in Canada have less than twenty employees.

c) Document the extent and nature of <u>crime fear, worry</u> and concern re crime and order and policing problems;

d) Develop a body of attitudinal and evaluative data and analysis on various aspects of <u>small town and rural policing</u> and the distinctive quality of the police role in rural areas;

e) Provide <u>comparative</u> analysis of <u>rural and urban, victimization and policing</u> data

A multipurpose victimization survey was developed to provide data capable of addressing these diverse issues.  The findings from this survey allow an examination of the various causal and interactive aspects of victimization, while at the same time providing local police and policy makers an useful body of data for evaluative purposes and program development.

The following report provides a summary of the findings from the survey.

**RESEARCH AND POLICY ISSUES**

A review of the research literature and policy issues identified a number of research and policy issues that became the focus of the questionnaire.  The following provides an brief overview of these issues.

<u>Distinguishing and Testing Rural Society and Social Control</u>

3

The debate over the distinctive nature of urban and rural society has long been a central issue in criminological theory and research (Kaill, 1986). The sociological literature and research on rural society generally distinguishes it as a distinctive environment with unique social organization and control mechanisms. Rural society is presumed to have a distinctive form of traditional cultural and social organization which produces high levels of public order and low levels of reported crime (Fischer, 1975; Wilson, 1985). Socio-demographic characteristics such as simple economic structures, low divisions of labour, homogeneous cultural and religious make-up, low mobility rates combine with a highly developed sense of community, frequent interpersonal contacts and viable social institutions (family, school, religion and community). These unique socio-cultural factors are said to exert effective pro-social pressures and strong informal social controls. Traditional individual and community values and standards regarding publicly acceptable forms of behaviours are enforced informally through a network of informal and formal community based social institutions and are reinforced formally by a responsive and knowledgeable police. Though these structural and cultural characteristics interact in various ways, they are

4

presumed to explain lower rates of crime, higher feelings of public safety and higher standards of public order in rural counties and communities.

More recent theory and research (Newbey and Lee, 1984; Pahl, 1966) argues that the differences between urban and rural society are diminishing and that as a result, personal victimization and community crime and order problems are increasing and becoming more similar to urban patterns. The degree and nature of the distinctiveness of rural society and rural crime and order, is not only an important theoretical issue, but also a criminal justice policy issue. For example, distinctive rural values, and attitudes towards law, police, private disputes may reduce reporting rates and thus diminish the effectiveness of urban oriented criminal justice education, prevention and enforcement programs. The empirical findings on victimization experience and public attitudes and values toward crime and policing allow the findings from this research to not only contribute to our understanding of the differences between rural and urban society but also distinguish the nature of rural victimization and policing attitudes.

Victimization:

As an alternative to official crime rates, victimization studies have established that large numbers of crime or victimizations are not reported to police.  As a result these crimes are not responded to, nor do they become part of the formal statistics on crime or victimization.  As the rate of official crime is lower in rural areas (Kaill,1986), it was expected that rural victimization rates would also be lower.  In addition to establishing levels of rural victimization, this study attempts to describe the nature and types of victimization, particularly distinctions between property and personal victimization.  Though a relatively large sample was employed (N=1146), it was recognized that the small number of reported victimization, would allow only limited analysis of general victimization types.

Victimization reporting patterns are also an important research and policy issues.  Studies (Smith, 1980) suggest that rural citizens are less likely to report certain kinds of crimes to police, particularly domestic or family related crimes.  As reporting patterns determine official crime rates, any differences in reporting or non-reporting between urban and rural will further distort official statistics.  Therefore the study addresses the issue of crime reporting and allows

6

comparative analysis of urban and rural data.

Attitudes and Values Re. Domestic Violence:

Related to victimization and reporting rates are the underlying values and attitudes of citizens towards domestic conflict and abuse. Whether people define interpersonal conflict as private or public matters, legal or social problems may determine whether there will be any third party intervention in the conflict and which agency will be called to provide that intervention. This issue is particularly important in rural areas given generally lower reporting rates and the hypothesized rural tendency to regard domestic violence as a private problem. These findings have numerous implications for police and criminal justice prevention strategies.

To address these concerns, a series of questions briefly describing different domestic violence/abuse incidents were developed to tap citizen attitudes towards various kinds of intervention strategies. The resulting data allows an examination of the values and responses preferences which different types of domestic violence evoke and how personal characteristics such as age, gender and income influence respondents preferences.

Crime Fear, Worry and Concern:

Fear of crime, worry about personal and property safety has recently become an important research and policy issue for criminal justice agencies. Studies of fear of crime and personal victimization have established that fear and worry about crime can have a dramatic impact on a variety of behavioural and attitudinal outcomes (Skogam, 1988). Individuals and groups with high levels of crime fear may restrict their personal movements, are less inclined to be sociable, withdraw from public and social involvements and are far more critical and less supportive of criminal justice agencies like the police and the courts. While these relationships may be understandable, they are also problematic, because research also demonstrates that vulnerable individuals and groups (i.e.) the elderly and women may have exaggerated perceptions of the actual risk of victimization. Information on crime fear and worry, is useful for policy makers and criminal justice agencies, as they are able to target particularly vulnerable and/or fearful groups and develop more focused risk reduction and crime prevention strategies. The survey therefore

developed a series of questions targeting public fear, concern

and anxiety over a wide range of crime and order problems.


Public Attitudes, Perceptions and Evaluations of Police and
Policing:

Community-based policing is often described as bringing the

positive qualities of small town policing to the urban community

and its police departments (Braiden, 1987).  Studies of rural

community attitudes and evaluations of small town and rural

police have become a more important issue since the development

of community-based policing as a progressive model of urban

public policing.  Traditional policing qualities such as

responsiveness to citizen demands, and enforcement of community

values, high levels of personal contact, and extensive knowledge

of the community and a broad "social" definition of the police

role, have made rural policing a possible model for urban police

reform.

    As a research issue, this study focuses on community

experience and contact with the police, citizen expectation of

police, evaluations of police activities and functions and

valued qualities of police performance.  By providing survey

data on these issues, it is hoped analysis of the findings, can

establish citizen perceptions, attitudes and evaluations of

rural police and the extent to which the traditional qualities

associated with rural police are valued by the community.

Comparative use of this data also allows research to examine key

differences between urban and rural policing and the various

factors which influence evaluations and perception of police

performance.  Finally the findings can be used by local police

as indicators of the perceived effectiveness of the various

services and policing strategies they provide.

**CHAPTER 2**

**METHODOLOGY**

A comprehensive review of the research and methodology
literature (Andrews & Ferrazzi, 1985; Larvakas, 1988; Murphy,
1985) on rural crime, victimization and public attitudes toward
policing preceded the development of an appropriate survey
instrument.  A questionnaire was developed, modelled in part on
a public victimization survey done in Halifax (Clairmont, 1989)
and Toronto (Murphy and de Verteuil, 1986; Murphy and
Lithopoulos, 1988.)  In addition a number of original questions
were developed to deal with various policing and victimization,
experience and community issues not addressed in these surveys.

Though much of the questionnaire was pretested in the
Halifax survey, it was considered important to pretest the
questionnaire in order to address the viability of the telephone
interview method in rural areas, the suitability of some
questions in a rural setting,  the clarity of additional
questions, and survey length.  A successful pretest established
the viability of the questionnaire items and the feasibility of
using a telephone survey methodology in rural areas.  Cost-

11

effectiveness, speed and control of the data collection process determined the adoption of telephone verses person to person interviews.

To meet the stated principal objectives of the survey and resolve the problem of survey length, the questionnaire was partitioned into three components; a core and two focus segments on victimization and the role of the police.  The core portion of the questionnaire, designed to gather general information on crime, policing and safety, was administered to the entire sample population (N = 1146).  The two focus segments were randomly assigned so that half the sample answered one or the other and focus segments in addition to the core.  The victimization segment (N = 562) dealt more specifically with issues of criminal victimization.  The role of the police role segment addressed more specifically public attitudes regarding police style and was administered to the remaining respondent population (N = 584).

Kings County, Nova Scotia was selected as the geographic area for the survey.  This is a mixed farming and fishing area that includes the towns of Middleton and Hantsport (Annapolis and Hants counties respectfully) bordering King's County.

Statistics Canada ( 1986) demographic figures indicated the
total population of the survey area was 56,404, which included
King's County (53,275), Middleton (1,772), and Hantsport
(1,357).  Including Kentville (5,208), Berwick (2,058) and
Wolfville (3,277) the towns in the survey area constituted
approximately 25% of the total sample population.  This area
represented a suitable mix of rural, town and villages and was
also the sight of an ongoing research project of small town and
rural policing.

Random digit dialling (RDD) was determined as an
appropriate technique for number selection in rural areas
instead of a list-based sampling procedure.  Telephone
directories in rural areas contain nearly complete population
coverage (Frey, 1983) and provide a reliable method of
estimating the sample pool.  A final sample size was determined
by an estimate of total working numbers, respondent exclusion
and refusals [ESSP = FSS/[[HR] [1-REC] [1-LE]] (Lavrakas, 1987.)
Numbers were randomly selected using a systematic sampling
procedure.  A respondent selection technique (Hagen and Collier,
1982) was used to designate an appropriate respondent within
each household and minimize bias in establishing a
representative sample.  This technique employed a gender-based,

non-intrusive strategy, where interviewers alternatively request the youngest female or youngest male (over 19) respondent.

From the initial sample pool of 3300 numbers, 36% of the numbers were not required, 13% were non-working/disconnected numbers and 8% were non-contracted call backs. Refusals accounted for 9% of the entire sample pool and partially completed interviews for 2%. The total number of successfully completed interviews was 1,146 which comprised 31% of the adjusted sample pool. Given a total population of 56,404 and 19,405 households, 1146 completed interviews represent a 1:17 successful household contact ratio, producing a usually large and reliable sample size. The integrity of the sample was further ensured by selecting the same demographic distribution with Statistics Canada profiles of the area. Having established the sampling pool and respondent selection process, the research group directly supervised the interview process including the hiring, training and supervision of interviewers in order to enhance the integrity and reliability of the data. Interviewers were locally, screened and trained. Close supervision and efficient interviewing produced an additional one hundred fifty interviews beyond the original projected sample size.

In conclusion, the decision to use the telephone survey

technique in a rural environment and directly supervise and
control the data collection process effectively produced high
quality data and enhanced the reliability of research findings.

The following table provide some descriptive data on
various socio-demographic characteristics of the valley sample.

| TABLE S.1 SAMPLE DEMOGRAPHICS AND CHARACTERISTICS | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Total Sample | Town | Rural/Other |
| **SAMPLE DEMOGRAPHICS** | | | |
| Female | **50%** | 50% | 50% |
| More than two adults/household | **19%** | – | – |
| Single-family Dwell. | **80%** | 71% | 86% |
| Home Owners | **78%** | 71% | 82% |
| Two or Less persons/household | **46%** | 52% | 43% |
| Age  18 – 40 | **48%** | 46% | 49% |
| 41 – 60 | **29%** | 27% | 30% |
| 61+ | **23%** | 27% | 21% |

**(TABLE S.1 continued)**

**SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Live in Valley<5 yrs | **15%** | 15% | 14% |
| Live in Area<5 yrs | **37%** | 35% | 38% |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| No Relatives in Neigh. | **44%** | 44% | 45% |
| No close friends in Neigh. | **15%** | 12% | 16% |
| Belongs to <u>No</u> organizations in area | **46%** | 41% | 49% |
| Marital Status:Single | **19%** | 23% | 16% |
| Respondents Employed | **54%** | 51% | 55% |
| Income: | | | |
|     20,000 + less | **33%** | 33% | 32% |
|     20 – 40,000 | **47%** | 42% | 49% |
|     40,000 + More | **21%** | 25% | 19% |

\*    Significant Difference (.05)        N = 1146

# CHAPTER 3

## VICTIMIZATION

Victimization surveys have established that there is a substantial difference between the amount of crimes that is reported to police and what respondents will reveal when surveyed directly.  As a result, victimization statistics allow more accurate estimates of the actual amount of crime or victimization in an area or community and ultimately a more detailed analysis of the characteristics of specific crime victims.  Knowledge of actual victimization rates and patterns also allows research to establish the relationship between victimization and issues such as fear of crime and evaluations of criminal justice agencies.    As most victimization surveys are of urban populations this study was particularly interested in establishing the rate and types of victimization in a rural sample.  The following findings describe the responses to a series of questions designed to produce information on individual victimization.


**TABLE V.1            COMPARATIVE: VICTIMIZATION SURVEYS**

|  | % Victimized | Year | Period | Total Sample Size |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valley: Valley Survey | 9% | 1989 | 2 yr | N =  1,146 |

```
Canada: Gen. Soc.Survey      24%        1988  2 yrs    N = 20,194

Halifax: Halifax Survey      31%        1988  2 yrs    N =    514
```

The first victimization question asked respondents to indicate whether they had been a victim of crime in the past two years.  This is a standard victimization question and can be used as a comparative measure with other victimization surveys.  Nine (9%) of the total valley sample indicated that they had been a victim of some sort of crime.  This figure is significantly lower than the finding for a similar question asked in Halifax and across Canada.

**TABLE V.1a   VICTIMIZATION (ALL CRIMES) BY GENDER/INCOME/LOCATION**

| Gender | Male | Female | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 11.4% | 6.9% | |
| **Income** | − $20,000 | $20 − 40,000 | $40,000+ |
| | 6.3% | 10.20% | 14.1% |
| **Location** | Town | Village | Other |
| | 9.7% | 8.4% | 10.0% |

In order to gather information on different types of victimization, a further series of questions focused on specific

18

offences such as robbery, assault and theft.  In order to
increase the information on possible victimization these
questions asked respondents to identify not only their own
victimization, but that of someone they knew personally in the
nieghbourhood.   This allowed the survey to develop sufficient
number for more detailed statistical analysis.   The findings
are reported in Table V.2.

**TABLE V.2     PERSONAL/RELEVANT OTHER VICTIMIZATION: TYPE & DEGREE**

|  | Personal Victimization | Other Victimization | Combined Pers/Other |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Hold Up** | 1% | 1% | 2% |
| **Assault** | 2% | 2% | 4% |
| **Theft** | 8% | 13% | 21% |
| **TOTAL** | **11%** | **16%** | **27%** |

\*    Relevant/Other refers to the victimization of someone the
      respondent knows personally living in the same
      neighbourhood.

When personal and known victimization responses are
combined, the findings generally indicated that more crime
happens to people that the respondents knew than had actually
happened to them personally.  The 11% of the respondents who
indicated they had been personally victimized is higher than 9 %
reporting victimization for the first victimization question.
It may be that more detailed and specific victimization

19

questions produce a more complete responses and thus explain the slightly higher number of reported victimizations. When responses are further analyzed by victimization type the findings indicate that property theft is the most common form of victimization, while personal property or assault accounted for only 3% of the total. The dominance of property to personal victimization is also reflected in official crime statistics.

More detail on the characteristics of the respondents and location of the victimization are reported in Table V.2a.

**TABLE V.2a      VICTIMIZATION: HOLD-UPS, ASSAULTS AND THEFT**

|  | **Hold-Up** | **Assault** | **Theft** |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pers/Others Victimized | 2% * | 4% * | 21% * |
| % Personal Victim | 42% | 59% | 39% |
| Reported to Police | 68% | 63% | 73% |
| Happen in Home | 58% | 23% | 69% |

*   These figures represent the percentage of personal and others victimized in the total sample. The other reported percentages are of the portion of the sample victimized, not the total sample. (N = 562)

In addition to victimization, respondents were asked to indicate

whether they or others had reported the crime to the police and whether the crime took place in the home or outside. The findings in Table V.2a indicates that the majority of all personal and other victimization were reported to police, with property crime being reported at a higher rate (73%) than personal assault crimes (63%). When asked about location of the victimization, the majority indicated that the home was the most likely place for property crime, and outside the home the most reported location for assault. However, the fact that 23% of the reported assaults took place in the home, may be a rough indicator of domestic violence.

In summary these victimization findings indicate that: (a) that rural victimization rates are lower than urban victimization rates, (b) that property victimization is more prevalent than personal victimization; (c) that gender, income and location do influence victimization, and (d) that a large number of crimes/victimization are unreported to police.


Responding To Domestic Victimization

The growing awareness that domestic violence is not just a private or personal problem but also a social and legal problem, suggests that individuals may vary in their attitudes towards

21

the "criminal" nature of domestic abuse.  Citizen attitudes

towards intervention in domestic abuse cases can determine

whether an incident will become public and what agency or group

will be asked to deal with the victim.  Knowledge of how

respondents say they would react to various incidents of

domestic violence and abuse, provides an indicator of the

underlying values and attitudes which influence reporting

patterns for domestic violence.

To examine various ways in which people define domestic

disputes/abuse and response preferences, respondents were asked

to indicate how they would respond to three different situations

of domestic abuse; domestic violence, child abuse and the abuse

of a family member.  The answers to these questions were coded

and categorized into five response options and are reported in

Table V.3a.

**TABLE V.3  VICTIMIZATION: PUB  ATTITUDES RE INTERVENTION/OPEN**

| Response Preference | Domestic Violence | Child Abuse | Family Abuse |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ignore | 5% | 2% | 1% |
| Personal Intervention | 16% | 15% | 40% |
| Call Others | 10% | 9% | 19% |
| Call Police | 65% | 19% | 18% |
| Call Other Service | 3% | 52% | 16% |

(N=562)

    The findings reported in the above table demonstrate considerable variation in response preference both within victim and between types of victimization.  Domestic violence between neighbours would be ignored by 5% of the sample, while another 26% said they would personally intervene in some direct way. However the majority (65%) of the respondents said they would call the police.  This is the largest group of respondents for all three categories who indicate they would call the police. This finding may reflect a more general acceptance of domestic violence as a legal issue or police business, and may also reflect the fact that the dispute involved neighbours and not personal friends or family members.

    Response preferences to the "child abuse" scenario show a dramatic decline in the number who would call the police (19%) and correspondingly an increase in those who would call other social or community agencies (52%).  Approximately the same number would intervene personally while less than 2% would ignore the situation.  These findings suggest that child abuse is seen by many as a "social" problem and only secondarily as a legal or police problem.

    When asked how people would respond to abuse within their

own family, predictably more (59%) indicated they would intervene personally  as their initial response.  Only 18% choose calling the police as their initial response while 16% said they would call a social or community agency.  The figures demonstrated a clear preference for personally responding to abuse within the family through personal or private means and not involving, at least initially, the police.

The findings demonstrate clearly that how people at least say they will respond varies significantly in relation to the type of abuse and by the nature of their relationship to the victim and the abuser.  In general the data suggest that the less personal the relationship between the respondent and the victim, the more likely they would use formal intervention – law enforcement as an appropriate response.  The more intimate the relationship between the victims and the respondent, the more likely they are to personally intervene and less likely to call the police.

These findings are reinforced by a question which asked respondents to choose their responses from a number of predetermined response options.  More than one choice was available so most respondents chose a number of response options.  The findings in (Table V.3b) while increasing overall

numbers of respondents.

**TABLE V.3a    VICTIMIZATION: PUB. ATTITUDES RE INTERVENTION**

| Response Options | Domestic Violence | Child Abuse | Family Abuse |
|---|---|---|---|
| Personally Intervene | 30% | 46% | 78% |
| Call Comm. Agency | 30% | 64% | 59% |
| Call Gov't Agency | 31% | 80% | 76% |
| Call Police | 90% | 73% | 67% |

(N=562)

choosing a particular option, generally maintain the same
pattern or distribution of responses, both within and between
response categories.  Similar patterns of personal verses
formal/police intervention, found in Table V.3b, reaffirm the
link between victim-witness relationship victimization type and
preferred response.  However, when individuals are allowed more
than one response, it would appear that significantly more
people would add calling the police to their various response
options.  This suggests while calling the police may not be an
individual's first choice of response, it would often follow
their initial personal intervention and/or call to another
social agency.

25

Examination of characteristics of the respondents found the following characteristic influenced response patterns.  When the gender of the respondent is identified (Table V.3b) it is clear that women and men adopt a different response pattern to domestic violence/abuse.

**TABLE V.3b   GENDER AND RESPONSE PREFERENCE (CLOSED)**

| | Child Abuse | Domestic Viol. | Family Abuse |
|---|---|---|---|
| ** | Male-/Female | Male/Female | Male/Female |
| Personal Intervention | 53 *   38 | 42 *   17 | 86 *   68 |
| Community Agency | 62 *   67 | 27 *   34 | 56 *   62 |
| Gov./Soc.W. Agency | 72 *   89 | 29     33 | 68 *   85 |
| Call Police | 79 *   66 | 88     93 | 66     68 |

\*    Statistically significance difference
\*\*   More than one choice possible

In general men are more likely than women to intervene personally  and  more likely to call police, while women would call a government or social agency more often than men.  These findings require further analysis but they do appear to suggest that men choose a more formal police based response while women choose a more social and perhaps less legalistic response.

In summary, despite recent emphasis on the criminal nature

of domestic abuse and the need to emphasize legal rather than informal or social responses to domestic victimization, there still appears to be considerable ambivalence and confusion about how people should respond to incidents of domestic victimization.  Response patterns vary significantly for all three scenarios, suggesting that despite recent attempts to "criminalize" domestic abuse through legislation and more aggressive law enforcement, the public still have different attitudes towards these disputes and reservation about the appropriate response.

## CHAPTER 4:

## PERCEPTIONS, FEARS AND WORRIES ABOUT CRIME

### Fear of Crime

Fear of crime constitutes a major source of personal anxiety for many Canadians.  Surveys of crime fear in a community or group are an indicator of the level of personal safety and security perceived by that group or community.  As the fear of crime or sense of personal safety may be only loosely related to the actual risk or level of crime, reduction of crime fear has become a major focus of many police and community based crime prevention programs.  This study was particularly interested in addressing the issue of crime fear and perceptions of crime in rural areas, given the comparatively low rate of crime or actual risk of victimization.

Crime fear is usually established in public surveys by responses to the standard survey question, "How safe do you feel, walking alone in your area during the day, and night".

TABLE C.1     FEAR OF CRIME (DAY & NIGHT)     (N = 1146)

| Safety | Total Sample | Town | Rural/Other |
|---|---|---|---|
| Very Safe (Day) | **90%** | 92% | 89% |
| Very Safe (Night) | **54%** | 53% | 55% |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Reasonably Safe | **26%** | 26% | 25% |
| Some Unsafe | **14%** | 16% | 13% |
| Very Unsafe | **6%** | 4% | 7% |

The results in Table C.1 confirm the findings of other victimization surveys, that residents typically feel safer during the day than at night.  While very few (10%) valley residents indicated that they feel unsafe during the day (10%), safety at night was a  concern to significantly more people, as 46% of the respondents indicated they felt somewhat or very unsafe at night in their neighbourhood.

**TABLE C.1a     FEELINGS OF SAFETY WALKING ALONE (NIGHT)**

| Crime Fear | Valley | Canada | Metro Toronto | Halifax |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Very Safe | 54% | 40% | 32% | 21% |
| Reas. Safe | 26% | 33% | 41% | 29% |
| Somewhat Safe | 14% | 17% | 21% | 21% |
| Very Unsafe | 6% | 9% | 7% | 30% |

When responses to this question are compared (Table C.1a) to other urban based findings, it is clear that valley residents feel significantly safer during the day and night, than their

urban counterparts in Nova Scotia and the rest of Canada.   As

the valley region also has a lower crime rate than the urban

areas sampled in Table C.1., these findings suggest there is a

link between reported crime and fear of crime.  In short, valley

residents feel safer than urban residents from criminal

victimization because they are actually safer from

victimization.

Further analysis of the findings reveals some interesting

differences in (Table C.1b) in the level of fear felt by gender,

age and income subgroups in our sample.


**TABLE C.1B     CRIME FEAR     (NIGHT) BY GENDER/AGE/INCOME**

| **Gender** | **Male** | **Female** | | **Sig.** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| very and some unsafe | 5% | 34% | | (.000) |

| **AGE** | **18–30yrs** | **31–54yrs** | **55–89yrs** | **Sig.** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| very & some unsafe | 15% | 17% | 27% | (.000) |

| **Household Income $** | **>20,000** | **$20–40,000** | **40,000+** | **Sig.** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Very & Some Unsafe | 27% | 16% | 12% | (.000) |

\*    Indicates % of group or category who said they felt very or
      somewhat unsafe.


Comparing the gender based responses of those who said they

felt very or somewhat unsafe at night, it is clear that women

have significantly higher rates of crime fear than men.  Eighty

seven (87%) of those who felt very or somewhat unsafe at night

were women, while 13% of this group were males.  A significant

difference was also found between the young and the elderly, as

42% of those who felt very or somewhat unsafe, 55-89 years old

reported they felt unsafe at night compared to only 20% of the

respondents between 18-30 years.  Income levels also seem to

have an impact on fear of crime, as those respondents from the

lower income category indicate the highest rates of crime fear.

These findings appear to confirm the proposition that those who

feel most vulnerable and or least able to defend themselves,

tend to have the highest fear of crime.

Perceptions of Crime:

Studies have demonstrated  (reference)  that an

individual's perceptions of crime in their neighbourhood or

community plays a significant role in their general sense of

safety, security and sociability.  The survey asked a variety of

questions on perceptions of neighbourhood crime in order to

explore these issues.

**TABLE C.2    PERCEPTIONS OF CRIME IN NEIGHBOURHOOD**

|  | **Total Sample** | **Town** | **Rural/Other** |
|---|---|---|---|
| High Crime | **8%** | 7% | 9% |
| Average Crime | **45%** | 45% | 45% |

```
Low Crime            47%            48%        46%

N = 1146
```

Responses to questions regarding the level of crime in one's neighbourhood or area indicates that few (8%) valley residents saw their neighbourhoods as high crime areas where the majority (47%) perceived their area as a low crime area.  There were no significant difference between town and rural residents on this question.

A question asking residents to compare crime in their area with others areas indicate a similar pattern of results (Table C.2a) with the vast majority or residents indicating that they have at least the same (41%) or less crime (54%) then other areas.  However, this time a statistically significant greater proportion of rural or non-town residents felt they had less crime than their town counterparts.  This difference is also reflected in actual reported crime rates in both the rural and urban areas of our sample.

**TABLE C.2a    COMPARATIVE PERCEPTIONS OF CRIME IN NEIGHBOURHOOD**

|  | **Total Sample** | **Town** | **Rural/Other** |
|---|---|---|---|
| More Crime Than Other Areas | **5%** | 7% | 3% |
| Same Crime As Other Areas | **41%** | 47% | 37% |

```
Less crime Than
Other Areas                 54%            46%      59% *
(N = 1146)
```

When asked whether crime was increasing or decreasing in their neighbourhood, a significant number of residents (31%) saw it as increasing, while only 6% saw crime as decreasing. The perception that crime is increasing is not surprising given similar results in other surveys, and the fact that official crime rates are actually increasing in the valley. The data once again suggests there is a link between perceptions of crime and actual crime rates.

Further analysis of respondent characteristics and crime perception, reveals some interesting variations in response patterns. The finding in Table C.2c indicates that women are significantly more likely than men to feel they live in a high crime area, and are slightly more likely to report crime as increasing. Older residents are significantly more likely than younger residents to report that they live in a high crime area and those with highest income levels have lowest perception of living high crime areas or see crime increasing.

**TABLE C.2b  PERCEPTION OF CRIME, BY GENDER,AGE,INCOME**

| Gender | Male | Female | | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| High crime | 7% | 9% | | (.002) |
| Increase crime | 30% | 32% | | (.806) |
| More crime than other areas 2.B | 5% | 5% | | (.243) |

| Age | 18–30yrs | 31–54yrs | 55–89yrs | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| High crime area | 6% | 7% | 11% | (.027) |
| More crime than other area | 7% | 7% | 4% | (.200) |
| Increase Crime | 33% | 30% | 31% | (.923) |

| Income | >20,000 | 20–40,000 | 40,000+ | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| High crime area | 12% | 7% | 4% | (.028) |
| More Crime area | 5% | 5% | 6% | (.414) |
| Crime Increased | 33% | 29% | 27% | (.022) |

(N = 1146)

Worry About Crime

The survey further explored the issue of citizen and community safety by asking a number of questions designed to target the degree to which people "worry" about specific crime categories. The findings in Table C.3. indicates that valley residents worry little about leaving their homes unattended and about being held up or assaulted. Respondents do however indicate more worry about the possibilities of break and enter and

vandalism.  These findings appear to reflect the differential

risk of personal versus property crime in the valley.


**TABLE C.3    WORRY ABOUT CRIME IN THE NEIGHBOURHOOD**

|  | Much | Some | Not At All |
|---|---|---|---|
| Home Unattended | 5% | 15% | 81% |
| Held Up | 3% | 12% | 85% |
| Assaulted | 3% | 13% | 84% |
| Break & Enter | 7% | 37% | 55% |
| Vandalism | 9% | 33% | 57% |
| Being a Victim | 3% | 12% | 85% |

N = 1146


When the data is analyzed in relation to key respondents'

characteristics further differences emerge.  Response patterns

indicate that male and female respondents generally express

similar levels of worry over, leaving homes unattended, break

and enter and property vandalism.  However, women worry

significantly more than men about being held up, assaulted and

being a victim of crime.  Thus while males and females have

similar worries regarding property crimes, women are

significantly more likely to be concerned about being a victim

of some form of personal crime.   Analysis of age differences

suggests that respondents 55-89 years of age compared to 18-30

year olds, are more likely to worry about all crime issues but

particularly about, being a crime victim (Sig .008), having

their property vandalized (Sig .000) and being assaulted (Sig

.004).

**TABLE C.3a    %  WORRY ABOUT CRIME, BY GENDER/AGE/INCOME \*\***

| Gender | Male | Female | | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Home Unattended | 3 | 6 | | (.194) |
| Held Up | 2 | 5 | | \*(.000) |
| Assaulted | 1 | 6 | | \*(.000) |
| Break & Enter | 5 | 9 | | (.028) |
| Vandalism | 8 | 10 | | (.206) |
| Being a Victim (more than most) | 6 | 10 | | \*(.019) |

| Age | 18–30 | 31–54 | 55–89 | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Home Unattended (some) | 4% | 5% | 4% | (.900) |
| Held Up (much) | 6% | 2% | 2% | (.005) |
| Assaulted (much) | 6% | 2% | 2% | \*(.001) |
| Break & Enter | 10% | 7% | 4% | **\***(.000) |
| Vandalism | 15% | 9% | 3% | (.000) |
| Being a Victim (yes,Q) | 8% | 8% | 7% | **\***(.003) |

| Income | >20,000 | 20–40,000 | 40,000+ | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Home Unattended (some) | 6% | 5% | 3% | (.190) |
| Held Up (very much) | 5% | 3% | 2% | \*(.026) |
| Assaulted (much) | 5% | 3% | 2% | \*(.178) |
| Break & Enter (much) | 8% | 7% | 6% | \*(.000) |
| Vandalism (much) | 8% | 8% | 11% | \*(.000) |
| Being a Victim (yes,Q) | 10% | 7% | 4% | \*(.000) |

\*    Statistically significant difference.
\*\*   % of those who indicated worry for particular response

category, not % of the total sample.

Comparing the results of income groups suggest that those with the highest income level in our sample worry the least about all forms of property and personal crime.


## Area Crime and Order Problems

A more comprehensive approach to assessing community concerns regarding crime and public order issues, was addressed by asking respondents to indicate how problematic they considered certain kinds of conflict and disorder were in their neighbourhood  or community.  A mix of typical community crime and order problems were offered for evaluation, as to their perceived level of importance (Big, Somewhat, No Problem).   The findings reported in Table C.4, indicate that the valley respondent were most concerned about drinking and driving, traffic and drug abuse. Fewer than 10% of the respondents indicated that any of the other neighbourhood problems listed were a "big" problem.

However, when "big and somewhat of a problem" responses are combined the same patterns of response emerge, but the level of concern and worry increases.  Of particular note in these combined results is the importance of general social order

38

problem like drugs, drinking and driving and the relatively low

rate of concern about classic crimes such as break and enter and

vandalism.

# TABLE C.4        NEIGHBOURHOOD CRIME & ORDER PROBLEMS

| Total Sample | | | Town | | Rural/Other | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Problems (%) | Big | Big/Some* | Big | Big/Some | Big | Some/Big |
| Break & Enter | 3 | 35 | 4 | 35 | 3 | 35 |
| Traffic | 16 | 46 | 17 | 49 | 15 | 44 |
| Vandalism | 5 | 37 | 6 | 39 | 4 | 34 |
| Drug Use | 15 | 56 | 20 | 61 | 12 | 53 * |
| Local Fighting | 2 | 15 | 4 | 20 | 2 | 15 |
| Domestic Viol. | 6 | 32 | 7 | 38 | 4 | 26 |
| Noisy Parties/ Loud Music | 6 | 25 | 6 | 32 | 4 | 25 |
| Loitering | 6 | 29 | 11 | 39 | 4 | 24 * |
| Police/Resident Contact | 4 | 21 | 6 | 22 | 3 | 21 |
| Drink & Drive | 16 | 59 | 19 | 61 | 14 | 58 * |
| Bootlegging | 4 | 21 | 6 | 23 | 3 | 20 |
| Illegal Hunting | 9 | 32 | 9 | 32 | 8 | 33 |

* Big Problem and Somewhat of Problem Combined.

These findings may in part reflect the actual low rates of serious crime in the valley area, which would allow citizen to focus their concern on the most common and visible forms of crime and public disorder – traffic drugs and alcohol related problems.  The relatively high rate of concern over drug

use/abuse may be a reflection of the degree to which this "problem" has become, a real one for rural communities and, or the extent to which the "drug problem" has become publicized and accepted as a pervasive social problem even in rural areas.

# CHAPTER 5

## ATTITUDES, EXPECTATIONS, AND EVALUATION

## OF SMALL TOWN AND RURAL POLICING

Small town and rural policing is often described in popular and academic studies as a distinctive, "traditional" form or style policing. Due to differences in the social and cultural organization of rural society and the size and scale of police operations, small town/rural policing offers an alternative model to urban policing. There have been recent attempts to introduce various aspects of small town policing in large urban police departments under the rubric of community based policing. To establish the distinctive qualities of small town policing and to understand the perceptions and evaluation of rural citizens, this survey asked a variety of questions on the style, characteristics and qualities of small town policing. The findings from the questions, allow detailed analysis and examination of both the traditional and modern qualities associated with contemporary small town/rural policing.

Contact/Knowledge of Police:

The first set of questions regarding rural and small town

policing focus on public knowledge, contact, awareness of the
police.  These questions were designed to explore the issue of
police visibility, presence, and access.  These are particularly
relevant issues for community based policing and have long been
assumed to be characteristic of small town or rural policing.

When asked about the "number of police in their area", the

majority of respondents (66%) indicated there were the "right

number", 31% felt that there were "too few", and only 3% said

"too many".  When these responses were broken down by location

38% of respondents in rural areas who felt there were "too few"

police present, compared to 20% in the four valley towns.  The

rural areas sampled, are under R.C.M.P jurisdictions.  The

different levels of response perhaps reflect the realities of

policing disperses populations in geographically large areas.

**TABLE P.1         POLICE PRESENCE         (N = 1146)**

| **NUMBER** | **T.** | **SAMPLE** | **TOWN** | | **RURAL/OTHER** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Too Many | | **3%** | 7% | * | .4% |
| Right Number | | **66%** | 73% | * | 62% |
| Too Few | | **31%** | 20% | * | 38% |

*   Significant Difference

When respondents were asked whether they had any contact

with police during the  last year, 38% indicated they had had

some sort of contact.  The nature of this contact was divided

relatively evenly, between traffic, complaints, investigations

and social contacts.  Thirty-four percent of these contacts were

as victims, 19% witness, 3% suspects and 44% were classified
as other. There were no significant differences between town
and rural respondents in the nature of the contact or the
contact role.

When asked to evaluate how they were treated, the overall
majority of respondents reported that they were treated
extremely (67%), or fairly (27%) well, with only 7% indicating
they were treated poorly. Significantly more town (75%) then
rural residents (61%) indicated they were treated extremely well
by the police.

**TABLE P.2**          **CONTACT WITH POLICE (LAST YEAR)**

|                      | TOTAL SAMPLE | TOWN |   | RURAL/OTHER |
|----------------------|:------------:|:----:|:-:|:-----------:|
| **A) Contact**       |              |      |   |             |
| Yes                  | **38%**      | 40%  |   | 37%         |
| No                   | **62%**      | 60%  |   | 64%         |
| **B) Nature of Contact** |          |      |   |             |
| Traffic              | **21%**      | 17%  | * | 23%         |
| Complaint/Assis.     | **25%**      | 17%  | * | 24%         |
| Investigation        | **23%**      | 24%  |   | 22%         |
| Social/Other         | **32%**      | 32%  |   | 31%         |
| **C) Contact Role**  |              |      |   |             |
| Victim               | **34%**      | 38%  | * | 31%         |
| Witness              | **19%**      | 17%  |   | 20%         |
| Suspect              | **3%**       | 4%   |   | 3%          |
| Other                | **44%**      | 42%  |   | 46%         |
| **D) Treatment**     |              |      |   |             |
| Extremely Well       | **67%**      | 75%  | * | 61%         |
| Fairly Well          | **27%**      | 18%  |   | 32%         |
| Poorly               | **7%**       | 7%   |   | 7%          |

*     Significant Difference

When asked how well they knew the police officers in their area, valley residents displayed  high levels of personal knowledge, as 43% knew a police officer by name, 62% by sight and 23% knew a police officer socially.  On all three contact measures town residents indicated significantly higher levels of personal knowledge of police than rural residents.  These findings suggest that a fundamental difference between the rural and town policing may be different levels of citizen awareness and contact with the police.

**TABLE P.3       AWARENESS AND CONTACT WITH LOCAL POLICE**

|  | **TOTAL SAMPLE** | **TOWN** |  | **RURAL/OTHER** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Knowledge of Police |  |  |  |  |
| By Name | **43%** | 62% | * | 31% |
| By Sight | **62%** | 82% | * | 49% |
| Socially | **23%** | 32% | * | 17% |
| * Significant Difference |  |  |  | N = 1146 |

In summary, it would appear that valley residents in general are satisfied with the amount of police presence and contact in their area.  This is explained by the fact that they appear to have considerable personal contact with and knowledge of local police.  Town residents generally have the most contact and personal knowledge of local police and more positively evaluate their treatment by police than rural residents.  When

45

compared to urban responses these results confirm the general
impression that small town and rural policing is a more personal
and contact oriented style of policing.  The impact of this
personal or contact of policing style on citizen safety, crime
fear, police evaluation and even crime rates will be pursued in
subsequent analysis.


Evaluating Police and Policing:

     A series of questions in this survey were designed to
examine how citizens evaluate various aspects of police service
in their community.  The responses provide citizen based
evaluation of policing, and allow examination of the perceived
merits of various police functions and job related qualities.
These findings also enable local police to know how the public
evaluates their performance and the relative strengths and
weaknesses of the various services they provide.

     The first evaluation question asked citizens to evaluate
police-community relations and services in their area.

**TABLE P.4      EVALUATION OF POLICE RELATIONS AND SERVICE**

|                          | TOTAL SAMPLE | TOWN    | RURAL/OTHER |
|--------------------------|:------------:|:-------:|:-----------:|
| A) **Community/Police**  |              |         |             |
| **Relations**            |              |         |             |
| Excellent                | **24%**      | 27% *   | 22%         |
| Good                     | **57%**      | 55%     | 59%         |
| Fair                     | **16%**      | 16%     | 16%         |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Poor | **3%** | 3% | 3% |
| B) **Adequate Service** | | | |
| Yes | **88%** | 92% * | 86% |
| C) **Comparative Police Service** | | | |
| Better | **18%** | 24% * | 14% |
| Same | **75%** | 70% | 78% |
| Poorer | **8%** | 7% | 8% |

\* Significant Difference                                   N = 1146

In general 80% of the sample indicated that relations were excellent (24%) or good (57%) , while only 19% perceived them as fair (16%) or poor (3%).  Eighty-eight percent  said they received adequate services from police and 92% indicated they thought they had better (18%) or the same (75%) services as other areas.  Only 8% of the sample, thought they had poorer levels of services than other areas.  While the overall favourable rating were high for both rural and town residents, town residents were generally more likely to give higher rating to their police service.

When asked to evaluate six different police functions valley residents remained consistently positive.  Police received the highest ratings on, being approachable, enforcing the law and responding to calls for services, while they received lower ratings in providing public information, public service and criminal investigation.  However, it should be noted

that the majority of respondents felt they were doing a good or
average job for all functions with no more then 6% of
respondents indicating a poor job on any particular police
function.  Significant variation between town and rural
respondents were found only in reference to calls for service,
favouring town police, while higher rating was given to the
R.C.M.P on criminal investigation.

| Table P.5 | EVALUATION OF MAJOR POLICE FUNCTIONS | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Total Sample | Town | Rural/Others |
| **A) Enforcement** | | | |
| Good Job | **75%** | 73% | 76% |
| Average Job | **23%** | 25% | 21% |
| Poor Job | **3%** | 2% | 3% |
| **B) Response To Calls** | | | |
| Good Job | **72%** | 76%   * | 70% |
| Average Job | **21%** | 20% | 22% |
| Poor Job | **6%** | 4% | 7% |
| **C) Crime Investigation** | | | |
| Good Job | **66%** | 62%   * | 68% |
| Average Job | **30%** | 34% | 27% |
| Poor Job | **5%** | 5% | 5% |
| **D) Being Approachable** | | | |
| Good Job | **81%** | 82% | 80% |
| Average Job | **16%** | 15% | 17% |
| Poor Job | **3%** | 4% | 3% |
| **E) Public Information** | | | |
| Good Job | **65%** | 62% | 66% |
| Average Job | **22%** | 24% | 21% |
| Poor Job | **13%** | 14% | 12% |
| **F) Public Service** | | | |
| Good Job | **69%** | 69% | 68% |
| Average Job | **26%** | 26% | 25% |
| Poor Job | **6%** | 5% | 6% |

N = 1146

When asked to simply state yes or no to a variety of descriptive qualities (Table P.6), respondents reported remarkably positive evaluations of local police.  Even on qualities typically not associated with rural or small town policing, such as modernism, efficiency, and professionalism, the responses were overwhelmingly positive.  Rural R.C.M.P police were given significantly higher rating than municipal police on police professionalism and modernization.  However, all of the descriptive qualities were endorsed by over 80% of the respondents.

**TABLE P.6     EVALUATION OF POLICING CHARACTERISTICS**

| TRAITS | TOTAL SAMPLE | TOWN | RURAL/OTHER |
|---|---|---|---|
| Fairness | **94%** | 92% | 95% |
| Honest | **93%** | 92% | 93% |
| Open | **82%** | 81% | 82% |
| Professional | **95%** | 91% * | 98% |
| Modern | **92%** | 86% * | 96% |
| Efficient | **89%** | 87% | 91% |

N = 1146

Finally a question evaluating the objectivity, professionalism and fairness of police yielded more varied responses. Responses in Table P.7 suggest that valley residents feel that police are fair, objective and unbiased. However a significant percentage (24%) of respondents felt that police enjoy pushing people around, but even more (35%) indicate that police are justified in doing so. A relatively large number of people felt that the rich have too much influence (53%) and that they are limited in their ability to influence police (65%). However, 89% had no personal experience of police unfairness.

| TABLE P.7 EVALUATION OF POLICE OBJECTIVITY (% AGREE) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | **TOTAL SAMPLE** | **TOWN** | **RURAL/OTHER** |
| Blacks Treated Fairly | **78%** | 74% | 80% |
| Rich & Powerful Too Much Influence | **53%** | 54% | 52% |
| Police Misconduct is Not Common | **87%** | 85% | 88% |
| Police Willing to Help Out | **95%** | 96% | 95% |
| Police Careful Not to Arrest Innocent | **88%** | 88% | 87% |
| Police Justified in Occasional Roughing | **35%** | 30%   * | 38% |
| Police Enjoy Pushing People Around | **24%** | 25% | 23% |

Citizens Too Little
    Influence on Police  **65%**          60%   *       68%

No Experience of
Police Unfairness        **89%**          87%           90%

N = 1146

    In summary, it would appear that our sample evaluates

police services and the manner in which various police functions

are carried out in a very positive way.  On virtually all of the

evaluative questions asked, the majority of respondents rated

police positively, very few respondents were critical of the

police, police services or police functions in their area.

While there were some minor variations between town and rural

sample, generally both town and rural residents responded in a

consistently positive fashion.

<u>Police Role</u>

    The purpose of the next set of questions were aimed at
exploring unique aspects of the police role in rural and small
town settings.  The questions were directed at probing the
qualities that are believed to characterize small town or rural
policing such as police knowledge of the local community, local
orientation, responsiveness, use of and discretion etc.

**TABLE P.8     CHARACTERISTIC OF THE POLICE ROLE (% AGREE)**

|                          | **TOTAL SAMPLE** | **TOWN** | **RURAL/OTHER** |
|--------------------------|------------------|----------|-----------------|
| Police Know Local Affairs | **94%**          | 96%      | 93%             |
| Police <u>Are</u> Concerned About The Area | **88%** | 10% | 13% |

51

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Not Enough Attention To Citizen Concerns | **15%** | 13% | 16% |
| Police Always Available | **80%** | 82% | 78% |
| Arrest Not Always Solution | **85%** | 85% | 84% |
| Police Not Always By Book | **76%** | 78% | 75% |
| Don't See Police Enough in area | **28%** | 21% * | 32% |
| Important To Know Local Police | **86%** | 88% | 85% |
| Important Police Be From The Area | **29%** | 36% * | 25% |
| Police Not Enough Respect/Cooperation | **37%** | 37% | 37% |

\* Significant Difference        N = 584

When residents were asked if they agreed with a series of descriptive statements about local policing, they indicated high levels of agreement with traditional policing qualities such as; police knowledge of local affairs (94%), attentiveness to citizen's concerns (88%), use of police discretion (76%), non-arrest alternative (85%), and importance of knowing the police (86%). The only finding that seems inconsistent with the traditional stereotypical view of rural policing, is the relatively low number of respondents (29%) who feel it is important for police officers to be from the local area.

52

A further set of questions probed other aspects of the

traditional police role by asking respondents to indicate how important, they felt certain key aspects of small town policing were.  The findings in Table P.9 indicate that the majority of respondents indicate that virtually all aspects of the police role listed are perceived as important to our respondents. Being visible and available (88%), responding to all calls (79%), enforcing the law (88%), and using arrest as a last resort (75%) were all thought to be an important part of the police job.  Of particular interest is the level of importance attributed to the "political independence of police" (93%), and having the "latest equipment and training" (91%),  These particular responses suggest that contrary to the popular view of small-town policing as traditional in style and political in orientation, valley residents indicate a strong preference for a politically independent and a modern recruited, trained and equipped police department.  Also, when asked about recruiting women and minorities for the police, a surprisingly large percentage (77%), said it was important.

**Table P.9**         **IMPORTANCE OF POLICE ROLE DIMENSIONS**

| | **TOTAL SAMPLE** | **TOWN** | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **RURAL/OTHER** | | | |
| **A) Responding To All Calls** | | | |
| Important | **79%** | 81% | 79% |
| Somewhat | **19%** | 17% | 20% |
| Not Important | **2**% | 2% | 1% |

**B) Latest Equipment/Training**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Important | **91%** | 90% | 91% |
| Somewhat | **9%** | 10% | 9% |
| Not Important | **>1%** | >1% | >1% |

**C) Enforcing The Law (Always)**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Important | **88%** | 85% | 89% |
| Somewhat | **11%** | 14% | 10% |
| Not Important | **1%** | 1% | 1% |

**D) Being Visible & Available**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Important | **88%** | 88% | 88% |
| Somewhat | **10%** | 10% | 11% |
| Not Important | **2%** | 2% | 1% |

**E) Political Independence**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Important | **93%** | 92% | 94% |
| Somewhat | **4%** | 5% | 3% |
| Not Important | **3%** | 3% | 3% |

**F) Recruiting Minorities**

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | **77%** | 73% | * | 80% |
| Somewhat | **16%** | 18% | | 14% |
| Not Important | **7%** | 9% | | 6% |

**G) Arrest As A Last Resort**

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Important | **75%** | 70% | * | 77% |
| Somewhat | **21%** | 26% | | 19% |
| Not Important | **4%** | 4% | | 4% |

\* Significant Difference                                              N = 584

A further variation on the issue of police role was
discussed in a question which asked residents to rate a variety
of operational aspects of police functioning.  The responses in
Table P.10 would appear to further support a mix of modern and
traditional policing characteristics.  Respondents agreed that
police should respond to all calls (83%) and respond quickly

(90%),but they also agree that police should be in schools (94%), display more sensitivity to victims (85%) and minorities (79%) and do more traffic work (82%). A question which focused on doing more to reduce crime, (33%) received the lowest level of endorsement. However when asked whether cost is a priority issue fifty-one percent of the sample said it was.

**Table P.10**     **POLICE ROLE PREFERENCES     (% AGREE)**

|  | TOTAL SAMPLE | TOWN | RURAL/OTHER |
|---|---|---|---|
| Police Should Respond To All Calls | 83% | 85% | 81% |
| Police Should Speak In Schools | 94% | 95% | 93% |
| Fast Response Is A Priority (All Calls) | 90% | 92% | 88% |
| Police Should Be Doing More To Reduce Crime | 33% | 38% | 31% |
| Police Should Do More Than Traffic & Crime | 82% | 85% | 80% |
| More Community/Police Interaction | 92% | 92% | 92% |
| More Sensitivity to Minorities | 79% | 77% | 79% |
| More Sensitivity to Victims | 85% | 86% | 84% |
| Cost Is Not A Priority In Police Service | 51% | 46% | 55% |

N = 584

In summary, the responses to the questions on various aspects of the police role and various police functions indicate that the respondents in our sample generally endorsed most aspects of the traditional style of policing they receive.  This traditional style, emphasizes personal contact, knowledge about the community, broad involvement in community activities, and an emphasis on order maintenance and service responsiveness. While these traditional small town policing qualities are endorsed, respondents also appear to want a modern and a well trained police force that is politically independent, equitable in its enforcement policies and sensitive to minorities and victims.  Significantly respondents did not endorse questions which emphasized a narrow, crime focused and arrest oriented policing style, often associated with modern urban policing. However as 51% of the sample also said that the cost of police services was a factor, it is not clear how important these community services would be at an extra cost to citizens.

This public desire for combination of traditional and modern policing characteristics, suggests that a new style of rural policing combining the best qualities of the traditional model and select qualities of more modern urban policing, is

56

emerging as the preferred ideal in rural Nova Scotia.  Combining

the basic qualities of community based policing and more modern

profess-

ional policing may well signify a change not only in public

expectation of rural police but may also serve as a preferred

model for the development of police services in rural areas.


**CHAPTER 6**


**Halifax and the Annapolis Valley:**

**Comparison of Public Perceptions and Attitudes**

**Toward Crime, and Policing**


The Public Surveys

The survey of public opinion in Halifax is described in

detail in the enclosed report (Clairmont, 1988).  It was a

large, representative sample of adults and households in

Halifax.  The total number of respondents was 513.  The survey

of public opinion in the Annapolis Valley was similarly

representative but much larger, featuring an N of 1146 persons.

The following tables describe the basic comparison between the

two surveys.


57

Tables H/V.1 and 2 focus on the demographic and social
characteristics of the two samples.  The two groupings are quite
similar with respect to % working, the age distribution, modal
household size and surprisingly the proportion of respondents
with shallow roots (i.e., five years or less) in the area and in
the neighbourhood.  As might be expected the Valley grouping,
living in small towns, villages or simple rural areas,
are more likely to be living among relatives and friends and
more likely to be in the homeowner-single family dwelling
arrangement.
Organizational involvement is less clearly differentiated by
residence since Haligonians are more or less involved depending
on whether the point of reference for them is the neighbourhood
or the city.


Perceptions of Crime and Safety

Tables H/V.3 and 4 indicate that sharp differences exist
between Halifax and Annapolis Valley residents with respect to
their perception of crime threat and their personal safety.

58

Haligonians are much more likely to perceive their area as one of high crime and, less significantly, their neighbourhood as especially crime-prone. Such differences follow the usual patterns of rural/urban comparison. It is accordingly not surprising to find that Haligonians are also more likely to perceive crime as increasing in their neighbourhood. The fact however that both Haligonians and Valley residents exceed the 1988 national average reported in the General Social Survey (i.e., 22% there perceived crime to be increasing in their neighbourhood) and match or exceed corresponding figures for urban areas of Toronto (see Solicitor General, 1986) suggests that the modern, mass society concept increasingly describes Nova Scotia.

<u>Tables H/V.3 and 4 here</u>

Haligonian and Valley residents differ also in terms of their perceptions of safety. The Halifax response is quite similar to that of urban Toronto where too only roughly 20% of survey respondents indicate that they feel very safe walking alone after dark in their neighbourhood (Solicitor General, 1986). More than half of the Valley residents report such a sense of security, a much higher percentage than among the urban

59

respondents but only roughly half the Valley percentage

reporting that they felt very safe walking alone during the day.

Both Halifax and Valley respondents perceive property crime

victimization to be more worrisome than personal assault or

mugging.  While the latter typically report much less

victimization worry than the former it can be seen in Table

H/V.4 that the Halifax-Valley difference declines as one move

from crimes against the person to property crimes.  This finding

is consistent with the General Social Survey (Statistics Canada,

1989) where it was found that urban residents were most likely

to express concern over physical attack while, when ruralites

were worried or concerned, it was more likely to be with crimes

of property.

Impact variables (i.e,variables found to have a

statistically significant relation to the dependent variable in

question) have been identified with the various perceptions of

crime and safety in the Halifax study.  No impact variables are

found with regard to "perceived level of crime" but females, the

less educated and those of lower socio-economic status (SES) are

more likely to report "crime increasing" and the females, the

older respondents and those of lower SES are also less likely to

report "feeling safe" walking at night in their neighbourhoods.

Crime in the Valley is more likely to be seen as high or
average by those who have been recently victimized, by older
persons, by women, by long-time residents, by those with fewer
neighbourhood bonds and  by those with comparatively low
education or income than by their counterparts (i.e.,non-
victims, males, younger respondents etc...).  Interestingly and
in contrast to Halifax there are few discernible impact
variables with reference to the perception of crime in one's
area compared to the Valley as a whole.  The higher educated
perceive their areas as more crime prone than the Valley as a
whole (reflecting perhaps more their area of residence) and not
surprisingly the recently victimized see their areas as more
crime prone.  There is no impact variable at all for perception
of crime changes in one's local area.  In the Valley as in the
Halifax sample it is the females and (to a much lesser extent)
those of low SES who feel less safe walking in their area
whether at night or during the day.

Perceptions of Neighbourhood Problems

In the case of the Halifax survey the chief perceived
neighbourhood problems are break and enter, traffic and abuse of
alcohol and drugs.  Break and enter by far is the most serious

61

concern. Tables H/V.5 and 6 present data on perceived local

problems by Valley respondents. Perhaps the most significant

point is the sharp difference with Halifax concerning break and

enter; only a handful of the respondents identify break and

enter as a big problem, a fact it might be noted that surprises

both the R.C.M.P. and the municipal police officers in the

Valley with whom these data have been discussed. On most other

items where comparisons are possible the differences between

Halifax and Valley responses are quite modest. Interestingly

town residents especially emphasize problems concerning drug use

and loitering. In general, within the Valley category, town

residents are much more concerned with "social order" issues

than are village and rural residents.

<center>Tables H/V.5 and 6 here</center>


In the Valley survey more questions were utilized to get at

perceived local problems. Overall those perceiving their local

area as having problems are most likely to be renters than

owners, victims than nonvictims, younger adults and those of low

SES. Factor analyses indicate that perceived problems could be

grouped into one of three groupings, namely criminal code

violations (e.g., vandalism), social order problems (e.g.,

<center>62</center>

loitering) and what might be called life style issues (e.g,deer jacking).  Those perceiving their local area as having life style type problems are more likely than others to have low pro-police attitudes and low expectations/demands about policing.

Victimization

Table H/V.7 presents data on victimization.  It can be noted that roughly one-third of Halifax's adults report having been a victim of some crime within the past two years.  This is about three times as much comparable victimization as reported by Valley respondents.  While analyses are still continuing it appears that in both Halifax and the Valley, as in other research (see Muir, 1988), the impact variables with respect to victimization are the opposite of those in connection with fear and worry; that is the young, the male, the higher income persons and the better educated report the greater victimization.  In Table H/V.7 victimization with respect to specific crimes in the past year is indicated.  Personal victimization is differentiated from the more inclusive "relevant" victimization which measures the extent to which either the respondent or someone else in the household or someone close to the respondent and living in the immediate area

63

has been victimized.  Either kind of victimization is more common in the city.  The Halifax percentages for break and enter are well above the national average of 6.5% and comparable to high crime areas of larger cities (General Social Survey,1989). Patterns of relevant victimization best differentiate the Valley from the city. While half or less as many Valley respondents report relevant victimization as regards being held up or assaulted within the past year, the difference in the case of theft is but 28% to 21%.

Table H/V.7 here

## Police Contact and Crime Information

Tables H/V.8 and 9 depict responses dealing with contact and knowledge of local police office and the source of crime information. It is on this dimension in particular that we expected to find sharp differences between Halifax and the Valley. Indeed Table H/V.8 bears out this expectation. Valley residents, especially those living in the towns, are much more likely to know their police officers by name as well as by sight. On the other hand it can be noted that formal contact with police (as a victim, witness etc...) is no more common in the Valley than in the city. Somewhat surprisingly there is virtually no difference between the two samples with respect to source of crime knowledge. Very few respondents in either grouping depend upon the police for a great deal of information about crime; the media constitute the chief source, followed at quite a distance by neighbours. As Table H/V. 9 indicates Valley residents are not any more likely than city residents to participate in police-sponsored crime prevention programs. In fact they are much less likely to be incorporated in Neighbourhood Watch and Operation Identification, a pattern perhaps not unrelated to the low perceived break and enter threat and to the limited resources of the small municipal

65

police departments.

## Evaluation of Policing

Table H/V.10 focuses on expectations concerning police
activity.  On the whole there is striking consensus among both
samples with respect to the desired style and scope of policing.
Both samples want a policing effort which is linked closely to
the community and exhibits considerable sensitivity to victims
and to minorities.  At the same time their expectations
concerning the scope of policing are strongly for a wide police
response, a fast police response and an expansive police mandate
extending well beyond concerns of crime to crime prevention and
general service.  As might be expected in light of their
different perceptions of the crime problem, Valley residents are
less demanding of more crime fighting that their city
counterparts.  Perhaps most important is the large difference
between the two samples in terms of the percentage indicating
that cost of police services should not rise much higher than it
is now; Haligonians appear much more likely to say the cost

66

factor is not a priority.  Town residents in particular
expressed concern over the cost factor.


<u>Table H/V.10 here</u>


There are important and interesting impact variables
regarding these expectations and demands.  In Halifax it is the
young, the better educated and those with least longevity in the
neighbourhood who expect/demand more and also give less priority
to the cost factor.  Females are more likely than males to
emphasize fast police response whatever the call for service and
victims are more demanding than non-victims.  Similar patterns
are found in the Valley sample but there it is possible to draw
some sharper distinctions.  The better educated and higher
income respondents are more demanding only with reference to the
scope of police service (i.e., police can do much in crime
fighting and should do more than crime fighting) while the young
-and sometimes the females and the victims- stress the style of
policing (i.e., more open, participative policing and more
sensitivity to the problems of victims and minorities).  In the
Valley too the better-off, but not the young as in Halifax, are
less concerned about the police cost factor rising.

67

Tables H/V.11 to 14 describe patterns of evaluation of police. There is very little percentage difference between Halifax and the Valley in terms of sample respondents identifying police-neighbourhood relationships as good or excellent. About 80% of the respondents provide that response (see Table H/V.11). The lack of difference here may well be due to the unusually high numbers reporting such a pattern in Halifax. Halifax differs sharply from the urban areas of metropolitan Toronto where a Solicitor General survey (1986) found only roughly half the adults or households reporting good/excellent police-neighbourhood relations. Despite this positive evaluation, and similar positive assessments to be detailed below, significant numbers of Halifax adults, and indeed of village/rural adults in the Valley, think that there are too few police in their area. To place their percentages in relief it may be noted that in the urban areas of Toronto approximately 36% of the adults believe that there are too few police in their area (Solicitor General, 1986) while the corresponding figure for Halifax is 51% and for village/rural areas of the Valley 38%. In Halifax the older and more veteran neighbourhood residents assess police-community relations most favourably while in the Valley it is the older, those with

68

strong neighbourhood ties, the better educated and higher income persons who have that view.  In the Valley older respondents are also most likely to indicate that the number of police in the area is appropriate and that their area receives police service as good as any other area.


<u>Tables H/V.11 and 12 here</u>


In terms of character or what some researchers have labelled "interpersonal effectiveness" (see Table H/V.12) a large majority of sample respondents in both surveys give their police officers "high grades".  This is especially the case in the Valley sample and within that sample, especially in the rural areas where the R.C.M.P. are seen as very knowledgeable and professional; on many of these items the findings indicate a virtual unanimity among respondents.  In both Halifax and the Valley it is the older adult who rates the police highest as regards "interpersonal effectiveness".

There is more variation in the assessments of how adequately the various police functions are carried on (see Table H/V.13).  Valley residents give their police forces much more favourable ratings with respect to the six basic police

69

functions.  Both samples evaluate most favourably "being

approachable".  The strongest difference between the two samples

is with respect to their assessment of the investigative

function  which twice as many Valley respondents as Haligonians

rate as being done well in their area.  The little difference

that appears between the town and village/rural parts of the

Valley sample are predictable. Town respondents evaluate

"response" better while the R.C.M.P.-policed village and rural

areas rate investigative police work better.

<center>Table H/V.13 here</center>

Basic cross-tabular analyses indicate that vulnerability

considerations play a significant role in the response variation

found in the Valley; those who perceive a crime threat or local

area problems give lower ratings on these police functions.

On each police function assessed those who worry about becoming

a victim, those who have been victims, those who perceive the

areas they live in to have some significant crime or social

order problem(s) and those who perceive crime to be on the

increase locally, are significantly less likely than their

counterparts to give positive evaluations of policing.   In

other words perceived vulnerability varies inversely with

<center>70</center>

favourable evaluation.  Another important impact variable for the Valley sample is the quality of the interaction the respondent has had with the police; those reporting favourable interaction (i.e., being treated well in a contact situation or having social relationships with police) give more positive evaluations than others. Ratings too are usually tied to demands or expectations for service as respondents demanding more police service give less positive evaluations on the police functions. Respondents scoring high on an index of conservative ideology also usually render less positive evaluations.  Over all police functions there is, among Valley adults, a consistent pattern for older respondents and for those with strong community bonds or with other social resources to give more positive ratings. Measures of education, income and occupational status did not differentiate much among respondents for the police function items.

In Halifax age is the key impact variable as older respondents (especially those 50 years of age or more) typically judge police performance more favourably.  General variables such as conservatism, demand for policing and the quality of respondent-police interaction also strongly affect evaluation of the police functions.

71

Table H/V. 14 describes basic attitudes towards police and provides several indexes (such as a pro-policing index) that will be utilized in subsequent analyses. Again it is clear that Valley respondents give more favourable evaluations and that, on the surface and with preliminary operationalizations of town and "other" area, there is little difference by geographical area within the Valley. In both Halifax and Valley samples police misconduct and personal experience of police unfairness is rarely reported and most respondents perceive police as willing to help out when requested. Valley residents as well as Haligonians, but significantly less so, hold that the rich and powerful exercise too much influence on the police; indeed in this respect they are both like Canadians in general who report that the criminal justice system favours the rich (Let's Talk, Volume 14, #9, 1989). Valley residents are more likely than Halifax adults to report that "blacks are treated fairly by the police" and that "police are careful not to arrest the innocent"; at the same time they are less likely to perceive police as "enjoying pushing people around". Only a minority in each grouping think that police are justified in occasionally roughing up disrespectful or abusive persons.

Table H/V.14 here

72

Looking at impact variables, favourable attitudes to police in the Valley are especially likely, across most items, among older residents and those of relatively high occupation-based status. Victims on the other hand are less favorable on most items than non-victims. Turning to more specific items, it can be noted that the better educated and higher income respondents are more likely to think they can influence police and less likely to note any police misbehaviour. Females are more likely than males to indicate that they would resort to police assistance at a time of fear and also more likely to report no unfavourable experience with the police. Persons well-rooted in their neighbourhoods (through long residence and friendship or kinship ties) are less likely than the less well-rooted to indicate any police unfairness or misbehaviour. Finally those respondents who get much of their information on crime and policing from the media tend to be more favorable than others on most of the items. Similar patterns are found in Halifax where SES differences are found on most items, the higher SES respondents reporting more favorable views on items dealing with actual police behaviour (i.e., helpful, open, non-pushy, no misconduct, fair) while those of lower SES indicate both less

favorable views and greater dependency vis-a-vis the police. Along with the young the less educated and lower SES grouping are more likely to report the police as being influenced too much by the rich and powerful.

In the Valley sample perceived vulnerability indicators consistently impact on these pro-policing items just as they do on the police function items discussed above. Worry about victimization, perceiving one local area as having various problems whether criminal or otherwise produce less favorable dispositions toward the police. High demands on policing and absence of positive interactions are general variables also associated in the Valley with less favorable assessments of police. In Halifax similar general variables —and especially ideological factors— affect police evaluation.

## Understanding Variations in Public Assessments of policing

In the Valley and Halifax surveys measures were obtained on various kinds of assessments of policing. One type of measure obtained the public's assessment of police performance (i.e., whether good, average or poor) with reference to the basic police functions of enforcement, investigation, response, referral, crime prevention and approachability. In both the

74

Valley and Halifax suitable indexes based on common items were

generated on perceptions of police performance.  It was

anticipated that evaluation of police performance would be

shaped by the kind of interaction one had with the police (i.e.,

whether positively or negatively perceived), the expectation one

had about policing (i.e., minimal or otherwise), the degree of

vulnerability or crime threat one sensed, and how conservative

one's values were. These latter, "endogenous" or intervening

variables in turn were expected to be controlled by "exogenous"

or background variables such as age, ses, sex, social resources,

neighbourhood integration and victimization.  It was anticipated

that the exogenous variables would not directly impact on

assessments of or attitudes toward policing but rather would

impact on them indirectly via the endogenous variables.

In general the above expectations were borne out though the

overall model was weak in explanatory power (see Tables

appended).  In the Valley variation in assessment of police

performance was a function of four factors, namely favorable

interaction experience, sense of vulnerability, expectations

concerning the policing role and neighbourhood integration.  The

most significant factor was favorable interaction; the more

favorable the interaction the more positive the evaluation of

police performance.  Also people claiming their local area to be relatively problem-free ranked police more positively than those identifying their local area as having significant crime or public order problems.  Similarly those surveyed who were the more demanding or had unmet expectations with regards to the policing role gave less positive ratings.  Strong neighbourhood integration was also linked to positive evaluation of police performance.  The results fell short of expectations in two ways. First the model was weak, accounting for about 15% of the variance (i.e,a multiple R of about .38). Secondly a measure of conservative attitudes did not contribute anything to the model's explanatory power.  It may be noted that neighbourhood integration, an exogenous factor, did impact significantly on police assessments but a forced entry type of regression analysis indicated that the increment in explained variance added by the introduction of any exogenous factors was not significant.

In the case of Halifax the overall results were similar though the specifics differed. The level of explanation was similar, roughly 15% of the variance, and the same three types of shortfalls were evident.  The major explanatory variables were interaction experience, expectations about the policing

role conservative attitudes and age.  Favorable interaction experience produced no effect but negative interaction experience was associated with lower evaluation of police performance.  Unlike the Valley situation, conservative outlook replaced perceived vulnerability as a significant variable and was associated with positive ratings of police performance.  The most important factor in the model was scope as those with high expectations for the policing effort gave poorer evaluations on the police functions. .  Age was an exogenous variable (the older respondents gave higher ratings of police performance) which impacted directly on police assessment.

Turning to more general attitudes toward police, a similar index was constructed from similar survey questions in both samples.  These questions dealt with the extent to which police were perceived as going about their job in a fair, open and morally acceptable manner.  The results were somewhat more in keeping with the model outlined above.  In both instances  the explained variance was modest (circa 15%).  In the Valley sample variables representing perceived vulnerability, interaction experience and demands about policing were significant; and, more marginally, conservative (perhaps alienated is a better term here) outlook was also a factor in effecting variation in

the public response.  All these variables had similar rather

weak betas.  In general respondents reporting favorable

interaction with police, having low demands or unmet

expectations, living in an area perceived as relatively problem-

free and not having a conservative-alienated outlook gave the

most favorable assessments.  Similar variables were also

significant in the case of the Halifax sample where the

intervening variables were apparently of roughly equal

importance.  In the Halifax case no exogenous variable had a

direct impact on attitudes to police though of course variables

such as ses and social resources were significant at the zero-

order level.  Age (i.e., the older the more positive attitude)

did have a significant direct effect in the Valley sample; the

increment in explained variance obtained by inserting age in the

second step of a forced entry regression was significant.

**TABLE H/V.1     SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS***     **(HALIFAX/VALLEY)**

| SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS RURAL/OTHER | HALIFAX | VALLEY | TOWN | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Live in Valley 5 Yrs or Less | 15 | 15 | 15 | 14 |
| Live in Neigh. 5 Yrs or Less | 33 | 37 | 35 | 38 |
| No Relatives in Neighbourhood | 69 | 44 | 44 | 45 |
| No Close Friends in Neighbourhood | 23 | 15 | 12 | 16 |
| Belong to NO Organizations/Area | 56** | 46 | 41 | 49 |
| Marital Status: Single | 28 | 19 | 23 | 16 |
| % Respondents Working | 53 | 54 | 51 | 55 |
| Income: | | | | |
| 20 Thousand/Less | XX | 33 | 33 | 32 |
| 20 – 40 Thousand | XX | 47 | 42 | 49 |
| 40 Thousand + | XX | 21 | 25 | 19 |

\*    Neighed Frequencies
\*\*   Only 35% of the Halifax adults belong to no organizations
in   the Halifax area.

79

**TABLE H/V.2    SOCIAL DEMOGRAPHICS\* (Halifax/Valley)**

| DEMOGRAPHICS | HALIFAX | VALLEY | TOWN | RURAL/OTHER | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| % Female | 61 | 50 | | | |
| More Than 2 Adults/Household | 25 | 19 | XX | | |
| Single Family Dwelling | 57 | 80 | 71 | 86 | |
| Home Owners | 61 | 78 | 71 | 82 | |
| Total Household 2 Persons/Less | 50 | 46 | 52 | | 43 |
| Respondent's Age | | | | | |
| 18 – 40 | 42 | 48 | 46 | 49 | |
| 41 – 60 | 32 | 29 | 27 | 30 | |
| 60+ | 26 | 23 | 27 | 21 | |

\*    Neighed Frequencies

80

**TABLE H/V.3          SELECTED PERCEPTIONS OF CRIME**\*

DO YOU THINK HALIFAX/VALLEY IS AN AREA WITH A HIGH, AVERAGE OR LOW AMOUNTS OF CRIME?

| | HALIFAX | VALLEY | TOWN | VALLEY/OTHER |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| High | 36 | 8 | 7 | 9 |
| Average | 50 | 45 | | |
| Low | 13 | 47 | 48 | 46 |

**HOW DO YOU THINK YOUR NEIGHBOURHOOD COMPARES WITH THE REST OF HALIFAX/VALLEY IN TERMS OF THE AMOUNT OF CRIME?**

| | HALIFAX | VALLEY | TOWN | VALLEY/OTHER |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| High | 16 | 5 | 7 | 3 |
| Average | 34 | 41 | 47 | 37 |
| Less | 50 | 54 | 44 | 58 |

**IN THE PAST YEAR OR TWO DO YOU THINK CRIME HAS INCREASED, DECREASED OR REMAINED THE SAME IN YOUR NEIGHBOURHOOD?**

| | HALIFAX | VALLEY | TOWN | VALLEY/OTHER RURAL/OTHER |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| High | 51 | 31 | 32 | 30 |
| Average | 46 | 63 | 62 | 63 |
| Decreased | 3 | 6 | 5 | 6 |

\*    Unweighted Frequencies

**TABLE H/V.4    PERCEPTIONS OF CRIME AND SAFETY\***
**(HALIFAX/VALLEY)**

| ASPECT | HALIFAX | VALLEY | TOWN | RURAL/OTHER |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Very Safe (Day) | 74 | 90 | 92 | 89 |
| Very Safe (Night) | 20 | 54 | 53 | 55 |
| Worry House Unattended (Not at All) | 60 | 81 | 82 | 80 |
| Worry – Mugging (Not at All) | 60 | 85 | 84 | 85 |
| Worry – Assault (Not at All) | 59 | 84 | 82 | 84 |
| Worry – B & E (Not at All) | 33 | 55 | 55 | 54 |
| Worry – Vandalism (Not at All) | 43 | 59 | 59 | 58 |
| Worry – Crime (More Than Most Things in Life) | 19 | 3 | 4 | 3 |

\*    Unweighted Frequencies

**TABLE H/V.5 PERCEPTION OF LOCAL PROBLEMS\* (% Saying Big Problem)**

| PROBLEM | HALIFAX | VALLEY | TOWN | RURAL/OTHER |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| B & E | 26 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| Traffic | 21 | 16 | 17 | 15 |
| Vandalism | 10 | 5 | 6 | 4 |
| Drug Use | 12 | 15 | 20 | 12 |
| Fighting/ Local Groups | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| Wife Battering/ Child Abuse | XX | 6 | 7 | 4 |
| Noisy Parties/ Loud Music | 6 | 5 | 6 | 4 |
| Loitering | 8 | 6 | 11 | 4 |
| Resident/Police Contact | 8 | 4 | 6 | 3 |
| Drinking & Driving | XX | 16 | 19 | 14 |
| Bootlegging | XX | 4 | 6 | 3 |
| Illegal Hunting | XX | 9 | 9 | 8 |

\*    Unweighted Frequencies

83

# TABLE H/V.6 PERCEPTIONS OF LOCAL PROBLEMS* (% SAYING BIG/SOMEWHAT BIG)

| PROBLEM | VALLEY | TOWN | RURAL/OTHER |
|---|---|---|---|
| B & E | 35 | 35 | 35 |
| TRAFFIC | 46 | 49 | 44 |
| VANDALISM | 37 | 39 | 34 |
| DRUG USE | 56 | 61 | 53 |
| FIGHTING BETWEEN LOCAL GROUPS | 15 | 20 | 15 |
| WIFE BATTERING/ CHILD ABUSE | 32 | 38 | 26 |
| NOISY PARTIES/ LOUD MUSIC | 25 | 32 | 25 |
| LOITERING | 29 | 39 | 24 |
| CONTACT BETWEEN POLICE/RESIDENTS | 21 | 22 | 21 |
| DRINKING AND DRIVING | 59 | 61 | 58 |
| BOOTLEGGING | 21 | 23 | 20 |
| ILLEGAL HUNTING | 32 | 32 | 33 |

*    UNWEIGHTED FREQUENCIES

## TABLE H/V.7  VICTIMIZATION IN THE PAST YEAR BY TYPE & DEGREE (%)*

| TYPE | | | DEGREE | |
|------|---|---|--------|---|
| | PERSONAL VICTIMIZATION | | RELEVANT VICTIMIZATION | |
| | HALIFAX | VALLEY | HALIFAX | VALLEY |
| HELD UP? | 2 | 1 | 7 | 2 |
| ASSAULTED? | 3 | 2 | 8 | 4 |
| B & E? | 10 | XX | 34 | XX |
| THEFT? | 11 | 8 | 28 | 21 |
| VANDALISM? (ESP. CAR) | 13 | XX | 22 | XX |

**WERE YOU, YOURSELF, A VICTIM OF ANY CRIME
AT ALL IN THE PAST TWO YEARS? (% YES)***

| HALIFAX | VALLEY | TOWN | RURAL/OTHER |
|---------|--------|------|-------------|
| 31 | 9 | 10 | 9 |

\*    UNWEIGHTED FREQUENCIES
\*\*   THE GENERAL SOCIAL SURVEY 1989 INDICATES FOR CANADA AS A    WHOLE, THE
SELF—REPORTED LEVEL OF VICTIMIZATION FOR 1987    AMONG ADULTS OVER FIFTEEN YEARS
OF AGE WAS 24%.

**TABLE H/V.8       INFORMATION, CONTACTS AND POLICING***

| DIMENSION | HALIFAX | VALLEY | TOWN | RURAL/OTHER |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| KNOWLEDGE OF OFFICER | | | | |
| BY NAME | 8 | 43 | 62 | 31 |
| BY SIGHT | 21 | 62 | 82 | 49 |
| SOCIALLY | N/A | 23 | 32 | 17 |

**CONTACT WITH POLICE IN LAST YEAR***

| | HALIFAX | VALLEY | TOWN | RURAL/OTHER |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| YES | 42 | 38 | 40 | 37 |

**SOURCE OF CRIME INFORMATION***

| | HALIFAX | VALLEY | TOWN | RURAL/OTHER |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| A GREAT DEAL | | | | |
| MEDIA | 34 | 38 | 42 | 36 |
| NEIGHBOURS | 18 | 17 | 14 | 19 |
| POLICE | 2 | 4 | 6 | 3 |
| SOME | | | | |
| MEDIA | 48 | 49 | 52 | 47 |
| NEIGHBOURS | 50 | 53 | 54 | 52 |
| POLICE | 12 | 19 | 21 | 17 |

\*    UNWEIGHTED FREQUENCIES

86

**TABLE H/V. 9     PARTICIPATION IN POLICE – SPONSORED CRIME**
**PREVENTION PROGRAM SAYING YES)\***

| PROGRAM | HALIFAX | VALLEY | TOWN | RURAL/OTHER |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH | 33 | 9 | 7 | 10 |
| BLOCK PARENTS | 12 | 13 | 14 | 12 |
| CRIME STOPPERS | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| OPERATION IDENTIFICATION | 27 | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| CRIME PREVENTION TALKS | 16 | 12 | 11 | 12 |
| BIKE SAFETY | 11 | 19 | 20 | 19 |

\*     UNWEIGHTED FREQUENCIES

87

**TABLE H/V.10    EXPECTATIONS OF POLICE: STYLE & SCOPE OF POLICING***

| STYLE OF POLICING | HALIFAX | VALLEY | TOWN | RURAL/OTHER |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| MORE COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION | 94 | 92 | 92 | 92 |
| MORE SENSITIVITY TO MINORITIES | 76 | 79 | 77 | 79 |
| MORE SENSITIVITY TO VICTIMS | 91 | 85 | 86 | 84 |
| **SCOPE OF POLICING** | | | | |
| WIDE RESPONSE | 87 | 83 | 85 | 81 |
| MORE CRIME FIGHTING | 51 | 33 | 38 | 31 |
| WIDE ROLE: SCHOOLS | 94 | 94 | 95 | 93 |
| FAST RESPONSE | 91 | 90 | 92 | 88 |
| WIDE MANDATE | 83 | 82 | 85 | 80 |
| COST **NOT** PRIORITY | 74 | 51 | 46 | 55 |

\*    UNWEIGHTED FREQUENCIES

**TABLE H/V.11   PERCEPTIONS OF POLICE – NEIGHBOURHOOD RELATIONS***

| FACET | HALIFAX | VALLEY | TOWN | RURAL/OTHER |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| GOOD/EXCELLENT RELATIONS | 78 | 81 | 82 | 81 |
| AREA ADEQUATELY SERVED/POLICE | 75 | 88 | 92 | 86 |
| TOO FEW POLICE IN AREA | 51 | 31 | 20 | 38 |

\*     UNWEIGHTED FREQUENCIES

**TABLE H/V.12  POLICE INTERPERSONAL EFFECTIVENESS (% SAYING POLICE EXHIBIT A TRAIT VERY WELL/WELL)\***

| TRAIT | HALIFAX | VALLEY | TOWN | RURAL/OTHER |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| FAIRNESS | 76 | 94 | 92 | 95 |
| HONESTY | 69 | 93 | 92 | 93 |
| CONCERNED/OPEN | 75 | 82 | 81 | 82 |
| KNOWLEDGEABLE/ PROFESSIONAL | 82 | 95 | 91 | 98 |
| MODERN | N/A | 92 | 86 | 96 |
| EFFICIENT | N/A | 89 | 87 | 91 |

\*    UNWEIGHTED FREQUENCIES

**TABLE H/V.13    EVALUATION OF MAJOR POLICE FUNCTIONS**

| FUNCTION | HALIFAX | VALLEY | TOWN | RURAL/OTHER |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **ENFORCEMENT** | | | | |
| GOOD | 50 | 75 | 73 | 76 |
| AVERAGE | 45 | 23 | 25 | 21 |
| | | | | |
| **RESPONSE** | | | | |
| GOOD | 56 | 72 | 76 | 70 |
| AVERAGE | 28 | 21 | 20 | 22 |
| | | | | |
| **INVESTIGATIONS** | | | | |
| GOOD | 32 | 66 | 62 | 68 |
| AVERAGE | 52 | 30 | 34 | 27 |
| | | | | |
| **BEING APPROACHABLE** | | | | |
| GOOD | 69 | 81 | 82 | 80 |
| AVERAGE | 25 | 16 | 15 | 17 |
| | | | | |
| **DISSEMINATING INFORMATION** | | | | |
| GOOD | 50 | 65 | 62 | 66 |
| AVERAGE | 32 | 22 | 24 | 21 |
| | | | | |
| **HELP WITH LOCAL PROBLEMS** | | | | |
| GOOD | 48 | 69 | 69 | 68 |
| AVERAGE | 39 | 26 | 26 | 25 |

\*    UNWEIGHTED FREQUENCIES

| TABLE H/V.14 | ASSESSMENT OF POLICING* | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| FACET | HALIFAX | VALLEY | TOWN | RURAL/OTHER |
| BLACKS TREATED FAIRLY | 56 | 78 | 74 | 80 |
| RICH TOO MUCH INFLUENCE | 67 | 53 | 54 | 52 |
| POLICE MISCONDUCT IS RARE | 93 | 87 | 85 | 88 |
| POLICE WILLING TO HELP OUT | 86 | 95 | 96 | 95 |
| POLICE CAREFUL NOT TO ARREST INNOCENT | 70 | 88 | 88 | 87 |
| POLICE ENJOY PUSHING PEOPLE AROUND | 39 | 24 | 25 | 23 |
| POLICE RESTRICTED | 69 | 65 | 60 | 68 |
| POLICE JUSTIFIED IN OCCASIONAL ROUGHING | 28 | 35 | 30 | 38 |
| NO EXPERIENCE OF POLICE UNFAIRNESS | 85 | 89 | 87 | 90 |

\*    UNWEIGHTED FREQUENCIES

# CHAPTER 7

# CONCLUSION

The development of a diverse and comprehensive data base on issues such as victimization, attitudes towards domestic violence, crime fear and worry, police role and police functions provides a rich body of data for analysis and interpretation.  The findings presented in this report while primarily descriptive allow some tentative research conclusions to be drawn and policy implications identified.  The following is a review of the findings and implications of this survey.

**Rural Victimization Research: Methodological Concerns**:

A)	THE FEASIBILITY OF CONDUCTING A RURAL VICTIMIZATION SURVEY BY TELEPHONE WAS CONFIRMED BY OUR STUDY.  ANTICIPATED PROBLEMS WITH SHARED PARTY TELEPHONE LINES AND A POSSIBILITY OF LOW RESPONSE RATES WERE NOT CONFIRMED BY OUR EXPERIENCE.  ON THE CONTRARY, THE RURAL RESIDENTS IN OUR SAMPLE  WERE VIRTUALLY ALL ON SINGLE PARTY LINES, TELEPHONE LISTINGS WERE COMPLETE AND RURAL RESPONDENTS HAD EVEN LOWER REFUSALS RATES THAN THE URBAN (HALIFAX) COMPONENT OF THIS SURVEY.  THE FEASIBILITY OF TELEPHONE SURVEYS IN RURAL AREAS AND THE DISTINCTIVE NATURE OF THE RURAL FINDINGS REINFORCES THE IMPORTANCE OF INCLUDING RURAL OR NON-URBAN RESIDENTS IN ALL FUTURE NATIONAL CRIME AND POLICING SURVEYS (SEE APPENDIX FOR MORE DETAILS ON METHODOLOGY AND SAMPLING ISSUES AND PROCEDURES).

**B) Victimization:**

The findings on rural victimization generally confirm that rural areas tend to have lower rates of victimization than urban areas. The two estimates of victimization for our sample (9% and 11%) are well below national and urban Nova Scotia averages. These findings confirm urban - rural differences reflected in official rates of crime and suggest that while rates of crime may be increasing in rural areas, they remain by all measures significantly lower than urban areas.

Differences in victimization patterns within our sample indicate that small towns, villages and rural areas have generally the same rates of victimization, that property crime is more common than personal crime and that men report more victimization than women. The majority of victimizations are reported to police at a rate that suggests that reporting rates may be higher in rural areas than in urban areas like Halifax ( % reported) and national rates ( % reported, Statistics Canada). In summary, the findings from the victimization questions confirm the general pattern of findings of most victimization surveys except that rural rates are significantly lower for all categories particularly person crimes.

C) Public Response Towards Domestic Violence:

The survey also asked a number of questions designed to probe public responses to different kinds of domestic violence scenarios. Given a number of open and closed response options, the findings indicate considerable variation in how

INDIVIDUALS SAY THEY WOULD RESPOND TO A PARTICULAR SITUATION OF DOMESTIC ABUSE. THE

KEY FACTORS WHICH APPEAR TO DETERMINE RESPONSE PREFERENCE HINGE ON A COMBINATION OF

A) THE NATURE OF THE DOMESTIC ABUSE SITUATION (SEXUAL OR PHYSICAL ABUSE), B) THE

HYPOTHETICAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE VICTIM AND THE RESPONDENTS (NEIGHBOUR,

PARENT, SIBLING) AND C) THE GENDER, AGE AND INCOME OF THE RESPONDENT. EVIDENCE OF

CONSIDERABLE VARIATION IN THE NUMBER WHO OPT TO CALL POLICE, RATHER THAN RESPOND

PERSONALLY OR CALL A SOCIAL AGENCY, SUGGEST THAT PARTICULAR CHILD OR INTER-FAMILY

ABUSE IS STILL CONSIDERED BY MANY TO BE PRIMARILY A "SOCIAL" AND PRIVATE PROBLEM AND

ONLY SECONDARILY A LEGAL OR POLICE PROBLEM. THESE FINDINGS SUGGEST THAT PUBLIC

EDUCATION ON THE LEGAL OR CRIMINAL ASPECTS OF CHILD AND FAMILY ABUSE MUST CONTEND

WITH APPARENTLY STRONGLY HELD PUBLIC PERCEPTIONS THAT CERTAIN FAMILY CONFLICTS ARE

BEST DEALT WITH BY PERSONAL STRATEGIES OR SOCIAL AGENCIES.


## FEAR AND WORRY ABOUT CRIME

THE SURVEY FINDINGS ON FEAR OF CRIME INDICATE THAT RURAL RESIDENTS IN OUR

SAMPLE FEEL SIGNIFICANTLY SAFER THAN THEIR URBAN OR NATIONAL COUNTERPARTS. THIS IS

NOT SURPRISING AS THE VICTIMIZATION DATA SUGGEST THAT THE RISK OF BEING A VICTIM OF

CRIME IS SIGNIFICANTLY LOWER IN RURAL AREAS. THESE FINDINGS DO SUPPORT THE LINK

BETWEEN CRIME FEAR AND VICTIMIZATION RISK. HOWEVER WHEN RESPONSES WERE FURTHER

ANALYZED, THIS DIRECT RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FEAR AND VICTIMIZATION WAS NOT EVIDENT.

THE FINDINGS THAT WOMEN TEND TO BE MORE FEARFUL THAN MEN, THAT THE OLD MORE FEARFUL

THAN THE YOUNG, AND THE POOR MORE FEARFUL THAN THE RICH, AND THAT THESE GROUPS HAVE

95

RELATIVE LOW RATES OF VICTIMIZATION SUGGEST THAT FACTORS OFTEN THAN ACTUAL RISK ALSO INFLUENCE FEAR AND WORRY.

CONSISTENT WITH REPORTS OF LOW CRIME FEAR WERE FINDINGS WHICH ALSO INDICATE THAT OUR RESPONDENTS FEEL THEY LIVE IN AREAS WITH AVERAGE OR LOW CRIME AND WITH THE SAME OR LESS CRIME THAN OTHER AREAS. HOWEVER A MAJORITY OF OUR SAMPLE ALSO SAW CRIME AS INCREASING IN THEIR OWN AREA. PUBLIC PERCEPTIONS APPEAR TO REFLECT THE REALITIES OF LIVING IN RURAL AREAS WITH RELATIVELY LOW RATES OF REPORTED CRIME AND VICTIMIZATION AND ALSO MEDIA REPORTS OF CRIME INCREASING.

WHEN ASKED ABOUT THEIR SPECIFIC CRIME WORRIES, RESPONDENTS GENERALLY INDICATED LOW LEVELS OF CRIME WORRY. THE ONLY SIGNIFICANT LEVEL OF WORRY FOCUSED ON THE MOST PROBABLE RISK OF VICTIMIZATION, VANDALISM AND BREAK AND ENTER. HOWEVER THE FACT THAT 85% OF OUR SAMPLE INDICATED THEY DID NOT WORRY ABOUT BEING A VICTIM OF CRIME MORE THAN OTHER THINGS, PUTS THESE FINDING IN A BROADER PERSPECTIVE.

## NEIGHBOURHOOD CRIME & ORDER PROBLEMS

QUESTIONS ADDRESSING A VARIETY OF COMMUNITY ORDER AND CRIME PROBLEMS, WERE ASKED TO ADDRESS THE FULL RANGE OF PUBLIC SAFETY CONCERNS OF RURAL CITIZENS. WHEN ASKED HOW BIG A PROBLEM ORDER AND CRIME ISSUES WERE IN THEIR AREA OR NEIGHBOURHOOD, THE MAJORITY OF RESPONDENTS INDICATED THAT ALL EXCEPT DRINKING AND DRIVING AND DRUG USE WERE NOT CONSIDERED A BIG PROBLEM. HOWEVER PROBLEMS SUCH AS TRAFFIC, VANDALISM, ILLEGAL HUNTING, BREAK AND ENTER, AND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE DID RATE AT LEAST "BIG AND SOMEWHAT" OF A PROBLEM FOR 30% OR MORE OF THE RESPONDENTS. THE COLLECTIVE PICTURE

96

PAINTED BY THESE FINDINGS IS A POPULATION NOT TERRIBLY CONCERNED ABOUT CRIME BUT

SOMEWHAT CONCERNED WITH PUBLIC ORDER AND SECURITY ISSUES. THE BIGGEST THREATS TO

THAT SENSE OF ORDER AND SECURITY, APPEAR TO BE DRUG (ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUGS) AND

TRAFFIC RELATED ISSUES. THE RELATIVELY LOW RATE OF CONCERN FOR CRIME FOR MOST

CITIZENS, PRESUMABLY IS A REFLECTION OF THE LACK OF ACTUAL THREAT POSED BY CRIME TO

VALLEY RESIDENTS. IT WOULD APPEAR THAT THE ABSENCE OF SERIOUS CRIME IN AN AREA ALLOW

CONSENT TO FOCUS ON PUBLIC ORDER ISSUES.

EVIDENCE THAT DRUG ABUSE IS CONSIDERED A BIG PROBLEM IN RURAL AREAS DESPITE A

LACK OF OBJECTIVE EVIDENCE OF ITS WIDESPREAD ABUSE, SUGGESTS THAT FACTORS OTHER THAN

THE ACTUAL AMOUNT OF CRIME MAY INFLUENCE PUBLIC PERCEPTIONS OF CRIME AREAS LEVELS OF

CONCERN.


## POLICE AND POLICING ISSUES

### CONTACT AND KNOWLEDGE OF POLICE

RESPONDENTS IN OUR VALLEY SAMPLE INDICATED THEY HAD CONSIDERABLE CONTACT

AND KNOWLEDGE OF LOCAL POLICE. THOUGH THE NATURE OF THESE CONTACTS VARIED THE

MAJORITY RATED THEIR CONTACT WITH POLICE POSITIVELY. THE DEGREE OF PERSONAL AND

PROFESSIONAL CONTACT INDICATED BY OUR SAMPLE, CONFIRMS THE VIEW THAT SMALL TOWN

POLICING IS A MORE INTIMATE AND CONTACT- BASED FORM OF POLICING THAN URBAN POLICING.

SUBSEQUENT ANALYSIS OF THE DATA (MURPHY & CLAIRMONT, 1990) INDICATES THAT CONTACT

WITH THE PUBLIC WAS ONE OF THE MOST IMPORTANT FACTORS EXPLAINING POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE

EVALUATIONS OF THE POLICE. THESE FINDINGS FURTHER SUPPORT THE CENTRAL TENET OF

97

COMMUNITY BASED POLICING WHICH PROPOSES THAT A STYLE OF POLICING WHICH ENABLES POLICE TO BE MORE PUBLICLY VISIBLE, AVAILABLE AND ACCESSIBLE, CREATES OR REINFORCES POSITIVE ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE POLICE. THE PERSONAL CONTACT STYLE OF SMALL TOWN/RURAL POLICING MAY IN PART BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE FOLLOWING EXTREMELY POSITIVE EVALUATIONS OF THE POLICE IN RURAL AREAS.

## EVALUATING POLICE AND POLICING

A SERIES OF QUESTIONS DESIGNED TO ELICIT EVALUATIVE RESPONSES FROM CITIZENS ON VARIOUS ASPECTS OF POLICE SERVICES IN THEIR AREA, PROVIDED A STRONG PUBLIC ENDORSEMENT OF RURAL AND SMALL TOWN POLICING. THE MAJORITY OF SAMPLE RESPONDENTS SAW COMMUNITY-POLICE RELATIONS AS EXCELLENT OR GOOD, AND LOCAL POLICE SERVICES AS BETTER OR THE SAME AS OTHER SERVICES. RESPONDENTS EXPRESSED A STRONG PREFERENCE FOR POLICE FUNCTIONS SUCH AS RESPONDING TO CALLS, CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION, EQUAL ENFORCEMENT AND ENDORSED THEIR LOCAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS' FAIRNESS HONESTY, OPENNESS, EFFICIENCY AND MODERNISM. ON ISSUES RELATED TO FAIRNESS, HONESTY AND USE OF FORCE, OUR RESPONDENTS FOUND LITTLE TO CRITICIZE. WHILE THERE WERE SOME MINOR VARIATIONS ON THE LEVEL OF APPROVAL FOR R.C.M.P AND MUNICIPAL POLICE, BOTH WERE RECIPIENTS OF HIGH APPROVAL RATINGS. IN SUMMARY IT WOULD APPEAR THAT THE MAJORITY OF RURAL CITIZENS IN BOTH SMALL TOWN AND RURAL AREAS RATE THE PERFORMANCE OF THEIR LOCAL POLICE HIGHLY. WHILE ALL STUDIES OF CANADIAN CITIZEN EVALUATION OF POLICE REPORT HIGH LEVELS OF PUBLIC SUPPORT, THE LEVEL OF SUPPORT IN OUR RURAL SAMPLE WAS EVEN HIGHER THAN MOST URBAN BASED SURVEYS.

## POLICE ROLE

THE QUALITIES AND CHARACTERISTICS THAT DISTINGUISH THE ROLE AND STYLE OF RURAL AND SMALL TOWN POLICING WERE ALSO THE FOCUS OF A NUMBER OF QUESTIONS IN OUR SURVEY. THE RESULTS ENDORSED A NUMBER OF TRADITIONAL POLICING QUALITIES SUCH AS POLICE KNOWLEDGE AND RESPONSIVENESS TO LOCAL CONCERNS, USE OF POLICE DISCRETION AND POLICE VISIBILITY AND AVAILABILITY. HOWEVER THE FINDINGS ALSO ENDORSED MORE MODERN POLICING QUALITIES SUCH AS POLITICAL INDEPENDENCE, MORE LOCAL AND MINORITY RECRUITING, NEW EQUIPMENT AND TRAINING AND FULL EQUITABLE ENFORCEMENT. A BROAD SOCIAL ROLE FOR POLICE, INCLUDING SPEAKING IN SCHOOL, MORE COMMUNITY INTERACTION, MORE SENSITIVITY TO MINORITIES AND VICTIMS WAS ENDORSED OVER INCREASING ATTENTION TO THE CRIME FIGHTING FUNCTION.

THE PUBLIC DESIRE FOR A MIX OF SOME TRADITIONAL POLICING VALUES AND STYLES ALONG WITH SELECTED MORE MODERN POLICING VALUES SUGGEST A NEW MODEL OF SMALL TOWN POLICING MAY BE EMERGING. THE TRADITIONAL MODEL OF SMALL TOWN POLICING CONVEYING WELL PUBLICIZED LIMITATIONS SUCH AS POLITICAL CONTROL, POOR TRAINING, BIASED ENFORCEMENT ETC., IS SOLIDLY REJECTED BY OUR RURAL RESPONDENTS. HOWEVER OUR SAMPLE APPEARS NOT WILLING TO THROW OUT THE TRADITIONAL CONCEPTS OF PUBLIC CONTACT, RESPONSIVENESS AND BROAD SOCIAL ROLES IN FAVOUR OF A NARROW CRIME FOCUSED BRAND OF MODERN POLICE PROFESSIONALISM. DEPOLITICIZING POLICING, ENHANCING TRAINING AND EQUIPMENT, BROAD RECRUITMENT PRACTICES AND EQUITABLE ENFORCEMENT ARE ALSO VALUED AS IMPORTANT MODERN POLICING QUALITIES. THIS NEW COMMUNITY BASED SMALL TOWN

POLICING MODEL IS IN ESSENCE A SYNTHESIS OF SELECTED QUALITIES OF BOTH THE TRADITIONAL AND MODERN PROFESSIONAL MODELS OF POLICING.

THIS POST-MODERN POLICING IDEAL, IS IN FACT BEING DEVELOPED IN RURAL AREAS AS MUNICIPAL POLICE MODERNIZE AND THE R.C.M.P ADOPT MORE COMMUNITY ORIENTED POLICIES TO THEIR MODERN STYLE OF RURAL POLICING (MURPHY, 1989). WHETHER COMMUNITY BASED POLICING WORKS IN URBAN SETTINGS MAY BE A SUBJECT FOR CONTINUING DEBATE BUT THE PUBLIC RESPONSES IN OUR SURVEY STRONGLY ENDORSE ITS CENTRAL TENETS.

## URBAN - RURAL DIFFERENCES

INTERESTING VARIATIONS WERE REVEALED WHEN FINDINGS FOR SIMILAR QUESTIONS WERE COMPARED BETWEEN HALIFAX AND THE VALLEY SAMPLES. AS MIGHT BE EXPECTED, RURAL RESIDENTS FELT MUCH SAFER DURING TO DAY AND NIGHT THAN HALIFAX RESIDENTS. RURAL RESIDENTS WHEN THEY DO WORRY ABOUT CRIME TEND TO BE MORE CONCERNED ABOUT PROPERTY THAN PERSON CRIME WHILE URBAN RESPONDENTS WERE WORRIED ABOUT PERSON CRIME. BOTH SAMPLES INDICATE THAT WOMEN, THE ELDERLY AND LOWER SOCIO-ECONOMIC RESPONDENTS ARE THE MOST FEARFUL. WHEN COMMUNITY CRIME AND ORDER PROBLEMS ARE EXAMINED URBAN HALIFAX RESIDENTS CONSIDER VIRTUALLY ALL COMPARABLE PROBLEMS EXCEPT DRUG USE AS A BIGGER PROBLEM THAN RURAL RESPONDENTS.

COMPARISON OF VICTIMIZATION RATES INDICATE THAT THE URBAN HALIFAX SAMPLE INDICATES A RATE THREE TIMES THAT OF OUR RURAL VALLEY SAMPLE. THIS URBAN DIFFERENCE IS TRUE FOR ALL CATEGORIES OF VICTIMIZATION CONFIRMING THAT URBAN HALIFAX IS INDEED A SIGNIFICANTLY HIGHER RISK AREA FOR CRIME THAN THE VALLEY AREA. THIS IS A

DIFFERENCE APPARENTLY UNDERSTOOD BY OUR RESPONDENTS.

EVALUATIONS OF POLICING CONTINUE TO DEMONSTRATE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN URBAN AND RURAL RESPONSE PATTERNS. THE FIRST KEY DIFFERENCE IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN URBAN AND RURAL KNOWLEDGE AND CONTACT WITH POLICE. NOT SURPRISINGLY FOR MORE RURAL RESIDENTS KNOW THEIR POLICE BY NAME AND SIGHT THAN HALIFAX RESIDENTS. HOWEVER HALIFAX AND VALLEY RESIDENTS REPORT SIMILAR LEVEL OF GENERAL CONTACT. HALIFAX RESIDENTS PRESUMABLY HAVE LESS CONTACT WITH POLICE OFFICERS THEY EITHER KNEW KNOW BY SIGHT OR BY NAME, BUT WHAT CONTENT DO THEY HAVE IS MORE FORMAL, IMPERSONAL AND CRIME FOCUSED THAN THE RURAL RESPONDENTS IN OUR SAMPLE. THIS FACTOR MAY BE LINKED TO FURTHER DIFFERENCES IN EVALUATING POLICE IN BOTH SAMPLES.

ON THE WHOLE RURAL RESIDENTS EVALUATE THEIR POLICE MORE POSITIVELY ON NEIGHBOURHOOD RELATIONS, INTERPERSONAL EFFECTIVENESS IN ALL OF MAJOR POLICE FUNCTIONS AND ON HONESTY AND FAIRNESS. THE DIFFERENCES FOR ALMOST ALL QUESTIONS ARE SIGNIFICANT. THE CENTRAL RESEARCH QUESTION THAT WILL BE ADDRESSED IN FUTURE ANALYSIS IS WHAT FACTORS EXPLAIN THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE THESE TWO SAMPLES; POLICE BEHAVIOUR, SIZE AND SCALE OF POLICE OPERATIONS, CRIME AND VICTIMIZATION RATES OR SOCIO-CULTURAL DIFFERENCES?

THE ISSUE OF POLICING STYLE DOES SHOW CONSISTENCY IN THE PATTERN OF RESPONSE BETWEEN RURAL AND URBAN SAMPLES. BOTH SAMPLES ENDORSE A BROAD SOCIAL ROLE FOR POLICE WHICH EXTENDS BEYOND CRIME FIGHTING INTO AREAS OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT AND PARTICIPATION. HOWEVER IT WOULD APPEAR THAT HALIFAX RESIDENTS ARE MORE WILLING TO PAY FOR THESE DEVELOPMENTS THAN THEIR RURAL COUNTERPARTS.

THE SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS OF THIS REPORT AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF SOME TENTATIVE CONCLUSIONS AND POLICY ISSUES ARE REFLECTIVE OF THE PRELIMINARY STAGES OF ANALYSIS OF THIS LARGE AND COMPLEX DATA SET. SUBSEQUENT ANALYSIS OF THE DATA WILL EXPLORE AND EXPAND ON SOME OF THE FINDINGS AND ISSUES IDENTIFIED IN PRELIMINARY REPORT. MORE ELABORATE AND SOPHISTICATED STATISTICAL ANALYSIS WILL ALLOW US TO SPECIFY MORE CONFIDENTLY AND CLEARLY THE CONCLUSIONS THAT CAN BE DRAWN FROM THIS STUDY AND THE POLICY IMPLICATIONS OF THESE FINDINGS.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

ANDREWS & FERRAZZY  A CANADIAN RURAL VICTIMIZATION SURVEY:
PRELIMINARY THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS, SOLICITOR
GENERAL OF CANADA, 1985.

BOGGS, S.  "URBAN CRIME PATTERNS", AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW.

CARTER, T. THE EXTENDED NATURE OF RURAL CRIME IN AMERICA IN RURAL CRIME:
INTEGRATING RESEARCH AND PREVENTION, ED. T. CARTER ET AL.,
WURSCHMIDT, N.G. ALLENHELD, 1982.

CLAIRMONT, D.    HALIFAX AREA SURVEY OF PUBLIC PERCEPTION AND ATTITUDES
TOWARDS CRIME, PUBLIC SAFETY AND POLICING, HALIFAX: ATLANTIC
INSTITUTE OF CRIMINOLOGY, 1985.

HUNTER, A.  "THE LOSS OF COMMUNITY: AN EMPIRICAL TEST THROUGH REPLICATION",
AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW, VOLUME 40, (OCTOBER) 1975, P.
537-552.

KAILL, R.    CRIME IN THE COUNTRY: A LITERATURE REVIEW OF CRIME AND
CRIMINAL JUSTICE IN RURAL AREA, ATLANTIC INSTITUTE OF
CRIMINOLOGY, 1986, DEPT. OF SOLICITOR GENERAL USER REPORT.

KRAMMICH, G.L.  "RAPID GROWTH AND FEAR OF CRIME: A FOUR COMMUNITY
COMPARISON", RURAL SOCIOLOGY, RURAL SOCIOLOGY, VOLUME 50,
NUMBER 2.

KONENIG, D. "POLICE PERCEPTIONS OF PUBLIC RESPECT AND EXTRA LEGAL USE OF
FORCE, A RECONSIDERATION OF FOLK WISDOM AND PLURALISTIC
IGNORANCE", CANADIAN JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY, VOL 1:3, FALL,
1975.

MURPHY, C. AND DE VERTEUIL METROPOLITAN TORONTO COMMUNITY POLICING SURVEY,
WORKING PAPER NO.1, 1986, SOLICITOR GENERAL OF CANADA.

MURPHY, C. AND LITHOPOULOS, S.  SOME DETERMINANTS OF ATTITUDES TOWARDS POLICE.
FINDINGS FROM THE TORONTO COMMUNITY POLICING SURVEY, OTTAWA: SOLICITOR
GENERAL OF CANADA.

MURPHY, T. SOCIOLOGICAL DIMENSIONS OF A CANADIAN RURAL VICTIMIZATION SURVEY, SOLICITOR GENERAL, UNPUBLISHED REPORT, 1985.


PAHL, R.E. "THE RURAL — URBAN CONTINUUM", SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW, VOLUME 6, NUMBER 3 & 4, 19??, P. 299-329.

SMITH, B.L. "CRIMINAL VICTIMIZATION IN RURAL AREAS", IN PRICE, B.R. AND BAUMACH, P.I. (ED.), CRIMINAL JUSTICE RESEARCH: NEW MODELS AND FINDINGS, CALIFORNIA, BEVERLY HILLS: SAGE, 1980.

SKOGAM, W. AND M.G. MAXFIELD COPING WITH CRIME: INDIVIDUAL AND NEIGHBOURHOOD REACTIONS, BEVERLEY HILLS: SAGE PUBLICATIONS.

SKOGAM, W. "CITIZEN'S SATISFACTION WITH POLICE SERVICES", IN R. BAKER AND F. MEYERS J. (ED) EVALUATING ALTERNATIVE LAW ENFORCEMENT POLICIES, LEXINGTON BOOKS, 1979.

SOLICITOR GENERAL CANADIAN URBAN VICTIMIZATION SURVEY, BULLETIN 1-9, 1982.

STATISTICS CANADA GENERAL SOCIAL SURVEY, OTTAWA, 1987.


WILSON, T. "URBANISM AND TOLERANCE: A TEST OF SOME HYPOTHESES DRAWN" FROM WIRTH AND SLOUFFER, AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW, VOL 50, (FEBRUARY), 1987, P. 117-123.