



Police Service Evaluations for Lethbridge Police Service

March 2016







Faron Ellis PhD
Citizen Society Research Lab
Lethbridge College
3000 College Drive South
Lethbridge AB T1K 1L6
faron.ellis@lethbridgecollege.ca
www.lethbridgecollege.ca/go/csrl



Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Methodology | 2 |
| Executive Summary | 3 |
| Perceptions of Lethbridge Police Service | 5 |
| Performance | 5 |
| Meeting Expectations | 7 |
| Changes in Meeting Expectations | 9 |
| Attitudes and Behavior of LPS Officers | 11 |
| Direct Contact with LPS Officer | 14 |
| Community Safety | 15 |
| Neighborhood Safety | 15 |
| Downtown Safety | 17 |
| Frequency of Visits to Downtown Core | 19 |
| Community Peace Officers | 21 |
| Demographics | 22 |
| Question Wording | 22 |

Methodology

-  **Population** The city of Lethbridge has a total population of 94,804 residents (2015 census) approximately 80% of which are 18 years of age or older (75,840). A total of 46,394 Lethbridge residents are male (49%) while 48,410 are female (51%). South Lethbridge is home to 31,337 residents (33.1%) while the rapidly expanding west side is now home to 36,716 residents (38.7%). There are 26,751 north Lethbridge residents (28.2%).
-  **Sample Data** Collected by Lethbridge College students enrolled in a variety of social science courses in the winter of 2015. Students interviewed 834 randomly selected, adult Lethbridge residents by telephone from February 6–10, 2016 under the supervision of School of Liberal Arts faculty member Faron Ellis. We sincerely appreciate and thank all those who took time to respond to our survey. Full methodological notes for samples from previous Lethbridge and Alberta Public Opinion Studies can be obtained by visiting the CSRL web pages at: www.lethbridgecollege.ab.ca/go/csrl.
-  **Representativeness** Analysis of the demographic data indicates that, within acceptable limits, the sample accurately represents the demographic distribution of the adult population within the city of Lethbridge. The sample has been statistically weighted to even better reflect that of the population (sex, age, and area of the city of Lethbridge).
-  **Confidence** The weighted sample yields a margin of error of ± 3.37 percentage points, 19 times out of 20. The margin of error increases when analyzing sub-samples of the data.
-  **IB Commons Call Centre** Students conducted interviews using the facilities of the Lethbridge College IB Commons Call Centre.
-  **Sponsorship** These data are part of a larger study of the opinions and attitudes of Lethbridge residents conducted by the Citizen Society Research Lab at Lethbridge College. This particular set of questions was sponsored by Lethbridge Police Service. We thank LPS for their continued support of our research program.

Executive Summary

Perceptions of Lethbridge Police Service

Performance

A substantial majority of Lethbridge residents (72.0%) believe Lethbridge Police Service is doing a good job policing their community. Very few Lethbridge residents (3.6%) believe LPS is doing a poor job, while approximately one-quarter (24.4%) say the police are performing adequately. Majorities within all demographic groups provide Lethbridge Police Service with very positive evaluations.

Meeting Expectations

A substantial majority of Lethbridge residents (67.7%) believes LPS is doing a good job meeting residents' expectations about what a police service should be doing. Less than one in twenty Lethbridge residents (4.1%) believe LPS is doing a poor job meeting expectations. Majorities within all demographic groups believe Lethbridge Police Service is meeting residents' expectations.

Changes in Meeting Expectations

Most Lethbridge residents (76.8%) believe LPS has neither improved nor worsened in meeting expectations in the past year. Of those who believe LPS has changed in meeting expectations, more than five times as many Lethbridge residents believe LPS has improved (19.5%) than believe LPS has gotten worse (3.8%). Few differences in opinion are measured between different demographic groups.

Attitudes and Behavior of LPS Officers

The vast majority of Lethbridge residents (91.5%) believe that LPS officers are polite and respectful. Only 8.5% of Lethbridge residents believe LPS officers are impolite and disrespectful (6.1% somewhat so while only 2.4% believe LPS officers to be very impolite and disrespectful.) All demographic groups within the city of Lethbridge agree by overwhelming majorities that LPS officers are polite and respectful.

Executive Summary (continued)

Community Safety

Direct Contact with LPS Officer in Past Year

Slightly more than half of all Lethbridge residents (52.5%) had some direct in-person contact with a LPS officer over the past year. Younger Lethbridge residents and those who frequent downtown Lethbridge most often were also most likely to have direct contact with an LPS officer.

Neighborhood Safety

A majority of Lethbridge residents (58.4%) feel very safe in their neighborhoods and a further 34.9% feel somewhat safe. Very few feel somewhat unsafe (5.2%) and fewer still (1.5%) feel very unsafe in their neighborhoods. Women feel just as safe in their neighborhoods as do men.

Downtown Safety

Overall, Lethbridge residents feel safe when visiting downtown Lethbridge, although less safe than they feel in their own neighborhoods. A majority of Lethbridge residents feel somewhat safe (53.5%) when visiting downtown Lethbridge, while just under one-quarter (23.8%) feel very safe downtown. Less than one-quarter of Lethbridge residents do not feel safe downtown, with most of those (18.9%) feeling somewhat unsafe. Only a very small number (3.7%) feel very unsafe while visiting downtown. Women feel as safe when visiting downtown as do men. Seniors and upper income residents are more likely than other groups to feel very safe downtown.

Frequency of Visits to Downtown Lethbridge

Most Lethbridge residents frequent downtown on a regular basis. Less than one in five Lethbridge residents (17.1%) go downtown daily, while half (50.0%) visit downtown on a weekly basis. One-fifth of Lethbridge residents (21.1%) visit downtown at least monthly, while 7.6% go downtown only a few times per year. Fewer than one in twenty Lethbridge residents (4.2%) report that they rarely or never go downtown.

Community Peace Officer

When asked whether or not they would support greater use of community peace officers within Lethbridge Police Service, a substantial majority of Lethbridge residents (70.6%) support greater use, with most (44.0%) stating that they are open to somewhat greater use, but a substantial number (25.7%) told us they are open to much greater use of this classification of officer within the LPS ranks.

Perceptions of Lethbridge Police Service

Performance

A substantial majority of Lethbridge residents (72.0%) believe Lethbridge Police Service is doing a good job policing their community, a noticeable increase from the 63.7% who thought similarly in 2006. Very few Lethbridge residents (3.6%) believe LPS is doing a poor job, while approximately one-quarter (24.4%) say the police are performing adequately.

Majorities within all demographic groups provide Lethbridge Police Service with positive evaluations. Women (76.5%), university graduates (80.0%), seniors (79.8%), and upper income residents (76.1%) are most positive. Men (67.4%), north Lethbridge residents (66.8%), and the youth (52.1%) are less positive, although still much more positive than negative. Residents who had direct personal contact with a LPS officer in the past year are nearly as likely (68.7%) as are those who had no contact (76.3%) to believe the police are doing a good job. Conversely, only one of every twenty Lethbridge residents (5.3%) who had contact with an LPS officer in the past year believes LPS is performing poorly, compared to fewer still (1.6%) who had no contact with LPS in the last year and also thought LPS to be performing poorly.

| | 2006 | 2007 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
|----------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------------|
| Good | 63.7 | 64.1 | 69.9 | 70.5 | 70.3 | 67.4 | 69.5 | 72.7 | 72.0 |
| Adequate | 27.7 | 28.7 | 24.5 | 23.6 | 25.6 | 29.0 | 25.1 | 21.7 | 24.4 |
| Poor | 8.6 | 7.2 | 5.6 | 5.9 | 4.1 | 3.6 | 5.4 | 5.6 | 3.6 |

| | 2006 | 2007 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
|-----------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------------|
| Very good | 19.9 | 23.7 | 17.3 | 21.1 | 30.7 | 22.1 | 28.1 | 30.9 | 30.5 |
| Good | 43.8 | 40.4 | 52.6 | 49.4 | 39.6 | 45.3 | 41.4 | 41.8 | 41.5 |
| Adequate | 27.7 | 28.7 | 24.5 | 23.6 | 25.6 | 29.0 | 25.1 | 21.7 | 24.4 |
| Poor | 6.1 | 5.5 | 3.4 | 4.6 | 3.0 | 2.7 | 4.1 | 4.6 | 2.6 |
| Very Poor | 2.5 | 1.7 | 2.2 | 1.4 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 1.3 | 1.0 | 1.0 |

Note: Due to rounding, proportions may not total exactly 100%

Lethbridge Police Service Performance (February 2016) (%)

| Gender* | Male | Female | Lethbridge |
|----------|------|--------|------------|
| Good | 67.4 | 76.5 | 72.0 |
| Adequate | 27.4 | 21.6 | 24.4 |
| Poor | 5.2 | 2.0 | 3.6 |

| Contact in past year* | Yes | No |
|-----------------------|------|------|
| Good | 68.7 | 76.3 |
| Adequate | 26.0 | 22.1 |
| Poor | 5.3 | 1.6 |

| Area* | South | North | West |
|----------|-------|-------|------|
| Good | 72.6 | 66.8 | 75.2 |
| Adequate | 24.4 | 26.5 | 22.8 |
| Poor | 3.0 | 6.7 | 2.0 |

| Household Income* | Under \$40,000 | \$40,001 to \$100,000 | Over \$100,000 |
|-------------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Good | 61.3 | 71.5 | 76.1 |
| Adequate | 32.5 | 25.5 | 22.1 |
| Poor | 6.1 | 3.0 | 1.9 |

| Education* | High School or less | Some Post-secondary | College-Tech-Trade | University Grad |
|------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| Good | 70.8 | 58.8 | 76.2 | 80.0 |
| Adequate | 23.6 | 36.2 | 21.4 | 17.9 |
| Poor | 5.6 | 5.0 | 2.4 | 2.1 |

| Age* | 18-29 | 30-44 | 45-64 | 65 and older |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|--------------|
| Good | 52.1 | 79.7 | 73.6 | 79.8 |
| Adequate | 40.2 | 19.3 | 22.5 | 19.1 |
| Poor | 7.7 | 1.0 | 4.0 | 1.1 |

| Visits Downtown | Daily | Weekly | Monthly or less |
|-----------------|-------|--------|-----------------|
| Good | 70.8 | 72.7 | 71.2 |
| Adequate | 23.4 | 24.5 | 25.0 |
| Poor | 5.8 | 2.8 | 3.8 |

Notes: Due to rounding, proportions may not total exactly 100%; * sig < 0.05

Perceptions of Lethbridge Police Service

Meeting Expectations

A substantial majority of Lethbridge residents (67.7%) believes LPS is doing a good job meeting residents' expectations about what a police service should be doing. Less than one in twenty Lethbridge residents (4.1%) believe LPS is doing a poor job meeting expectations while the remaining 28.2% believe LPS to be adequately meeting residents' expectations.

Women (71.1%), seniors (77.8%), university graduates (76.7%), and west Lethbridge residents (70.7%) are most likely to believe LPS is meeting their expectations of what a police service should be doing. Men (64.1%), those with the least amount of formal education (62.8%), lower income earners (56.6%) and the youth (50.0%), are somewhat less likely to state LPS is meeting their expectations; however, all of these groups are still much more positive than negative.

Those who had direct personal contact with an LPS officer in the past year are somewhat more critical of LPS than are those who did not. For example. Although the vast majority of residents who had contact with LPS in the past year state that the police are meeting their expectations (64.5%), significantly lower than the 71.7% of those who had no contact and think similarly. Only 6.4% of those who had contact believe LPS to be doing a poor job meeting residents' expectations. Few still (1.6%), of those who had no contact believe LPS to be performing poorly with respect to meeting expectations.

| | 2006 | 2007 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
|----------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------------|
| Good | 64.3 | 58.3 | 65.4 | 67.0 | 68.6 | 63.3 | 68.1 | 70.5 | 67.7 |
| Adequate | 30.2 | 35.0 | 29.6 | 26.7 | 27.8 | 32.1 | 28.2 | 24.5 | 28.2 |
| Poor | 5.6 | 6.7 | 5.0 | 6.3 | 3.6 | 4.6 | 3.7 | 5.0 | 4.1 |

| | 2006 | 2007 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
|-----------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------------|
| Very good | 15.9 | 14.8 | 14.5 | 15.5 | 22.7 | 17.3 | 23.9 | 22.3 | 24.9 |
| Good | 48.4 | 43.5 | 50.9 | 51.6 | 45.9 | 46.0 | 44.2 | 48.2 | 42.8 |
| Adequate | 30.2 | 35.0 | 29.6 | 26.7 | 27.8 | 32.1 | 28.2 | 24.5 | 28.2 |
| Poor | 3.6 | 5.5 | 4.3 | 4.6 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 1.8 | 4.3 | 2.8 |
| Very Poor | 2.0 | 1.2 | 0.7 | 1.7 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 1.8 | 0.7 | 1.3 |

Note: Due to rounding, proportions may not total exactly 100%

Meeting Expectations (February 2016) (%)

| Gender* | Male | Female | Lethbridge |
|----------|------|--------|------------|
| Good | 64.1 | 71.1 | 67.7 |
| Adequate | 29.4 | 27.0 | 28.2 |
| Poor | 6.5 | 1.9 | 4.1 |

| Contact in past year* | Yes | No |
|-----------------------|------|------|
| Good | 64.5 | 71.7 |
| Adequate | 29.1 | 26.7 |
| Poor | 6.4 | 1.6 |

| Area | South | North | West |
|----------|-------|-------|------|
| Good | 67.7 | 63.7 | 70.7 |
| Adequate | 27.5 | 29.6 | 27.4 |
| Poor | 4.8 | 6.6 | 1.9 |

| Household Income* | Under \$40,000 | \$40,001 to \$100,000 | Over \$100,000 |
|-------------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Good | 56.6 | 69.4 | 74.0 |
| Adequate | 33.7 | 27.6 | 24.7 |
| Poor | 9.7 | 3.0 | 1.4 |

| Education* | High School or less | Some Post-secondary | College-Tech-Trade | University Grad |
|------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| Good | 62.8 | 59.0 | 69.8 | 76.7 |
| Adequate | 31.1 | 34.9 | 27.8 | 20.8 |
| Poor | 6.1 | 6.1 | 2.4 | 2.5 |

| Age* | 18-29 | 30-44 | 45-64 | 65 and older |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|--------------|
| Good | 50.0 | 75.6 | 66.4 | 77.8 |
| Adequate | 39.6 | 23.3 | 28.8 | 21.6 |
| Poor | 10.4 | 1.0 | 4.8 | 0.5 |

| Visits Downtown | Daily | Weekly | Monthly or less |
|-----------------|-------|--------|-----------------|
| Good | 63.8 | 69.7 | 66.4 |
| Adequate | 30.4 | 27.5 | 28.4 |
| Poor | 5.8 | 2.7 | 5.2 |

Notes: Due to rounding, proportions may not total exactly 100%; * sig < 0.05

Perceptions of Lethbridge Police Service

Changes in Meeting Expectations

Most Lethbridge residents (76.8%) believe LPS has neither improved nor worsened in meeting expectations in the past year. Of those who believe LPS has changed in meeting expectations, more than five times as many Lethbridge residents believe LPS has improved (19.5%) than believe LPS has gotten worse (3.8%).

Few differences in opinion are measured between different demographic groups, although lower income residents (27.7%) are significantly more likely than are other income groups to believe LPS has improved in meeting residents' expectations about what a police service should be doing. More than one in five of those who had contact with LPS (20.1%) believe LPS has improved in meeting expectations, nearly four times more than those who had contact but believe LPS has worsened in meeting expectations (5.6%).

| | 2006 | 2007 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
|-------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------------|
| Improved | 24.3 | 17.4 | 18.2 | 16.0 | 16.0 | 17.0 | 16.8 | 17.0 | 19.5 |
| Stayed Same | 71.9 | 77.2 | 78.4 | 79.9 | 80.5 | 77.0 | 75.9 | 78.1 | 76.8 |
| Worsened | 3.7 | 5.4 | 3.4 | 4.1 | 3.5 | 6.0 | 7.3 | 4.9 | 3.8 |

Note: Due to rounding, proportions may not total exactly 100%

Changes in Meeting Expectations (February 2016) (%)

| Gender | Male | Female | Lethbridge |
|-----------------|------|--------|------------|
| Improved | 21.1 | 18.0 | 19.5 |
| Stayed the same | 74.2 | 79.1 | 76.8 |
| Worsened | 4.7 | 2.9 | 3.8 |

| Contact in past year | Yes | No |
|----------------------|------|------|
| Improved | 20.1 | 19.1 |
| Stayed the same | 74.4 | 79.4 |
| Worsened | 5.6 | 1.5 |

| Area | South | North | West |
|-----------------|-------|-------|------|
| Improved | 22.3 | 23.4 | 14.3 |
| Stayed the same | 73.6 | 71.5 | 83.6 |
| Worsened | 4.1 | 5.1 | 2.1 |

| Household Income* | Under \$40,000 | \$40,001 to \$100,000 | Over \$100,000 |
|-------------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Improved | 27.7 | 17.3 | 15.2 |
| Stayed the same | 69.2 | 78.0 | 80.4 |
| Worsened | 3.1 | 4.7 | 4.4 |

| Education | High School or less | Some Post-secondary | College-Tech-Trade | University Grad |
|-----------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| Improved | 22.6 | 14.1 | 25.3 | 16.1 |
| Stayed the same | 73.7 | 80.4 | 70.7 | 81.2 |
| Worsened | 3.6 | 5.4 | 4.0 | 2.7 |

| Age | 18-29 | 30-44 | 45-64 | 65 and older |
|-----------------|-------|-------|-------|--------------|
| Improved | 21.8 | 16.7 | 16.2 | 24.7 |
| Stayed the same | 73.7 | 79.6 | 79.2 | 74.1 |
| Worsened | 4.5 | 3.8 | 4.6 | 1.2 |

| Visits Downtown | Daily | Weekly | Monthly or less |
|-----------------|-------|--------|-----------------|
| Improved | 20.7 | 19.3 | 19.1 |
| Stayed the same | 77.0 | 77.1 | 76.1 |
| Worsened | 2.2 | 3.6 | 4.8 |

Notes: Due to rounding, proportions may not total exactly 100%; * sig < 0.05

Perceptions of Lethbridge Police Service



Attitudes and Behavior of LPS Officers

The vast majority of Lethbridge residents (91.5%) believe that LPS officers are polite and respectful. Only 8.5% of Lethbridge residents believe LPS officers are impolite and disrespectful (6.1% somewhat so while only 2.4% believe LPS officers to be very impolite and disrespectful.)

All demographic groups within the city of Lethbridge agree by overwhelming majorities that LPS officers are polite and respectful. Statistically significant differences can be measured within four demographic groups. Men, younger, lower income, and north Lethbridge residents are somewhat less likely than other groups to think LPS are polite and respectful. But even here it must be noted that all groups are much more likely to think LPS officers are polite and respectful than to think they are impolite and disrespectful. Similarly, although those who had direct contact with an LPS member are somewhat more critical, the overwhelming majority (88.7%) believe LPS officers to be polite and respectful.

| | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
|--------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------------|
| Polite & respectful | 89.2 | 89.9 | 88.4 | 87.5 | 85.6 | 88.5 | 91.5 |
| Impolite & disrespectful | 10.8 | 10.1 | 11.6 | 12.5 | 14.4 | 11.5 | 8.5 |

| | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
|-----------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------------|
| Very polite & respectful | 40.8 | 40.0 | 43.4 | 38.5 | 37.0 | 40.4 | 47.5 |
| Somewhat polite & respectful | 48.4 | 50.0 | 45.0 | 49.0 | 48.6 | 48.1 | 44.0 |
| Somewhat impolite & disrespectful | 8.1 | 7.5 | 9.1 | 10.5 | 9.4 | 9.8 | 6.1 |
| Very impolite & disrespectful | 2.7 | 2.6 | 2.4 | 2.0 | 5.0 | 1.7 | 2.4 |

Note: Due to rounding, proportions may not total exactly 100%

Attitudes and Behavior (February 2016) (%)

| Gender* | Male | Female | Lethbridge |
|----------------------------|------|--------|------------|
| Polite and respectful | 88.6 | 94.2 | 91.5 |
| Impolite and disrespectful | 11.4 | 5.8 | 8.5 |

| Contact in past year* | Yes | No |
|----------------------------|------|------|
| Polite and respectful* | 88.7 | 95.1 |
| Impolite and disrespectful | 11.3 | 4.9 |

| Area | South | North | West |
|----------------------------|-------|-------|------|
| Polite and respectful | 91.9 | 90.4 | 91.9 |
| Impolite and disrespectful | 8.1 | 9.6 | 8.1 |

| Household Income* | Under \$40,000 | \$40,001 to \$100,000 | Over \$100,000 |
|----------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Polite and respectful | 85.1 | 93.0 | 93.8 |
| Impolite and disrespectful | 14.9 | 7.0 | 6.2 |

| Education | High School or less | Some Post-secondary | College-Tech-Trade | University Grad |
|----------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| Polite and respectful | 92.2 | 85.7 | 92.1 | 95.9 |
| Impolite and disrespectful | 7.8 | 14.3 | 7.9 | 4.1 |

| Age* | 18-29 | 30-44 | 45-64 | 65 and older |
|----------------------------|-------|-------|-------|--------------|
| Polite and respectful | 83.2 | 94.9 | 91.3 | 97.6 |
| Impolite and disrespectful | 16.8 | 5.1 | 8.7 | 2.4 |

| Visits Downtown | Daily | Weekly | Monthly or less |
|----------------------------|-------|--------|-----------------|
| Polite and respectful | 94.9 | 91.4 | 89.6 |
| Impolite and disrespectful | 5.1 | 8.6 | 10.4 |

Notes: Due to rounding, proportions may not total exactly 100%; * sig < 0.05

Attitudes and Behavior (February 2016) (%)

| Gender* | Male | Female | Lethbridge |
|---------------------------------|------|--------|------------|
| Very polite/respectful | 40.8 | 54.0 | 47.5 |
| Somewhat polite/respectful | 47.8 | 40.2 | 44.0 |
| Somewhat impolite/disrespectful | 8.2 | 4.2 | 6.1 |
| Very impolite/disrespectful | 3.3 | 1.6 | 2.4 |

| Contact in past year | Yes | No |
|---------------------------------|------|------|
| Very polite/respectful | 47.8 | 47.9 |
| Somewhat polite/respectful | 40.9 | 47.2 |
| Somewhat impolite/disrespectful | 7.5 | 4.3 |
| Very impolite/disrespectful | 3.8 | 0.6 |

| Area | South | North | West |
|---------------------------------|-------|-------|------|
| Very polite/respectful | 51.6 | 40.7 | 49.3 |
| Somewhat polite/respectful | 40.7 | 49.8 | 42.9 |
| Somewhat impolite/disrespectful | 4.9 | 7.2 | 6.1 |
| Very impolite/disrespectful | 2.8 | 2.4 | 1.7 |

| Household Income* | Under \$40,000 | \$40,001 to \$100,000 | Over \$100,000 |
|---------------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Very polite/respectful | 40.5 | 48.3 | 53.1 |
| Somewhat polite/respectful | 44.6 | 44.8 | 40.6 |
| Somewhat impolite/disrespectful | 8.9 | 5.9 | 5.2 |
| Very impolite/disrespectful | 6.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |

| Education* | High School or less | Some Post-secondary | College-Tech-Trade | University Grad |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| Very polite/respectful | 43.7 | 41.3 | 42.9 | 59.9 |
| Somewhat polite/respectful | 47.9 | 44.4 | 49.2 | 35.9 |
| Somewhat impolite/disrespectful | 7.0 | 9.2 | 6.8 | 2.3 |
| Very impolite/disrespectful | 1.4 | 5.1 | 1.0 | 1.8 |

| Age* | 18-29 | 30-44 | 45-64 | 65 and older |
|---------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|--------------|
| Very polite/respectful | 29.1 | 56.8 | 45.9 | 62.3 |
| Somewhat polite/respectful | 54.2 | 38.6 | 45.4 | 35.3 |
| Somewhat impolite/disrespectful | 11.7 | 2.8 | 7.2 | 1.8 |
| Very impolite/disrespectful | 5.0 | 1.7 | 1.4 | 0.6 |

| Visits Downtown | Daily | Weekly | Monthly or less |
|---------------------------------|-------|--------|-----------------|
| Very polite/respectful | 44.1 | 46.9 | 50.0 |
| Somewhat polite/respectful | 50.7 | 44.7 | 39.6 |
| Somewhat impolite/disrespectful | 3.7 | 5.7 | 7.9 |
| Very impolite/disrespectful | 1.5 | 2.7 | 2.5 |

Notes: Due to rounding, proportions may not total exactly 100%; * sig < 0.05

Perceptions of Lethbridge Police Service



Direct Contact with LPS Officer in Past Year

Slightly more than half of all Lethbridge residents (52.5%) had some direct contact with a LPS officer over the past year. Younger Lethbridge residents (60.3%) are much more likely to have contact with LPS officers than are seniors (37.3%). Interestingly, those who frequent downtown Lethbridge most often are also most likely to have had direct contact with an LPS officer (66.9%), clearly a reflection of LPS's efforts at being visible and interactive with downtown Lethbridge businesses, their employees and patrons.

Direct Contact with LPS Officer in the Past Year (February 2016)

| Gender | Male | Female | Lethbridge | |
|------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| Yes | 55.4 | 49.6 | 52.5 | |
| No | 44.6 | 50.4 | 47.5 | |
| Area | South | North | West | |
| Yes | 53.5 | 51.1 | 52.6 | |
| No | 46.5 | 48.9 | 47.4 | |
| Household Income | Under \$40,000 | \$40,001 to \$100,000 | Over \$100,000 | |
| Yes | 55.1 | 48.3 | 62.5 | |
| No | 44.9 | 51.7 | 37.5 | |
| Education* | High School or less | Some Post-secondary | College-Tech-Trade | University Grad |
| Yes | 39.7 | 53.8 | 56.6 | 55.6 |
| No | 60.3 | 46.2 | 43.4 | 44.4 |
| Age* | 18-29 | 30-44 | 45-64 | 65 and older |
| Yes | 60.3 | 60.4 | 52.6 | 37.3 |
| No | 39.7 | 39.6 | 47.4 | 62.7 |
| Visits Downtown* | Daily | Weekly | Monthly or less | |
| Yes | 66.9 | 53.5 | 43.6 | |
| No | 33.1 | 46.5 | 56.4 | |

Notes: Due to rounding, proportions may not total exactly 100%; * sig < 0.05

Community Safety

Neighborhood Safety

For the most part, Lethbridge residents feel very safe in their neighborhoods.

A majority of Lethbridge residents (58.4%) feel very safe in their neighborhoods and a further 34.9% feel somewhat safe. Very few feel somewhat unsafe (5.2%) and fewer still (1.5%) feel very unsafe in their neighborhoods.

Women feel just as safe in their neighborhoods as do men. South and west Lethbridge residents, university graduates, seniors, and upper income residents are most likely to feel safe in their neighborhoods. Lower income earners, north Lethbridge residents, and the youth are less likely to feel very safe in their neighborhoods and slightly more likely to feel somewhat unsafe. However, even these groups are much more likely to feel safe than unsafe in their neighborhoods.

| | 2006 | 2007 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
|-----------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Very safe | 60.7 | 49.8 | 59.9 | 54.2 | 62.1 | 59.0 | 61.8 | 60.9 | 58.4 |
| Somewhat safe | 32.2 | 42.9 | 36.2 | 41.4 | 34.9 | 35.8 | 30.7 | 33.8 | 34.9 |
| Somewhat unsafe | 4.9 | 6.6 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 2.3 | 4.6 | 6.4 | 3.7 | 5.2 |
| Very unsafe | 2.1 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 1.1 | 1.6 | 1.5 |

Note: Due to rounding, proportions may not total exactly 100%

Evaluations of Neighborhood Safety (February 2016) (%)

| Gender | Male | Female | Lethbridge |
|-----------------|------|--------|------------|
| Very safe | 59.4 | 57.4 | 58.4 |
| Somewhat safe | 33.9 | 36.0 | 34.9 |
| Somewhat unsafe | 4.7 | 5.7 | 5.2 |
| Very unsafe | 2.0 | 1.0 | 1.5 |

| Contact in past year* | Yes | No |
|-----------------------|------|------|
| Very safe | 53.1 | 64.3 |
| Somewhat safe | 39.4 | 29.5 |
| Somewhat unsafe | 6.3 | 4.1 |
| Very unsafe | 1.2 | 2.1 |

| Area* | South | North | West |
|-----------------|-------|-------|------|
| Very safe | 60.1 | 48.7 | 63.6 |
| Somewhat safe | 32.1 | 41.2 | 33.0 |
| Somewhat unsafe | 5.5 | 7.5 | 3.1 |
| Very unsafe | 2.2 | 2.7 | 0.3 |

| Household Income* | Under \$40,000 | \$40,001 to \$100,000 | Over \$100,000 |
|-------------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Very safe | 43.5 | 55.7 | 73.1 |
| Somewhat safe | 41.2 | 39.3 | 25.0 |
| Somewhat unsafe | 10.2 | 4.6 | 1.4 |
| Very unsafe | 5.1 | 0.3 | 0.5 |

| Education* | High School or less | Some Post-secondary | College-Tech-Trade | University Grad |
|-----------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| Very safe | 61.6 | 43.7 | 60.6 | 66.9 |
| Somewhat safe | 33.1 | 42.3 | 33.7 | 30.6 |
| Somewhat unsafe | 4.0 | 9.8 | 5.3 | 2.0 |
| Very unsafe | 1.3 | 4.2 | 0.5 | 0.4 |

| Age* | 18-29 | 30-44 | 45-64 | 65 and older |
|-----------------|-------|-------|-------|--------------|
| Very safe | 45.0 | 60.0 | 60.9 | 67.7 |
| Somewhat safe | 42.3 | 34.9 | 32.6 | 29.0 |
| Somewhat unsafe | 7.9 | 5.1 | 5.2 | 2.7 |
| Very unsafe | 4.8 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 0.5 |

| Visits Downtown | Daily | Weekly | Monthly or less |
|-----------------|-------|--------|-----------------|
| Very safe | 60.0 | 57.8 | 57.8 |
| Somewhat safe | 27.9 | 37.6 | 34.8 |
| Somewhat unsafe | 12.1 | 2.7 | 5.6 |
| Very unsafe | 0.0 | 2.0 | 1.9 |

Notes: Due to rounding, proportions may not total exactly 100%; * sig < 0.05

Community Safety

Downtown Safety

Overall, Lethbridge residents feel safe when visiting downtown Lethbridge, although less safe than they feel in their own neighborhoods. A majority of Lethbridge residents feel somewhat safe (53.5%) when visiting downtown Lethbridge, while just under one-quarter (23.8%) feel very safe downtown. Less than one-quarter of Lethbridge residents do not feel safe downtown, with most of those (18.9%) feeling somewhat unsafe. Only a very small number (3.7%) feel very unsafe while visiting downtown.

Women feel as safe when visiting downtown as do men. Seniors and upper income residents are more likely than other groups to feel very safe downtown. Younger residents feel slightly less safe when visiting downtown Lethbridge than do other age groups, but even younger and lower income residents are still much more likely to feel safe downtown than unsafe.

Most of the differences in perceived levels of safety downtown parallel those found in perceptions of neighborhood safety. For example, the youth and lower income residents feel less safe both in their own neighborhoods and downtown indicating that socioeconomic factors are more likely to be at play here than real safety concerns. Further, the data on the following page clearly indicate that those who frequent downtown most are also those who feel safest downtown. Hence, while there may be a perception amongst some that downtown is less safe than other areas of the city, those opinions are most acute amongst socioeconomic groups who feel less safe more generally, and by those who do not frequent downtown very often. Clearly, those who are most familiar with downtown are most likely to feel safe in that area of Lethbridge.

| | 2006 | 2007 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
|-----------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Very safe | 24.1 | 23.2 | 25.1 | 30.7 | 29.5 | 23.1 | 25.4 | 22.4 | 23.8 |
| Somewhat safe | 54.9 | 53.1 | 53.6 | 52.4 | 53.8 | 55.6 | 54.4 | 53.9 | 53.5 |
| Somewhat unsafe | 16.9 | 19.6 | 18.1 | 15.0 | 14.9 | 18.9 | 15.6 | 19.8 | 18.9 |
| Very unsafe | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.2 | 1.9 | 1.8 | 2.3 | 4.6 | 3.9 | 3.7 |

Note: Due to rounding, proportions may not total exactly 100%

Evaluations of Downtown Safety (February 2016) (%)

| Gender | Male | Female | Lethbridge |
|-----------------|------|--------|------------|
| Very safe | 27.1 | 20.7 | 23.8 |
| Somewhat safe | 50.0 | 56.9 | 53.5 |
| Somewhat unsafe | 19.1 | 18.7 | 18.9 |
| Very unsafe | 3.8 | 3.6 | 3.7 |

| Contact in past year | Yes | No |
|----------------------|------|------|
| Very safe | 24.7 | 23.1 |
| Somewhat safe | 52.0 | 55.1 |
| Somewhat unsafe | 18.3 | 19.4 |
| Very unsafe | 5.0 | 2.4 |

| Area | South | North | West |
|-----------------|-------|-------|------|
| Very safe | 26.7 | 22.5 | 22.4 |
| Somewhat safe | 48.9 | 54.5 | 56.5 |
| Somewhat unsafe | 20.3 | 18.9 | 18.0 |
| Very unsafe | 4.1 | 4.1 | 3.1 |

| Household Income* | Under \$40,000 | \$40,001 to \$100,000 | Over \$100,000 |
|-------------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Very safe | 18.4 | 23.9 | 29.2 |
| Somewhat safe | 50.0 | 54.8 | 53.2 |
| Somewhat unsafe | 24.7 | 16.9 | 16.2 |
| Very unsafe | 6.9 | 4.3 | 1.4 |

| Education* | High School or less | Some Post-secondary | College-Tech-Trade | University Grad |
|-----------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| Very safe | 22.9 | 19.5 | 20.9 | 31.5 |
| Somewhat safe | 52.1 | 49.8 | 58.3 | 52.5 |
| Somewhat unsafe | 21.5 | 25.1 | 18.0 | 13.0 |
| Very unsafe | 3.5 | 5.6 | 2.9 | 2.9 |

| Age* | 18-29 | 30-44 | 45-64 | 65 and older |
|-----------------|-------|-------|-------|--------------|
| Very safe | 15.2 | 27.2 | 22.4 | 31.3 |
| Somewhat safe | 50.5 | 56.4 | 53.5 | 52.0 |
| Somewhat unsafe | 27.2 | 14.4 | 20.2 | 15.1 |
| Very unsafe | 7.1 | 2.1 | 3.9 | 1.7 |

| Visits Downtown* | Daily | Weekly | Monthly or less |
|------------------|-------|--------|-----------------|
| Very safe | 32.4 | 25.4 | 16.8 |
| Somewhat safe | 44.6 | 53.8 | 57.6 |
| Somewhat unsafe | 20.9 | 16.6 | 21.8 |
| Very unsafe | 2.2 | 4.2 | 3.8 |

Notes: Due to rounding, proportions may not total exactly 100%; * sig < 0.05

Downtown Lethbridge

Frequency of Visits to Downtown Lethbridge

Most Lethbridge residents frequent downtown on a regular basis. Less than one in five Lethbridge residents (17.1%) go downtown daily, but half (50.0%) visit downtown on a weekly basis. One-fifth of Lethbridge residents (21.1%) visit downtown at least monthly, while 7.6% go downtown only a few times per year. Fewer than one in twenty Lethbridge residents (4.2%) report that they rarely or never go downtown.

| | Lethbridge | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | 2006 | 2007 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
| Daily | 23.6 | 19.9 | 20.4 | 15.9 | 18.9 | 18.5 | 18.0 | 20.2 | 17.1 |
| Weekly | 47.8 | 46.2 | 47.0 | 51.6 | 46.5 | 45.9 | 46.5 | 43.2 | 50.0 |
| Monthly or less | 28.7 | 33.8 | 32.6 | 32.4 | 34.6 | 35.5 | 35.6 | 36.7 | 32.9 |

| | Lethbridge | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | 2006 | 2007 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
| Daily | 23.6 | 19.9 | 20.4 | 15.9 | 18.9 | 18.5 | 18.0 | 20.2 | 17.1 |
| Weekly | 47.8 | 46.2 | 47.0 | 51.6 | 46.5 | 45.9 | 46.5 | 43.2 | 50.0 |
| Monthly | 17.4 | 19.3 | 21.3 | 19.7 | 22.1 | 23.3 | 25.2 | 25.6 | 21.1 |
| Few times/year | 4.8 | 7.3 | 6.3 | 7.1 | 6.0 | 9.0 | 6.7 | 6.1 | 7.6 |
| Rarely or never | 6.4 | 7.3 | 5.0 | 5.6 | 6.4 | 3.3 | 3.6 | 4.9 | 4.2 |

Note: Due to rounding, proportions may not total exactly 100%

Frequency of Visits to Downtown Lethbridge (February 2016) (%)

| Gender* | Male | Female | Lethbridge |
|-----------------|------|--------|------------|
| Daily | 18.5 | 15.8 | 17.1 |
| Weekly | 52.6 | 47.4 | 50.0 |
| Monthly or less | 28.9 | 36.8 | 32.9 |

| Contact in past year* | Yes | No |
|-----------------------|------|------|
| Daily | 21.9 | 12.0 |
| Weekly | 50.8 | 49.0 |
| Monthly or less | 27.3 | 39.1 |

| Area | South | North | West |
|-----------------|-------|-------|------|
| Daily | 16.8 | 17.3 | 17.2 |
| Weekly | 52.6 | 39.4 | 55.1 |
| Monthly or less | 30.6 | 43.4 | 27.7 |

| Household Income* | Under \$40,000 | \$40,001 to \$100,000 | Over \$100,000 |
|-------------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Daily | 11.9 | 14.8 | 23.0 |
| Weekly | 52.0 | 51.0 | 48.4 |
| Monthly or less | 36.2 | 34.2 | 28.6 |

| Education* | High School or less | Some Post-secondary | College-Tech-Trade | University Grad |
|-----------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| Daily | 13.4 | 12.1 | 20.8 | 20.2 |
| Weekly | 38.9 | 55.6 | 45.9 | 55.8 |
| Monthly or less | 47.7 | 32.2 | 33.3 | 24.0 |

| Age* | 18-29 | 30-44 | 45-64 | 65 and older |
|-----------------|-------|-------|-------|--------------|
| Daily | 16.3 | 21.6 | 18.5 | 12.4 |
| Weekly | 62.5 | 55.2 | 39.2 | 44.3 |
| Monthly or less | 21.2 | 23.2 | 42.2 | 43.2 |

Notes: Due to rounding, proportions may not total exactly 100%; * sig < 0.05

Community Peace Officers



When asked whether or not they would support greater use of community peace officers by Lethbridge Police Service, a substantial majority of Lethbridge residents (70.6%) support greater use, with most (44.0%) stating that they are open to somewhat greater use, but a substantial number (25.7%) told us they are open to much greater use of this classification of officer within the LPS ranks..

Women (76.1%) and older residents (77.1%) are most supportive, but clear majorities of all demographic groups are much more supportive than opposed.

| | All Respondents | Decided Respondents | Decided Respondents |
|----------------------|-----------------|---------------------|--|
| Much greater use | 21.9 | 25.7 | |
| Somewhat greater use | 38.2 | 44.9 | Use Community Peace Officers 70.6 |
| No more or less use | 19.4 | 22.8 | Do not use Community Peace Officers 29.4 |
| No use at all | 5.6 | 6.6 | |
| Unsure | 14.8 | | |

Community Peace Officers (February 2016) (%)

| Gender* | Male | Female | Lethbridge |
|----------------|------|--------|------------|
| Use CPO | 65.3 | 76.1 | 70.6 |
| Do not use CPO | 34.7 | 23.9 | 29.4 |

| Area | South | North | West |
|----------------|-------|-------|------|
| Use CPO | 68.2 | 77.9 | 67.1 |
| Do not use CPO | 31.8 | 22.1 | 32.9 |

| Household Income | Under \$40,000 | \$40,001 to \$100,000 | Over \$100,000 |
|------------------|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Use CPO | 64.2 | 76.7 | 67.7 |
| Do not use CPO | 35.8 | 23.3 | 32.3 |

| Education | High School or less | Some Post-secondary | College-Tech-Trade | University Grad |
|----------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| Use CPO | 72.7 | 67.5 | 70.4 | 72.1 |
| Do not use CPO | 27.3 | 32.5 | 29.6 | 27.9 |

| Age* | 18-29 | 30-44 | 45-64 | 65 and older |
|----------------|-------|-------|-------|--------------|
| Use CPO | 62.6 | 71.5 | 71.0 | 77.4 |
| Do not use CPO | 37.4 | 28.5 | 29.0 | 22.6 |

| Visits Downtown | Daily | Weekly | Monthly or less |
|------------------|-------|--------|-----------------|
| Much greater use | 63.4 | 74.3 | 68.8 |
| No use at all | 36.6 | 25.7 | 31.2 |

Notes: Due to rounding, proportions may not total exactly 100%; * sig < 0.05

Demographics

| Gender (%) | | Area of City (%) | | Income (%) | | Education (%) | | Age (%) | |
|------------|------|------------------|------|----------------|------|-----------------|------|-------------|------|
| Male | 48.8 | South | 32.8 | Under \$40,000 | 25.5 | H-School/less | 18.4 | 18-29 | 23.7 |
| Female | 51.2 | North | 27.4 | \$40-100,000 | 43.6 | Some P-Sec. | 26.4 | 30-44 | 24.2 |
| | | West | 39.8 | Over \$100,000 | 30.9 | Col-Tech-Grad | 25.3 | 45-64 | 28.9 |
| | | | | | | University Grad | 29.9 | 65 or older | 23.2 |

Contact with LPS (%)

| | |
|-----|------|
| Yes | 52.5 |
| No | 47.5 |

Note: Due to rounding, proportions may not total exactly 100%

Questions

How would you rate the job the Lethbridge police are doing in policing our community?

We would like to know how the Lethbridge Police Service is meeting your expectations about what the police should be doing to keep Lethbridge a safe and secure place to live and work.

In the past year, would you say that Lethbridge Police Service has improved in meeting your expectations of what a police service should be doing, has neither improved nor worsened, or that Lethbridge Police Service has gotten worse in meeting your expectations of what a police service should be doing?

Overall, how would you rate Lethbridge Police Service officers' attitudes and behavior?

Have you had direct contact with a Lethbridge Police Service officer in the past year?

Overall, how safe do you feel in your neighborhood?

Overall, how safe do you feel when you visit downtown Lethbridge for work, business, shopping or entertainment (including dining)?

How often do you visit downtown Lethbridge for work, business, shopping, or entertainment (including dining)?

Community Peace Officers are a class of uniformed officers with limited powers to enforce certain laws and regulations or perform administrative duties thereby freeing up regular police officers to focus on more serious criminal activity. From what you know about Community Peace Officers, please tell me whether you think Lethbridge Police Service should make greater use of Community Peace Officers. Would you say they should...

(Optional read information if requested: Community Peace Officers are paid less than regular police officers and have limited authority and duties. Examples of Community Peace Officer duties include: traffic control after accidents or emergencies, in-person administrative duties (front counter reception of requests and reports), attending to vagrancy issues, minor nuisance issues...) (In the past, Lethbridge Police Service has hired a Community Peace Officer on a temporary basis but currently has no Community Peace Officers on staff.)