

St. Petersburg Sociological Institute, Russian Academy of Sciences
Center for the Study of Deviant Behavior

St. Petersburg University of Economics and Finance

Vera Institute of Justice, New-York

Non-Governmental Human Rights Organization
"Citizens' Watch", St. Petersburg

COMPARATIVE SOCIOLOGICAL STUDY

"THE COMMUNITY
AND THE POLICE
IN A LARGE CITY"

(REPORT-3)

*With the financial support of the
Ford Foundation*

St. Petersburg

2001

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100

**Non-governmental Human Rights Organization
"Citizens' Watch", St. Petersburg**

**VERA INSTITUTE
LIBRARY**

**COMPARATIVE SOCIOLOGICAL STUDY
"THE COMMUNITY AND THE POLICE
IN A LARGE CITY"**

(REPORT-3)

**St. Petersburg Sociological Institute, Russian Academy of Sciences
Center for the Study of Deviant Behavior**

St. Petersburg University of Economics and Finance

Vera Institute of Justice, New-York

**With the financial support of the
Ford Foundation**

St. Petersburg

2001

363.20147 SS

1. GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE RESEARCH

The materials presented in this report are the result of the third stage of the study, "The Public and the Police in a Large City", started in 1999 by the Center for the Study of Deviant Behavior, part of the St. Petersburg branch of the Institute of Sociology, by the Russian Academy of Science (now the Sociological Institute, the RAS), by the St. Petersburg University of Economics and Finance, together with the VERA Institute of Justice (New York), with the financial support of the Ford Foundation and with organizational assistance from the human rights organization "Citizens' Watch" (St. Petersburg).

The results of the two first phases of the research were reflected respectively in the Report (1999) and Report-2 (2000).

The special feature of this, the third, phase is the opportunity to make a comparative analysis of the results of the three annual surveys of the population in St. Petersburg (1999, 2000, 2001), and also surveys of the population in Volgograd (a large city) and Borovichi (a small town) in 2001. There is also the addition of a criminological analysis of crime as a whole in St. Petersburg by district cross-section.

Furthermore, in accordance with the original plan for this work, a survey was made of 124 employees of various services and ranks in the Petersburg police force, the objectives and results of which are set out in section 5 of this report.

The process of preparing and carrying out the third phase of the project was conducted with mutual consultations between the Russian and American sides, opinions were exchanged among project participants, including "Citizens' Watch" and the leadership of the Central Department of Internal Affairs (GUVD/ Glavnoe Upravlenie Vnutrennykh Del) of St. Petersburg and the Leningrad Region.

The project was conducted by: O. Bozhkov, Y. Gilinskii, N. Gordienko, I. Eliseyeva, Y. Kostyukovskii, K. Belousov, E. Kochetkov.

The authors of Report-3:

sections 1, 2 – Y. Gilinskii, Y. Kostyukovskii

section 3 – I. Eliseyeva, N. Gordeenko

section 4 – O. Bozhkov

section 5 – O. Bozhkov

2. A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE CRIMINAL SITUATION IN ST. PETERSBURG

Since a quite detailed description of the criminal situation in St. Petersburg, and Moscow was presented in the previous project Reports (1999, 2000), we will restrict ourselves to continuing crime trends (according to the official statistical data), considering the data for the various districts of the city, and commenting also on a number of tendencies observed. With the accessible official statistics for 1999-2000 being incomplete it has become necessary to cite levels of crime according to our own calculated data. For these reasons we omit information for Moscow for 2000.

As was already mentioned in our Reports for 1999 and 2000, in analysing the criminal statistical information it is necessary to take as a starting point the **high potential** for crime, not reflected in statistics for various reasons: *natural*, since the victims of crimes often refuse to report crimes to the police, for various reasons, including “ineffectiveness” (the police will not hunt for the criminals) and *artificial* – as a result of the mass concealment of crimes from the records¹.

Among other things, the results of our surveys for the project give evidence that there is high *natural* potential: thus in *St. Petersburg* in 1998 70,3% of the victims of crime did not report the incidents to the police; the figure in 1999 - 69,2%, and in 2000 – 73,7% (see below, table 4.20). In *Volgograd* the figure in 2000 – 58,6%, and in *Borovich* – 58,3% (table 4.42). The results of the survey of Muscovites in the mid-1990s gave evidence that suggests that this is not a unique situation (Scientific Research Institute of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Russian Federation – NII MVD RF/ Nauchno-Issledovatel'skii Institut Ministerstva Vnutrennykh Del Rossiiskoi Federatsii) – more than 60% of the victims of *serious* crimes did not turn to the law-enforcement agencies.

Table 2.1.

Detection of crime (in %) in St. Petersburg and in Russia (1992 – 2000)

<i>Russia</i>									
	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
- total	46,9	50,6	59,6	64,5	70,1	72,2	74,4	73,4	
- criminal police			51,9	55,4	60,8	64,6	66,8	65,5	
- MPS			91,3	94,4	96,9	93,9	94,7	95,4	
<i>St. Petersburg</i>									
	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
- total		44,4	49,8	55,4	67,9	58,8	58,3	69,1	76,3
- criminal police		40,6	42,7	44,8	57,0	51,2	51,5	60,0	67,0
- MPS		62,5	83,1	92,7	98,1		79,4	94,4	97,4

The high *artificial* potential, which continues to rise, seems to be reflected especially by the constantly growing total level of detection (table 2.1): in Petersburg from 44,4% in 1993 to 76,3% in 2000, and in Russia from 46,9% in 1992 to 73,4% in 1999. The latest figures are absolutely unreal (incidentally, as is the case for all “detection” after 1993-1994): no police force in the world

¹ The natural potential reflects crimes that are not registered, since the agencies that register crimes did not know about them; the artificial potential is crimes that have become known to these agencies but were not recorded by them.

is able to achieve such “brilliant” figures other than by registering only the so called “obvious” crimes and concealing from the records a mass of the “not so obvious” (Gavrilov, 2001; Gilinskii, 1995: 93-96; Luneyev, 1997: 127-133). Secondly, evidence of this is the increase in Russia in 2000 of such serious crimes as murder and grievous bodily harm while there is a “reduction” in theft, robbery, hooliganism – crimes significantly easier to conceal (table 2.3; 2.4).

According to medical statistics, in St. Petersburg, the number of **deaths from homicide** has grown in recent years: 1997 – 879 people (the level of homicides for every 100.000 inhabitants - 18,5), 1998 – 897 people (level – 18,9), 1999 – 935 people (level – 19,8) (Principal indicators of demographic processes in St. Petersburg and the Leningrad Region, 2000: 30-31).

The dynamic for **general crime** is presented in table 2.2.

In the city there is a very high level of such dangerous **street** crimes that alarm the population as **robbery** (registered: 6258, level – 133,4, for Russia at the same time it was – 90,6) and **attacks by thieves** (registered 2015, level - 42,9, in Russia – 27,0). In public places a total of 18379 crimes was registered or 18,8% per capita (97704).

A high level of drug-related crimes has continued (table 2.5).

Of the crimes not reflected in the tables we will mention also rape and attempted rape (in 2000 the level in St. St. Petersburg was 2,7; in Russia – 5,4), hooliganism (in 2000 the level in the city was 97,8; in Russia – 85,7), fraud (in 2000 the level in the city was 81,8; in Russia – 55,8).

Table 2.2.

Dynamic of the levels (per 100 000 inhabitants) of general crime in Russia, St. Petersburg and Moscow (1985 – 2000)

19--	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	2000
Russia	989,8	929,2	816,9	833,9	1098,5	1242,5	1463,2	1856,5	1887,8	1778,9	1862,7	1778,4	1629,3	1759,5	2026,0	2028,2
St. Petersburg	981,9	975,1	880,5	894,8	1080,3	1144,1	1376,8	2112,4	2542,5	2219,4	2110,2	1763,5	1657,8	1907,4	2150,3	2081,5
Moscow			418,0	438,9	607,5	668,9	716,7	882,8	939,2	999,2	1074,4	1016,8	825,3	815,1	913,9	

Table 2.3.

Level (per 100 000 inhabitants) of serious violent crimes in Russia, St. Petersburg, Moscow (1985 – 2000)

<i>Premeditated murder (including attempted murder)</i>																
	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Russia	8,5	6,6	6,3	7,2	9,2	10,5	10,9	15,5	19,6	21,8	21,4	19,9	19,9	20,1	21,1	21,8
St. Petersburg	5,1	3,9	3,4	4,9	4,9	5,8	7,7	11,2	17,7	20,4	19,5	17,5	16,2	19,3	19,2	18,4
Moscow			2,3	2,7	4,7	4,9	5,6	10,3	15,9	20,9	19,7	18,0	17,3	13,8	14,2	
<i>Grievous Bodily Harm (up to 1998), premeditated causing of serious bodily injury:</i>																
	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Russia	19,9	14,7	13,9	18,2	25,0	27,7	27,8	36,2	45,1	45,7	41,7	36,2	31,4	30,8	32,4	34,1
St. Petersburg	12,4	10,4	8,2	12,6	16,7	17,7	20,2	34,4	43,5	40,8	36,0	26,4	24,0	23,3	22,4	21,3
Moscow			3,9	6,0	10,5	11,0	11,0	16,1	22,0	22,7	19,3	15,7	12,0	12,4	12,2	

Table 2.4.

Level (per 100 000 inhabitants) of crimes against property in Russia, Petersburg, Moscow (1985 – 2000)

	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Larceny:																
- Russia	324,7	264,4	251,1	327,2	512,1	616,8	837,3	1110,2	1065,2	888,4	924,6	818,0	716,3	779,2	961,8	896,7
- SPB			285,9	310,9	413,2	575,5	801,3	1227,7	1037,1	771,8	727,5	540,8	574,0	743,7	794,7	709,9
- Moscow			146,6	183,2	286,3	321,1	379,1	465,9	467,1	404,6	393,5	308,8	222,4	216,4	260,9	
Robbery:																
- Russia	29,9	21,8	21,0	29,9	51,0	56,3	68,8	110,9	124,3	100,4	95,0	82,2	76,2	83,4	94,5	90,6
- SPB	34,9	29,2	26,1	34,4	61,1	65,6	87,5	213,6	285,3	243,1	219,8	137,6	160,5	165,8	155,4	133,4
- Moscow			12,2	16,7	32,6	30,4	33,2	50,9	63,6	54,2	49,4	40,4	33,9	34,2	37,2	
Assaults with robbery																
- Russia	5,8	4,2	3,9	5,5	9,9	11,2	12,4	20,4	27,0	25,6	25,5	24,3	23,3	26,2	27,9	27,0
- SPB	11,0	8,3	6,4	9,6	15,3	19,0	22,0	47,3	64,5	53,8	53,4	38,7	49,1	57,0	52,7	42,9
- Moscow			3,5	6,1	12,8	12,0	13,4	25,5	37,2	35,0	33,3	25,2	19,4	18,3	18,7	

Table 2.5.

Drug-related crimes in Russia, Petersburg, Moscow (1990 – 2000)

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Russia:											
- level (per 100.000 inhabitants)	10,9	13,0	20,0	35,8	50,5	54,0	65,5	126,3	129,6	147,2	
SPB:											
- number	773	880	1195	1490	2310	2999	5656	12224	10998	14694	14048
- level	15,4	17,5	23,9	30,3	47,6	62,4	118,6	257,6	233,2	312,6	299,5
Moscow:											
- number	679	896	1490	2178	2406	3005	4625	8720	9737	6540	
- level	7,6	10,0	16,9	24,8	27,7	34,8	54,0	102,0	114,1	76,9	

Economic crime and crime in public office was potentially so high that it is senseless to discuss the official statistical data seriously. Thus for example, in 2000 in St. Petersburg, 135 cases of bribery in all were registered and 20 of commercial graft, while in reality such crimes are committed daily on a massive scale. This is witnessed by the press, surveys of the population, published “prices” for “services” (see for example Corruption and the struggle against it, 2000 (Korrupsiya i borba s nei): 62-63 the Petersburg monthly newspaper “Your secret adviser” (vash tainyi sovetnik), etc.).

There still remains the situation with **organized crime** (as in Russia as a whole). Official information about registered group crime (11163 in 2000, which amounts to 15,1% of all crime and is 17,9% less than in 1999); says little about the real state of affairs. The continuing re-distribution of spheres of influence, the penetration into governmental structures and legal business, and the growth in the influence of the drugs industry, and so on are revealed by the results of criminological studies and journalistic inquiries.

In describing the people who were revealed to have committed crimes in 2000, a relatively high proportion of women can be noted – 24,2% (in Russia in previous years this indicator did not exceed 16%) and a very high proportion of persons without a regular source of income (53,3%), which has become customary. The proportion of juveniles is decreasing, which also had become a trend (6,7%). 18,7% of crimes were committed in a state of alcoholic intoxication (of course this indicator increases sharply with serious violent crimes, hooliganism, and decreases with economic crimes). 0,2% of all crimes are committed in a state of narcotic intoxication.

In 2000, 5864 road traffic accidents (dorozhno-transportnykh proisshestvii - **RTA/ DTP**) were registered, in which 662 people died, and 6241 were injured.

Some information about the state of crime in the **districts** of St. Petersburg is presented in table 2.6. As is apparent from the data presented, in the group of central districts (Admiralteiskii, Vasileostrovskii, Petrogradskii, Tsentralnyi), the levels of crime and the more serious crimes is on the whole higher than in the “bedroom” districts. Especially high figures are in the Petrogradskii District (the maximum level of general crime, causing grievous bodily harm, one of the highest figures for homicide, theft, robbery). The high rate of crime and the variety in types of crime in the districts of the city’s historical center is a sustained trend, noted in the 1970s and 1980s. (Avrutin, Gilinskii, 1991). It is true that before the enlargement of the districts, the Kuibishevskii District was in first place (now part of the Tsentralnyi). This is explained not by the increased “criminality” in the inhabitants of the central districts, but the districts’ attractions (a mass of stores, restaurants, casinos, clubs, etc.) which leads to the “importing” of crime from outlying districts of the city. In the group of “bedroom” districts as a whole there are unfavorable indicators for the Vyborgskii and Kirovskii Districts. The lowest indicators are for the Primorskii District. It is more difficult to assess the situation in the “suburban” districts, in particular because the absolute figures are insignificant (dozens of crimes for each of the considered types per year). All the same, it is possible to single out the figures for Lomonosovskii District as unfavorable and the Petrodvortsovyi as favorable.

Table 2.6

**Level of type of crimes
(per 100 000 inhabitants) according to district in St. Petersburg (1999–2000)**

Districts	Total crimes		Murder (including attempts)		Grievous bodily harm		Robbery		Robbery with assault	
	1999	2000	1999	2000	1999	2000	1999	2000	1999	2000
Admiralteiskii		2194	22,8	21,5	22,3	21,9	195,8	157,1	61,7	37,7
Vasileostrovskii		2107	21,1	16,2	34,7	25,4	148,2	134,5	74,4	78,7

Petrogradskii		3179	22,8	28,3	36,4	40,6	236,4	180,4	74,3	87,7
Tsentralnyi		2614	29,1	29,2	31,3	26,4	174,5	130,8	50,7	60,4
Vyborgskii		2148	17,5	18,6	16,6	18,6	259,2	189,5	67,3	43,9
Kalininskii		1467	13,9	11,2	23,6	22,3	110,5	98,3	38,5	32,4
Kirovskii		2284	17,0	18,6	22,8	22,6	178,9	181,4	61,9	67,5
Krasnogvardeiskii		2232	13,8	12,5	21,6	18,5	127,2	143,7	39,0	41,6
Krasnoselskii		2232	13,8	12,5	21,6	18,5	127,2	143,7	39,0	41,6
Moskovskii		1944	22,1	26,1	16,8	16,6	162,7	122,4	86,9	48,8
Nevskii		1535	20,4	16,6	22,4	23,3	130,7	117,6	34,2	22,0
Primorskii		1285	14,8	16,5	14,0	9,7	112,4	83,5	44,8	33,6
Frunzenskii		1663	19,2	16,6	21,5	16,8	132,4	89,3	44,3	31,1
Kolpinskii		1920	15,7	15,9	32,0	29,4	134,3	153,4	36,5	27,1
Kronshtadskii		2165	20,0	22,7	15,5	18,2	106,7	104,5	42,2	47,7
Kurortnyi		2304	20,0	20,3	22,8	17,4	48,6	66,7	35,7	28,9
Lomonosovskii		2920	21,9	41,5	34,1	17,1	246,3	180,5	41,5	45,0
Petrodvortsovyi		2926	9,7	14,8	18,3	27,2	121,9	125,9	13,4	14,8
Pushkinskii		2735	24,5	26,0	19,6	37,0	150,0	207,0	44,5	51,0
Total for the city		2028	19,2	18,4	22,4	21,3	155,4	133,4	52,7	42,9

Literature

Avrutin, Yu. E., Gilinskii Y. I. (1991): Kriminologicheskii analiz prestupnosti v regione: Metodologiya, metodika, tekhnika. (Criminological analysis of crime in the region: Methodology, method, technique). Leningrad: LVK MVD RSFSR.

Gavrilov B. Ya. (2001) Sposobna li Rossiiskaya statistika o prestupnosti stat realno? (Can Russian statistics on crime become realistic?) // Gosudarstvo i pravo (government and law). No. 1. p. 47-62.

Gilinskii Ya. I. (1995) Ot "tsivilizovannosti" k "sotsialnosti": Prestupnost v Sankt-Peterburge i bezopasnost naseleniya (From "civilised" to "socialised": Crime in St. Petersburg and public safety) // Versiya (version). No. 1. p. 88-97.

Korrupsiya i borba s nei (2000) (Corruption and the struggle against it (2000)). Moscow: Rossiiskaya kriminologicheskaya assotsiyatsiya (Russian Criminological Association).

Luneyev V. V. (1997) Prestupnost XX veka: Mirovoi kriminologicheskii analiz (20th century crime: world criminological analysis). Moscow: Norma.

Osnovnye pokazateli demograficheskikh protsessov v Sankt-Peterburge i Leningradskoi oblasti. Statisticheskii sbornik (2000) (Principal indicators of demographic process in St. Petersburg and the Leningrad Region. Collection of statistics (2000). St. Petersburg: Peterburgkomstat.

3. STRUCTURE OF THE SAMPLE AND RESULTS OF THE SURVEY

3.1. *Object of the research.*

In order to assess the motives for the subjects' actual behavior, we must have an opportunity to observe this behavior in natural conditions and then for a sufficiently long enough period of time, otherwise the interpretation of evident actions as a reflection of the subjects' motives will be unreliable. On the basis of this, during the concluding stage of carrying out the research project on interrelations between the city population and the police, a selected pool of St. Petersburg residents was used.

We shall recall that the first survey of the St. Petersburg population (residents aged 18 and over) within the framework of this project was carried out in 1999 during the first quarter of the year, in six districts of the city. Information was collected about what happened to the respondents in 1998 and their assessments relative to the following year. The second survey was conducted exactly a year later, during the first quarter of 2000 in six districts of the city. However, some alterations in the boundaries of the project were made: the town of Kronshtadt was excluded and the Primorskii District was included.

In discussing the results of the survey the idea emerged to include residents of the entire territory of the city (without the suburban districts). It was decided to supplement the survey of 2000 and to carry out a selective investigation in the other districts of St. Petersburg. Since the decision was made in June, it was possible to do this only in September 2000.

Incidents that occurred in 1999 were revealed; it must be taken into account that the reliability of the information received in January-February 2000 or more than half a year later (in September 2000) can vary.

Only by comparing the data of the survey in St. Petersburg with similar investigations of citizens in other large Russian cities is it possible to determine how specific the situation is to St. Petersburg, and to understand the general trends in citizens' attitudes towards the activities of the police and the crime situation. Volgograd was chosen as such a city – located in the Privolozhskii Federal District and one of the 12 cities in Russia with a population of at least a million. For the sake of contrast, it was decided to conduct a similar survey of the inhabitants of a small Russian town. The town of Borovichi in the Novgorod Region was selected – a typical small town with a population of 61.600 on 01.01.2000.

As was planned, all three surveys in St. Petersburg, Volgograd, and Borovichi were conducted simultaneously in the first quarter of 2001.

On the basis of the survey of 2000, in all its subsequent stages, the same questionnaire, without corrections, was used. The questionnaire included the following sections: questions about the population's perception of the police's activity in the micro-district; contacts between the population and the police by the initiative of the police employees (detaining vehicles, stopping and detaining members of the public by the police); contacts with the police on the initiative of the population (turning to the police in order to report crimes, traffic incidents, or accidents, suspicious persons, sounds, noises, personal problems, to obtain a passport, certificate, or other necessary documents, etc.); questions about illegal actions in relation to the respondents and members of their families. The questionnaire included also the demographic and social characteristics of the respondents (sex, age, ethnic origin, education, average income). After the first survey (in 1998), questions clarifying the micro-districts' residents' attitude towards the actions of the police, included in accordance with recommendations by the Vera Institute of Justice, were especially useful if the respondent had had difficulties in answering a particular question.

3.2. Planning of the sample

Planning of the sample in St. Petersburg

The sample in 2001 included the territory of 13 of 20 administrative districts in St Petersburg - that is, all the districts apart from the suburbs (Kolpinskii, Kronshtadtskii, Kurortnyi, Lomonosovskii, Pavlovskii, Petrodvortsovyi, Pushkinskii).

The representative nature of the territories served by departments of the police

73 police departments are operating in the territory of the 13 districts of the city. It was planned to carry out the survey on the territories served by 71 police departments. In the sample for 2000, the 79th police department was not included (Tsentralnyi District) because during 1999 a change took place in the boundaries of territories served by the 78th and 79th departments. The respondents living in 1999 in the territory of the 79th department were surveyed in 2000 as residents who had lived on the territory of the 78th department. In 2001 the 79th department was again not included in the sample. Apart from that, in the Primorskii District the 48th police department was not included, as was the case in 2000, as this department is in the suburban part of the city (Lisii Nos).

The number of police departments that were examined included 38 departments in 6 city districts, the territory of which was embraced by the sample of winter 2000. In order to organize the autumn survey of 2000, the sample took in the territories of 33 police departments, located in 7 districts of the city. In fact, in autumn 2000 the survey of residents was conducted on the territory, not of 33, but of 29 police departments. In carrying out the survey, the following police departments were omitted: the 77th of the Admiralteiskii District, the 16th of the Vasileostrovskii District, the 82nd of the Krasnoselskii District, located in an industrial zone, the 9th of the Krasnoselskii District, located by the city's boundary line.

In order to carry out an additional survey in Petersburg in autumn 2000, "reserve" lists of respondents were prepared (2000 people). The planned volume of the sample was accepted as equal to 1500 respondents. It should be taken into account that in winter 2000 a survey was made of 2075 respondents with the planned volume being 2000 people. Its results are reflected in the previous project report.

In order to carry out the survey of winter 2001 in 13 districts, the planned volume of the sample amounted to 5000 respondents, with a "reserve" for occasions when households were accidentally visited more than once, and when those who were surveyed refused to respond. The volume of the sample was calculated on the basis of guaranteeing the representative nature of the sample in terms of sex, age, and social characteristics.

Planning of the sample in Volgograd

On 1.01.01 the population of Volgograd was 1.025.600 people. The planned size of the sample in Volgograd was 2000 respondents.

At present, Volgograd is divided into 8 administrative districts. 11 police departments operate in the city. According to the districts, the police departments are distributed in the following way.

Traktorozavodskoi District: police department 1 of the ROVD (Regionalnyi Otdel Vnutrennykh Del/ Regional Department of Internal Affairs) of the Traktorozavodskoi District, police department 4 of the ROVD of the Traktorozavodskoi District, ROVD of the Traktorozavodskoi District;

Krasnooktyabrskii District: police department 5, ROVD of the Krasnooktyabrskii District;

Tsentralnyi District: RUVD (Regionalnyi Upravlenie Vnutrennykh Del/ District Administration of Internal Affairs) of the Tsentralnyi District;

Dzerzhinskii District: police department 10, RUVD of the Dzerzhinskii District;

Sovietskii District: ROVD of the Sovietskii District ;

Krasnoarmeiskii District: police department 7, RUVD of the Krasnoarmeiskii District, police department 12, RUVD of the Krasnoarmeiskii District;

Kirovskii District: ROVD of the Kirovskii District;

Voroshilovskii District: ROVD of the Voroshilovskii District.

In accordance with the planned size of the sample (2000 people) there were about 200 respondents for each police department. The survey was conducted according to a quota- (sex, age) specific sample. The address list was compiled with a reserve of 500 people.

Planning of the sample in the town of Borovichi

In Borovichi there are no territorial divisions, therefore there is no territorial aspect in the analysis of this town.

The planned sample in Borovichi was carried out in accordance with official statistical data on the population aged 18 and over. The size of the sample was calculated on the basis of providing a representative sample according to sex and age. During the phase of planning the sample, lists of 600 people were compiled with a planned volume of 500 people.

In all, in winter 2001 the planned volume of the sample comprised 6000 respondents, including:

in St. Petersburg - 3500

in Volgograd -2000

in Borovichi -500.

Carrying out a survey on this scale in different cities demanded special work in creating territorial teams, working out directions for each team, and organizing the co-ordination of the work, guaranteeing easily comparable data in order to resolve all methodological questions.

3.3. Results of the survey.

3.3.1. Results of the survey in St. Petersburg.

The survey in St. Petersburg in autumn 2000

As has already been noted, as a result of the round table session in June 2000 it was decided to spread the survey of the population to the rest of the districts of St. Petersburg.

The survey was conducted from 15.09.00 to 1.11.00 in 7 administrative districts of the city: Admiralteiskii, Vasileostrovskii, Krasnogvardeiskii, Krasnoselskii, Moskovskii, Petrogradskii, Frunzenskii. The population of these districts on 1.01.00 was 1.833.400 people or 39,1% of the total population of St. Petersburg. The questionnaire from 1999 was used, which made it possible to combine the data of the winter and autumn 2000 surveys.

The structure of the population relating to the additional districts of the city is presented in table 3.1.

Table 3.1

Distribution of the respondents according to administrative districts of St. Petersburg, autumn 2000

District	Sample		General aggregate, %	Deviation, %
	persons	%		
Admiralteiskii	158	10,4	10,4	+0,6
Vasileostrovskii	154	10,1	10,8	+0,3
Krasnogvardeiskii	262	17,2	17,3	-
Krasnoselskii	213	14,0	16,5	-1,5
Moskovskii	263	17,2	16,1	-
Petrogradskii	152	9,9	7,6	+1,0
Frunzenskii	323	21,2	21,3	+0,7
Total	1525	100,0	100,0	X

The deviation of the sample proportion from the general did not exceed 2%. The most noticeable deviation was observed in the Krasnoselskii District (1,5%). In the Krasnogvardeiskii and Moskovskii Districts, in the sample of the general aggregate, the representative quality corresponded exactly.

Distribution of those surveyed according to police departments is presented in table 3.2.

Table 3.2

Distribution of respondents according to police departments of St. Petersburg, autumn 2000

Districts	Police departments	Number of respondents	
		total	in % of total
Admiralteiskii	1	54	3,54
	2	51	3,34
	38	53	3,48
Vasileostrovskii	30	51	3,34
	37	52	3,41
	60	51	3,34
Krasnogvardeiskii	13	52	3,41
	22	51	3,34
	26	53	3,48
	52	55	3,61
	66	51	3,34
Krasnoselskii	9	51	3,34
	42	54	3,54
	54	52	3,41
	74	56	3,67
Moskovskii	12	51	3,34
	29	52	3,41
	33	51	3,34
	51	56	3,67
	68	53	3,48
Petrogradskii	18	51	3,34
	43	51	3,34
	71	50	3,28
Frunzenskii	4	54	3,54
	11	51	3,34
	40	54	3,54
	41	57	3,74
	72	53	3,48
	73	54	3,54
Total	X	1525	100,0

The population living in the territory of 29 police departments, in 7 districts of the city, was surveyed. The number of respondents according to police departments (number of clusters) was at least 50. On average 53 respondents were surveyed for each department.

The structure of the sample according to sex was close to the general distribution (table 3.3).

Table 3.3

Distribution of respondents of St. Petersburg according to sex, autumn 2000

	Sample		General aggregate, %	Deviation, %
	Persons	%		
Men	673	44,1	43,7	+0,4
Women	852	55,9	56,3	-0,4
Total	1525	100,0	100,0	X

The most noticeable displacement in the structure of the sample was according to age (table 3.4).

Table 3.4

Distribution of respondents of St. Petersburg according to age, autumn 2000

Age, sex	Sample		General aggregate, %	Deviation, %
	Persons	%		
18-25	226	14,8	14,2	+0,6
26-30	174	11,4	9,2	+2,2
31-35	136	8,9	8,9	-
36-45	307	20,1	20,7	-0,6
46-55	289	19,0	17,3	+1,7
56-60	113	7,4	6,2	+1,2
61 and older	280	18,4	23,5	-5,1
Total	1525	100,0	100,0	X

For the age group 31-35 the sample proportion precisely corresponds to the general. For the group aged 61 and over, it was observed that there was a greater deviation in the sample proportion from the general proportion.

In conducting the survey, 27 persons were not found at their address, and refusals to participate amounted to 22,3%. Refusals were distributed according to reasons in the following way (in percentages):

On principle, do not participate in sociological surveys	25
The subject of the survey does not interest them	33
Specific questions did not suit them	19
No time	15
Without explanations	8

Furthermore, there were cases when the respondents refused to answer individual questions. There were refusals to answer 29 questions. The distribution of refusals according to questions was as follows (table 3.5).

Table 3.5

Question (no.)	Number of refusals
Average monthly income for one member of the family (73-74)	12
Can the results of the survey be believed? (80)	7
Assessment of questions about the work of the police in the main part of the questionnaire (81)	3
Data about last contact with police (60-65)	6
Reason for visit to the home by police officers (40)	1

The autumn 2000 survey was carried out by 28 interviewers, 10 of them were involved for the first time (undergraduate and post-graduate students of the statistics department of St. Petersburg State University of Economics and Finance).

According to the data of the two surveys in 2000, they obtained the distributions of respondents in St. Petersburg relating to districts of the city, sex, and age (table 3.6-3.8).

Table 3.6

Distribution of respondents according to administrative districts of St. Petersburg, 2000

District	Sample		General aggregate, %	Deviation, %
	persons	%		
Admiralteiskii	158	4,4	4,6	-0,2
Vasileostrovskii	154	4,3	4,7	-0,4
Vyborgskii	388	10,8	10,2	+0,6
Kalininskii	412	11,4	11,1	+0,3
Kirovskii	310	8,6	8,3	+0,3
Krasnogvardeiskii	262	7,3	7,6	-0,3
Krasnoselskii	213	5,9	7,3	-1,4
Moskovskii	263	7,3	7,1	+0,2
Nevskii	420	11,7	10,9	+0,8
Petrogradskii	152	4,2	3,3	+0,9
Primorskii	288	8,0	8,9	-0,9
Frunzenskii	323	9,0	9,4	-0,4
Tsentralnyi	257	7,1	6,6	+0,5
Total	3600	100,0	100,0	X

The deviation of the sample proportion from the general was not more than 1,5%. The largest deviation was noted in the Krasnoselskii District.

Table 3.7

Distribution of respondents in St. Petersburg according to sex, 2000

	Sample		General aggregate, %	Deviation, %
	Persons	%		
Men	1588	44,1	43,7	+0,4
Women	2012	55,9	56,3	-0,4
Total	3600	100,0	100,0	X

On the whole, for the survey of 1999 the deviation of the sample proportion from the general according to sex did not exceed 0,5%.

Table 3.8

Distribution of respondents of St. Petersburg according to age, 2000

Age, years	Sample		General aggregate, %	Deviation, %
	Persons	%		
18-25	514	14,3	14,2	+0,1
26-30	361	10,0	9,2	+0,8
31-35	311	8,6	8,9	-0,3
36-45	784	21,8	20,7	+1,1
46-55	698	19,4	17,3	+2,1
56-60	250	6,9	6,2	+0,7
61 and older	682	19,0	23,5	-4,5
Total	3600	100,0	100,0	X

As has already been said earlier, people from the older age group more frequently refused to participate in the survey. This led to the most noticeable deviation in the sample proportion from the general for respondents aged 61 and above.

The survey in St. Petersburg in winter 2001

The next phase of implementing the project began with carrying out the survey in three cities – St. Petersburg, Volgograd, and Borovichi, at approximately the same time.

The survey in Petersburg took place during the period 15.01.01-07.03.01. 3617 people were surveyed (the planned number was 3500).

The planning of the sample for 2001 relied on data of the Peterburgkomstata (Petersburg Statistics Commission) on the distribution of the St. Petersburg population according to districts of the city, age, and sex as from 1 January 2000.

We will consider the principal distributions of respondents in Petersburg according to the results of the survey of 2001. (table 3.9-3.12).

Table 3.9

Distribution of respondents according to administrative districts of St. Petersburg, winter 2001

District	Sample		General aggregate, %	Deviation, %
	Persons	%		
Admiralteiskii	187	5,2	4,6	+0,6
Vasileostrovskii	181	5,0	4,7	+0,3
Vyborgskii	359	9,9	10,2	-0,3
Kalininskii	409	11,3	11,1	+0,2
Kirovskii	308	8,5	8,3	+0,2
Krasnogvardeiskii	274	7,6	7,6	-
Krasnoselskii	211	5,8	7,3	-1,5
Moskovskii	255	7,1	7,1	-
Nevskii	388	10,7	10,9	-0,2
Petrogradskii	154	4,3	3,3	+1,0
Primorskii	267	7,4	8,9	-1,5
Frunzenskii	367	10,1	9,4	+0,7
Tsentralnyi	257	7,1	6,6	+0,5
Total	3617	100,0	100,0	X

The circle of districts fully coincides with 2000. The proportion of respondents in two districts of the city precisely corresponds to the plan of the sample. In the remaining districts the deviation of the sample proportion from the general does not exceed 2%.

Table 3.10

Distribution of respondents according to police departments of St. Petersburg, winter 2001

Districts	Police departments	Number of respondents	
		Total	In % of total
Admiralteiskii	1	57	1,58
	2	50	1,38
	38	50	1,38
	77	30	0,83
Vasileostrovskii	16	30	0,83
	30	50	1,38
	37	51	1,41
Vyborgskii	60	50	1,38
	19	52	1,44
	20	50	1,38
	36	52	1,44
	49	51	1,41
	57	50	1,38
Kalininskii	58	51	1,41
	59	53	1,47
	03	50	1,38
	06	51	1,41
	15	51	1,41
	17	52	1,44
Kirovskii	21	52	1,44
	61	50	1,38
	62	53	1,47
	63	50	1,38
	07	51	1,41
	08	53	1,47
Krasnogvardeiskii	14	51	1,41
	31	52	1,44
	64	50	1,38
	65	51	1,41
	13	57	1,58
Krasnoselskii	22	51	1,41
	26	57	1,58
	52	51	1,41
	66	58	1,60
	9	30	0,83
Moskovskii	42	50	1,38
	54	51	1,41
	74	50	1,38
	82	30	0,83
	12	50	1,38
Nevskii	29	50	1,38
	33	51	1,41
	51	52	1,44
	68	52	1,44
	10	51	1,41
	23	62	1,71
Nevskii	24	54	1,49
	32	66	1,82
	45	50	1,38
	70	50	1,38
	75	55	1,52

Petrogradskii	18	52	1,44
	43	50	1,38
	71	52	1,44
Primorskii	25	51	1,41
	34	54	1,49
	35	52	1,44
	44	54	1,49
	53	56	1,55
Frunzenskii	4	51	1,41
	11	51	1,41
	40	53	1,47
	41	54	1,49
	47	50	1,38
	72	51	1,41
	73	57	1,58
Tsentralnyi	05	51	1,41
	27	52	1,44
	28	51	1,41
	76	52	1,44
	78	51	1,41
Total	X	3617	100,0

For the departments 77 (Admiralteiskii District), 16 (Vasileostrovskii District), 9, 82 (Krasnoselskii District), 30 people were surveyed, which is explained by the low population density in the territories served by these police departments.

Table 3.11

Distribution of respondents of St. Petersburg according to sex, winter 2001

	Sample		General aggregate, %	Deviation, %
	Prsons	%		
Men	1543	42,7	43,7	-1,0
Women	2074	57,3	56,3	+1,0
Total	3617	100,0	100,0	X

The deviation of the sample proportion from the general according to sex did not exceed 2%. The largest displacement of the structure of the sample, as in previous surveys, occurred according to age (table 3.12).

Table 3.12

Distribution of respondents of St. Petersburg according to age, winter 2001

Age, years	Sample		General aggregate, %	Deviation, %
	Persons	%		
18-25	551	15,2	14,2	+1,0
26-30	359	9,9	8,9	+1,0
31-35	313	8,7	9,0	-0,3
36-45	800	22,1	20,5	+1,6
46-55	758	21,0	18,0	+3,0
56-60	254	7,0	6,2	+0,8
61 and older	582	16,1	23,2	-7,1
Total	3617	100,0	100,0	X

The smallest deviation from the general took place in the age group 31-35, the largest (as in the sample of 2000) – in the last age group - 61 and older. Older people more often refuse to participate in the survey. People aged 36 to 55 entered into more active conversation with the interviewers.

In the last survey, as earlier, the indicator of the “proportion of persons with higher education in the population aged 18 and older” was used as a controlling social parameter. In the sample for 2001, the proportion of this category amounted to 32%. In addition, attention was paid to such characteristics as the average monthly per capita income, the proportion of the non-Russian population, the proportion of automobile owners – in view of the fact that this type of characteristic among respondents to a certain degree is related to their attitude toward the police. The significance of these indicators in St. Petersburg according to the three surveys is presented in table 3.13.

Table 3.13

Indicator	Sample 1999	Sample 2000	Sample 2001	General parameter
Average per capita income per month, rubles	772	1969	2505	1905 (2000, IV quarter))
Proportion of non-Russians, %	9,4	14,4	13,8	8,2 (according to data of micro-census of 1994)
Number of owners of passenger automobiles per 1000 inhabitants	235	368	355	225 (on 1.01.2001)

Indicators for 1999 (sample of 2000) were calculated according to combined data: the winter and autumn surveys. The characteristics of the sample of 2001 differ insignificantly from the general indicators.

When the survey was conducted in winter 2001, 22 persons were not found at their addresses, refusals amounted to 26,7%. The refusals were distributed according to reasons in the following way (in percentages):

No time	29
Subject of the survey did not suit them	22
Specific questions did not suit them	20
Tired of participating in surveys (3 rd time)	16
Without explanations	13

Among people who declined to take part in the survey, people of the older age group predominated. The structure of refusals according to age groups was as follows (in percentages):

18-25 years	11,5
26-30	6,2
31-35	9,9
36-45	16,3
46-55	10,3
56-60	4,0
61 and older	41,8

Moreover, among those who were surveyed in Petersburg, answers were not received for 53 questions. Refusals according to questions in Petersburg were distributed in the following way (table 3.14):

Table 3.14

Question (no.)	Number of refusals
Average monthly income for one member of the family (73-74)	14
Can the results of our survey be believed? (80)	7
Assessment of questions about work of the police in the main part of the questionnaire (81)	7
Contact with the police on respondents' own initiative during 2000 (50-59)	10
"Problematic" aspect in interaction between police and residents of micro-district (14-19)	6
What is the basis of the opinion about the relations of the police and micro-district residents? (20)	1
Reasons of difficulties in assessing police's relations with residents of micro-district (21)	1
Data on last contact with police (60-65)	6
Criminal acts against members of the respondent's family (48)	1

We see that in Petersburg refusals to answer the question about average monthly income dominated (26% of refusals). Evidently this question puts residents of the city on their guard. We draw such a conclusion in view of the persistent concentration of "no answers" that occur specifically with reference to this question.

3.3.2. Results of the survey in Volgograd.

The planned volume for the sample in Volgograd numbered 2000 people. Employees of the Center for Social-Economic Research of the Volga State University drew up the sample and its representation according to the territory of police departments.

The survey was conducted from 3.01.01 to 24.02.01.

According to the results of the survey in Volgograd the distribution of respondents was structured according to districts, police departments, sex, and age. The most noticeable displacement of the sample's structure occurred according to districts (table 3.15).

Table 3.15

Distribution of respondents according to districts of Volgograd, winter 2001

Districts	Sample		General aggregate, %	Deviation, %
	Persons	%		
Traktorzavodskoi	506	25,3	14,0	+11,3
Krasnooktyabrskii	206	10,3	15,4	-5,1
Tsentralnyi	201	10,1	9,1	+1,0
Dzerzhinskii	191	9,5	16,3	-6,8
Sovietskii	216	10,8	9,5	1,3
Krasnoarmeiskii	328	16,4	18,6	-2,2
Kirovskii	190	9,5	9,5	-
Voroshilovskii	162	8,1	7,6	0,5
Total	2000	100,0	100,0	X

For the Kirovskii District the survey achieved full correspondence between the sample proportion and the general. The greatest deviation of the sample proportion from the general is observed for the Traktorozavodskoi District, which corresponds to the plan of the sample (for each police department there should be about 200 respondents). The distribution of respondents for police departments is presented in table 3.16.

Table 3.16

Distribution of respondents according to district and police departments of Volgograd, winter 2001

Districts	Police department (code)	Sample	
		persons	%
Traktorozavodskoi	1	190	9,5
	2	139	6,9
	3	177	8,9
Krasnooktyabrskii	4	206	10,3
Tsentralnyi	5	201	10,1
Dzerzhinskii	6	191	9,5
Sovietskii	7	216	10,8
Krasnoarmeiskii	8	174	8,7
	9	154	7,7
Kirovskii	10	190	9,5
Voroshilovskii	11	162	8,1
Total	X	2000	100,0

The structure of the sample according to sex is close to the general distribution.

Table 3.17

Distribution of respondents of Volgograd according to sex, winter 2001

	Sample		General aggregate, %	Deviation, %
	Persons	%		
Men	891	44,5	45,2	-0,7
Women	1109	55,5	54,8	+0,7
Total	2000	100,0	100,0	X

The deviation of the sample proportion from the general according to age did not exceed 1% (table 3.18).

Table 3.18

Distribution of respondents of Volgograd according to age, winter 2001

Age, years	Sample		General aggregate, %	Deviation, %
	Persons	%		
18-25	254	12,7	12,7	-
26-30	189	9,4	9,0	+0,4
31-35	170	8,5	8,4	+0,1
36-45	398	19,9	20,8	-0,9
46-55	338	16,9	16,8	+0,1
56-60	147	7,4	6,9	+0,5
61 and older	505	25,2	25,4	-0,2
Total	2000	100,0	100,0	X

In carrying out the survey, the interviewers filled out route pages which were analysed at the end of the survey. On the route pages the respondent's address and telephone number were recorded, in cases of refusal, the reason, the sex, and the approximate age of the respondent who refused to participate in the survey. As a result of the analysis of the information, the following was revealed:

1. Respondents' refusals to answer questions and to take part in the sociological survey were distributed according to reasons as follows:
 - Without explanations – 40,4%,
 - No time – 41,1%,
 - Negative attitude toward the police – 8,5%,
 - Do not trust surveys – 10,0%.
2. According to the respondents' age and sex, cases of refusal were distributed in the following way (in percentages):

Age	Men	Women
18-25	2,1	6,8
26-30	2,8	9,0
31-35	3,6	9,6
36-45	9,8	16,9
46-55	4,5	9,6
56-60	3,4	6,0
61 and older	5,0	10,9
Total	31,2	68,8

Thus among those who refused to participate in the survey in Volgograd, women aged 36-45 predominate.

3. Respondents' refusal according to city districts (in percentages):

Traktorzavodskoi District	19,5
Krasnooktyabrskii District	9,1
Tsentralnyi District	6,2
Dzerzhinskii District	11,6
Sovietskii District	12,9
Krasnoarmeiskii District	19,7
Kirovskii District	6,4
Voroshilovskii District	14,6

In 87 completed questionnaires, refusals to answer individual questions were encountered. The distribution of the refusals according to questions is presented in table 3.19:

Table 3.19

Question (no.)	Number of refusals
Ethnic origin (72)	1
Average monthly income for one member of the family (73-74)	45
Reasons why sometimes people do not trust data of surveys (79)	34
Can the result of our survey be believed? (80)	9
Assessment of questions about the work of the police in main part of questionnaire (81)	8
Reasons for difficulties in assessing activity of police in micro-district (12 p. 4)	1
Were doors, glass, light fixtures broken in entry way? (22 p. 1)	1
Illegal acts involving vehicles (25)	1
Criminal incidents involving respondents (41)	1
Criminal incidents involving members of respondent's family (48)	1

Thus in Volgograd, out of 101 refusals, 45% relate to the question about the average monthly level of income for one member of the family, meaning that the situation is analogous to that which existed in St. Petersburg.

3.3.3. Results of the survey in the town of Borovichi.

The survey was conducted by employees of the Borovichi Center for Employment of the Population. It took place from 8.01.01 to 3.02.01.

In forming the sample the gender structure of the population was taken into consideration according to the sex of respondents aged 18 and over. The structure of the sample according to sex is close to the general distribution (table 3.20).

Table 3.20

Distribution of respondents of Borovichi according to sex, winter 2001

	Sample		General aggregate, %	Deviation, %
	Persons	%		
Men	224	44,6	42,6	+2,0
Women	278	55,4	57,4	-2,0
Total	502	100,0	100,0	X

The deviation of the sample proportion from the general according to age groups did not exceed 1%. The greatest deviation was observed for the age group 56-60 (Table 3.21).

Distribution of respondents of Borovichi according to age, winter 2001

Age, years	Sample		General aggregate, %	Deviation, %
	Persons	%		
18-25	69	13,7	14,1	-0,4
26-30	45	9,0	9,0	-
31-35	41	8,2	7,9	+0,3
36-45	102	20,3	20,4	-0,1
46-55	82	16,3	16,3	-
56-60	36	7,2	6,6	+0,6
61 and older	127	25,3	25,7	-0,4
Total	502	100,0	100,0	X

In carrying out the survey 19 were not found at home, 79 refused to participate in the survey. Thus the proportion of refusals amounted to 13,6%.

Refusals were distributed according to reasons in the following way (in percentages):

On principle, they do not participate in sociological surveys	36
No time	31
The subject of the survey does not interest them	14
Without explanations	19.

Questions 14-19 caused difficulties in answering. To control the work of the interviewers, collated reports were compiled (from the interviewers' journals).

Thus it can be stated that first, in spite of the difficulties related with the subject of the survey and the suspicions of the population, the survey could be conducted quite successfully in all three cities. Refusals did not exceed 23-27%. Everywhere people were suspicious about the question concerning average per capita monetary income. In St. Petersburg and in Borovichi, in general older people (61 and over) refused to answer this question, which led to decreased representation of older people in the sample. In Volgograd it was mainly women aged 36-45 who refused to answer.

In all cities the principle of a spatial sample was adhered to and the representative nature of the city's territory was guaranteed. In St. Petersburg and Volgograd the respondents were distributed according to territories of police departments, which made it possible to carry out a comparative analysis and assessment of their activity.

3.4. Ranking of police departments of St. Petersburg in order of size.

One of the tasks of the project "The population and the police in a large city" is to obtain a comparative evaluation of the activity of police departments of St. Petersburg, which could be based on the opinion of the towns. This kind of evaluation should embrace various aspects of the activity of the police, including an evaluation of contacts with the population (e.g. courtesy, fairness). In order to be able to compare the evaluations of the residents of St. Petersburg according to the data of the three surveys (1999, 2000, 2001) it must be based on identical questions. The questions of the first block of the questionnaire meet this condition – questions about the attitude of the population toward the activity of the police in the micro-district:

1. Are the police able to cope with problems of preserving public order, which concern the residents?
2. Is the assistance given by the police to victims of crime in the micro-district effective?
3. Is the work of the police well organized in the prevention of crime?
4. Are the police able to maintain the necessary level of public order on the streets and in public places?
5. Are the police who work in the micro-district polite in their treatment of residents?
6. Are the police attentive to the problems of regarding public order which concern the residents?
7. Do the police show readiness to help residents with their problems and difficulties?
8. Did the work of the police in the micro-district change in the last year?
9. Is there a serious problem in the micro-district with police detaining people on the streets without sufficient reason?
10. Is there a serious problem in the micro-district with the police's harsh treatment of people who are detained?
11. Is there a serious problem in the micro-district with the police applying physical force to people who are detained?
12. Is there a serious problem in the micro-district with the police assaulting people who are detained?
13. Is there a serious problem in the micro-district with the police taking bribes?
14. Is there a serious problem in the micro-district with the police taking direct part in underground business activities?

The ordering of police departments was done by the use of the method of the unweighted multiple-measure average.

The order of the multiple-measure average:

1. For each question, the proportion of negative answers for each police department was calculated. For example, for question no. 2 the proportion of negative answers was defined as the relation of the number of respondents who gave the answers "very poor" and "rather poor" to the number of respondents who gave informative answers to this question (apart from the answer "hard to answer"); y_i is the proportion of negative answers to i -question for the police department;
2. In order to guarantee the equal variability of each question, a ranking was made on the basis of the range:

$$d = \frac{y_{\max i} - y_{\min i}}{5}$$

where $y_{\max i}$ – is the maximum value for i -question for all departments,
 $y_{\min i}$ – is the minimum value for i -question for all departments.

Five gradations were used to guarantee a significant difference between the maximum and minimum values of the multiple-measure average. The rank for i -question for a particular police department (r_i) was conferred depending on which interval y_i fell into

$$\begin{aligned}
 r_i &= 1, \text{ if } y_{\min i} \leq y_i < y_{\min i} + d \\
 r_i &= 2, \text{ if } y_{\min i} + d \leq y_i < y_{\min i} + 2d \\
 r_i &= 3, \text{ if } y_{\min i} + 2d \leq y_i < y_{\min i} + 3d \\
 r_i &= 4, \text{ if } y_{\min i} + 3d \leq y_i < y_{\min i} + 4d \\
 r_i &= 5, \text{ if } y_{\min i} + 4d \leq y_i ;
 \end{aligned}$$

3. For each police department the value of the multiple-measure average was calculated according to the formula:

$$\bar{r} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n r_i}{n},$$

where \bar{r}_i - is the average value for i- question for all police departments,

n - is the overall number of questions considered in calculating the multiple measure average.

A high rank value corresponds to a “poor” reference for the police department: the higher the ranking value of each of the listed indicators, the worse the quality of this police department’s work with the population. Accordingly, a low value of the multiple-measure average is evidence of a favorable state of affairs in the work of the police of the micro-district.

The multiple-measure average was calculated separately for the three categories – according to the answers of those who had been subjected to illegal activities (victims), those who had been detained by the police (detained), and those who had not been detained and were not victims of criminal acts. In addition the multiple-measure average for all respondents was calculated. The results of the calculations according to the data of the surveys 1999-2001 are presented in tables 3.22-3.25.

Table 3.22

Ranking of police departments of St. Petersburg according to the multiple-measure average, answers of “victims”

1999		2000		2001	
Police department	Average	Police department	Average	Police department	Average
17	1,25	32	1,36	29	1,40
32	1,24	41	1,34	23	1,37
19	1,23	12	1,34	57	1,34
28	1,23	59	1,33	11	1,33
75	1,22	11	1,32	28	1,28
20	1,15	25	1,27	68	1,27
10	1,15	5	1,27	31	1,26
36	1,14	76	1,23	24	1,24
78	1,13	23	1,21	25	1,21
3	1,12	53	1,18	27	1,21
63	1,10	45	1,16	70	1,20
31	1,10	19	1,16	36	1,19
15	1,09	27	1,14	44	1,18
76	1,09	49	1,12	30	1,17
79	1,08	37	1,12	17	1,17
61	1,07	78	1,09	73	1,16
45	1,06	70	1,08	54	1,16
5	1,04	38	1,08	53	1,12
24	1,02	33	1,08	41	1,12
23	1,01	35	1,07	15	1,10
58	1,01	9	1,07	62	1,09
27	0,99	21	1,07	66	1,09
21	0,98	4	1,07	40	1,08
6	0,92	65	1,06	5	1,08
14	0,90	30	1,05	64	1,08
8	0,89	15	1,05	20	1,07
59	0,82	34	1,05	26	1,05
57	0,80	22	1,03	58	1,04

7	0,78	72	1,03	71	1,04
70	0,74	44	1,03	75	1,03
65	0,71	13	1,02	9	1,02
62	0,67	52	1,02	10	1,02
49	0,65	40	1,01	65	1,02
64	0,60	1	1,01	32	1,00
		20	1,00	4	0,99
		14	0,99	76	0,97
		26	0,99	22	0,97
		51	0,99	13	0,97
		29	0,99	59	0,96
		8	0,98	72	0,96
		61	0,98	8	0,96
		18	0,98	78	0,96
		43	0,97	7	0,95
		10	0,95	77	0,94
		74	0,94	19	0,94
		64	0,94	33	0,93
		66	0,93	45	0,92
		63	0,90	49	0,89
		75	0,90	6	0,89
		73	0,89	12	0,89
		60	0,88	63	0,88
		68	0,88	52	0,88
		28	0,88	37	0,87
		62	0,87	43	0,87
		31	0,87	82	0,87
		3	0,84	61	0,86
		7	0,83	3	0,84
		6	0,82	34	0,84
		24	0,82	51	0,82
		2	0,75	35	0,81
		42	0,69	2	0,81
		58	0,68	18	0,77
		71	0,66	21	0,77
		17	0,66	14	0,76
		54	0,66	47	0,75
		57	0,65	42	0,75
		36	0,59	38	0,75
				60	0,74
				74	0,71
				16	0,69
				1	0,65

In 2001 according to the answers of “victims”, “poor” and “good” departments received worse evaluations than in previous years.

Multiple-measure average	1999	2000	2001
Max	1,25	1,36	1,40
Min	0,60	0,59	0,65
Range	0,65	0,77	0,75

In order to determine the degree of stability in the ranking of police departments according to the data of the three surveys, the coefficients of the rank correlation were calculated for those departments which were represented in all three samples.

Coefficients of the correlation of ranks of police departments:

1999 – 2000 = -0,0028
 2000 – 2001 = -0,0035
 1999 – 2001 = 0,061.

As we see, the ranks of police departments obtained on the basis of the crime victims' answers are weakly correlated according to years, that is, the assessments of the police's activities exhibit instability.

We will consider by the same method the ranking of police departments on the basis of answers of those who were subjected to detention at least once during the course of a year (table 3.23).

Table 3.23

The ranking of police departments of St. Petersburg according to the multiple-measure average, answers of those “detained”

1999		2000		2001	
Police department	Average	Police department	Average	Police department	Average
76	1,37	30	1,52	58	1,53
49	1,36	28	1,42	61	1,48
32	1,29	12	1,39	64	1,44
24	1,25	76	1,30	35	1,35
20	1,24	23	1,26	44	1,33
70	1,23	32	1,24	54	1,32
23	1,22	26	1,20	15	1,32
58	1,20	70	1,20	75	1,31
3	1,16	6	1,19	23	1,29
5	1,15	4	1,18	17	1,25
17	1,14	54	1,17	37	1,25
64	1,12	19	1,17	30	1,24
19	1,08	42	1,15	24	1,21
75	1,04	40	1,12	27	1,21
6	1,02	59	1,12	4	1,19
15	1,01	21	1,11	43	1,19
27	1,01	27	1,11	65	1,16
45	0,99	20	1,11	9	1,15
7	0,97	65	1,11	20	1,14
28	0,95	75	1,11	60	1,14
79	0,90	33	1,09	71	1,13
36	0,88	53	1,09	77	1,12
14	0,87	52	1,08	45	1,12
21	0,87	68	1,07	5	1,12
63	0,86	7	1,07	52	1,11
78	0,85	24	1,05	53	1,11
65	0,85	14	1,04	70	1,10
31	0,82	38	1,03	3	1,08
59	0,79	3	1,03	47	1,08
8	0,75	35	1,03	7	1,08
61	0,67	5	1,02	33	1,08
62	0,58	22	1,02	59	1,07
10	0,53	45	1,01	13	1,06
		1	1,00	31	1,05
		44	0,99	12	1,05

		34	0,99	28	1,05
		78	0,99	16	1,01
		71	0,98	32	1,00
		17	0,98	73	0,98
		37	0,97	18	0,94
		43	0,96	11	0,93
		63	0,96	49	0,93
		15	0,93	78	0,92
		57	0,92	40	0,92
		72	0,92	72	0,91
		64	0,91	1	0,90
		73	0,90	42	0,90
		13	0,89	14	0,89
		49	0,89	66	0,88
		74	0,88	36	0,88
		8	0,88	22	0,88
		25	0,88	25	0,87
		2	0,86	21	0,87
		66	0,84	38	0,83
		11	0,83	74	0,80
		10	0,81	57	0,77
		41	0,79	10	0,76
		36	0,77	51	0,73
		18	0,71	76	0,65
		60	0,67	34	0,65
		29	0,66	63	0,62
		58	0,59	19	0,62
		62	0,52	29	0,53
		31	0,30	41	0,46
				26	0,45
				2	0,31
				62	0,31

Departments where there were no people detained in the sample: in 1999 – 57th, in 2000 – 9th, 51st, 61st, in 2001 – 6th, 8th, 68th, 82nd.

According to the answers of people who were detained, the range of multiple-measure averages grew in 2000 in comparison to the previous year. “Poor” police departments were identified as such, to a greater degree in 2001 than in 1999-2000. “Good” departments received better evaluations in 2001 than in 1999.

Multiple-measure average	1999	2000	2001
Max	1,37	1,52	1,53
Min	0,53	0,30	0,31
Range	0,84	1,22	1,22

The rankings of police departments obtained on the basis of answers of people who were detained correlate to previous years more than according to the answers by victims of crimes, meaning that the assessments of police activity made by people who were detained are more stable.

Coefficients of the correlation of ranks:

1999 – 2000 = 0,333

2000 – 2001 = 0,092

1999 – 2001 = 0,362

The latter conclusion is especially just in comparing the results of the survey of 1999 with 2000 and with 2001. There is a very weak correlation among the data of 2000 and 2001. Possibly this is the result of a break in time when the survey was conducted in 1999: those who were subjected to detention could have forgotten the special aspects of the specific situation by the time of the survey which was carried out in September 2000.

Table 3.24

Ranking of police departments of St. Petersburg according to multiple-measure average, answers of “the other” people

1999		2000		2001	
Police department	Average	Police department	Average	Police department	Average
45	1,45	51	1,56	77	1,49
28	1,40	68	1,37	4	1,39
76	1,31	73	1,37	70	1,38
19	1,30	33	1,34	65	1,37
24	1,20	41	1,34	30	1,35
3	1,17	30	1,28	71	1,33
17	1,15	65	1,27	19	1,32
10	1,13	54	1,24	28	1,32
58	1,11	25	1,23	82	1,32
36	1,10	35	1,23	33	1,30
15	1,08	45	1,21	40	1,30
59	1,06	19	1,21	21	1,25
6	1,05	52	1,20	63	1,23
75	1,04	37	1,14	68	1,22
7	1,04	27	1,14	41	1,21
20	1,01	4	1,13	75	1,21
65	1,01	10	1,13	74	1,18
5	0,99	11	1,12	51	1,17
8	0,98	64	1,11	12	1,16
27	0,96	18	1,11	18	1,14
79	0,95	17	1,11	66	1,14
62	0,93	21	1,10	45	1,13
23	0,89	61	1,10	73	1,10
61	0,86	38	1,09	34	1,10
31	0,85	9	1,08	38	1,10
70	0,84	76	1,08	72	1,07
64	0,84	29	1,07	11	1,06
49	0,83	12	1,06	13	1,06
63	0,82	71	1,06	27	1,04
21	0,76	70	1,06	25	1,02
57	0,73	26	1,05	20	1,02
14	0,72	72	1,03	17	1,02
32	0,71	43	1,02	29	1,01
78	0,70	22	1,01	10	1,00
		20	1,00	23	1,00
		5	1,00	42	0,98
		2	0,99	57	0,97
		7	0,98	5	0,96
		75	0,98	49	0,96
		6	0,97	60	0,96
		23	0,96	24	0,96
		44	0,94	2	0,96
		34	0,92	47	0,95
		24	0,92	14	0,90

		40	0,91	58	0,89
		62	0,87	35	0,87
		49	0,87	26	0,87
		66	0,86	44	0,87
		74	0,83	43	0,87
		57	0,83	32	0,86
		15	0,83	22	0,85
		53	0,82	31	0,84
		28	0,81	36	0,83
		63	0,81	52	0,83
		13	0,81	54	0,81
		58	0,80	37	0,81
		78	0,80	61	0,79
		42	0,80	76	0,79
		3	0,78	59	0,78
		60	0,78	64	0,77
		32	0,77	62	0,75
		59	0,75	8	0,75
		31	0,73	6	0,74
		36	0,73	9	0,73
		1	0,68	16	0,73
		14	0,40	7	0,72
		8	0,38	3	0,71
				53	0,66
				1	0,66
				15	0,62
				78	0,48

According to the answers of “other” people, that is, those who were not detained and were not victims of crimes, the rank scale of 2000 was more inclined towards a negative evaluation in comparison with the following year. Thus in 1999 the proportion of “poor” departments for which the multiple-measure average was more than 1 amounted to 50%, while in 2000 it was 54%. In 2001 the “poor” departments were recognized as such to a lesser degree than in 2000. The “good” departments received worse evaluations. The range of evaluations for this nomination category for three years amounted to:

Multiple-measure average	1999	2000	2001
Max	1,45	1,56	1,49
Min	0,70	0,38	0,48
Range	0,75	1,18	1,01

For this category of persons, who were not subject to illegal activities and not detained by the police, a noticeable correlation in the ranks of police departments is observed, according to the answers of 2000 and 2001, that is, their evaluations of the activity of the police are quite stable.

The coefficients of the correlation of ranks were:

1999 – 2000	= 0,25
2000 – 2001.	= 0,430
1999 – 2001	= 0,063

For all the people surveyed put together, the following multiple-measure averages were obtained (table 3.25).

Table 3.25

Ranking of police departments of St. Petersburg according to the multiple-measure average, answers from all people surveyed

1999		2000		2001	
Police department	Average	Police department	Average	Police department	Average
76	1,40	51	1,46	70	1,46
45	1,40	41	1,35	77	1,38
28	1,37	76	1,34	30	1,36
19	1,34	19	1,32	28	1,34
24	1,32	33	1,30	65	1,33
17	1,22	30	1,29	71	1,33
3	1,21	45	1,28	40	1,30
75	1,21	27	1,26	4	1,29
15	1,16	68	1,25	41	1,29
10	1,12	73	1,23	19	1,28
20	1,11	22	1,23	33	1,23
58	1,10	65	1,22	11	1,23
5	1,07	70	1,22	68	1,22
36	1,05	4	1,21	17	1,22
27	1,05	25	1,20	82	1,21
6	1,04	12	1,20	75	1,20
7	0,95	18	1,17	29	1,17
79	0,92	52	1,17	45	1,16
32	0,92	21	1,16	24	1,15
49	0,90	35	1,15	63	1,15
31	0,86	37	1,15	25	1,14
59	0,86	11	1,14	23	1,14
63	0,86	61	1,13	12	1,13
65	0,86	54	1,11	18	1,10
70	0,84	26	1,09	66	1,09
23	0,83	64	1,08	13	1,09
8	0,83	72	1,06	21	1,08
78	0,82	23	1,05	27	1,08
61	0,80	38	1,04	44	1,06
64	0,79	5	1,04	72	1,03
62	0,72	9	1,04	51	1,02
14	0,70	40	1,03	73	1,01
21	0,68	43	1,03	20	1,00
57	0,68	10	1,03	57	0,99
		44	0,99	34	0,98
		20	0,98	74	0,98
		74	0,96	58	0,97
		34	0,95	9	0,96
		53	0,94	31	0,96
		29	0,93	54	0,96
		6	0,93	36	0,96
		7	0,93	5	0,96
		71	0,91	35	0,94
		17	0,89	10	0,93
		2	0,89	38	0,92
		49	0,89	22	0,90
		75	0,89	61	0,89
		32	0,86	47	0,87
		78	0,86	62	0,87
		15	0,85	64	0,86
		63	0,85	59	0,86

		60	0,85	76	0,86
		59	0,84	43	0,85
		28	0,83	42	0,84
		3	0,82	60	0,84
		24	0,81	49	0,84
		42	0,80	32	0,82
		13	0,78	37	0,79
		66	0,77	52	0,79
		1	0,75	14	0,78
		62	0,74	26	0,78
		57	0,72	2	0,76
		31	0,70	8	0,74
		58	0,67	3	0,73
		36	0,50	6	0,71
		14	0,46	7	0,70
		8	0,43	16	0,66
				53	0,65
				15	0,64
				1	0,61
				78	0,56

In 2000, according to the replies of all respondents, "poor" police departments received evaluations that were worse than in 1999. In 2001, the "good" departments received worse evaluations than in the previous years; therefore the range of good and bad evaluations was reduced.

Multiple-measure average	1999 г.	2000 г.	2001 г.
Max	1,40	1,46	1,46
Min	0,68	0,43	0,56
Range	0,72	1,03	0,9

On the basis of the coefficients of the correlation of ranks according to answers for 200 and 2001 it is possible to draw a conclusion about more stable assessment of the activity of police departments.

Coefficients of the correlation of ranks were:

$$1999 - 2000 = 0,177$$

$$2000 - 2001 = 0,404$$

$$1999 - 2001 = 0,216$$

According to data obtained, five "poor" and five "good" police departments were picked out by the three selected categories of respondents over three years. The results are presented in table 3.26.

Table 3.26

Year	"Better" police departments	"Worse" police departments
Assessment of crime victims		
1999	64, 49, 62, 65, 70	17, 32, 19, 28, 75
2000	36, 57, 54, 17, 71	32, 41, 12, 59, 11
2001	1, 16, 74, 60, 38,	29, 23, 57, 11, 28
Assessment of people who were detained		
1999	10, 62, 61, 8, 59	76, 49, 32, 24, 20
2000	31, 62, 58, 29, 60	30, 28, 12, 76, 23
2001	62, 2, 26, 41, 29	58, 61, 64, 35, 44
Assessment of persons not detained and not victims of crimes		
1999	78, 32, 14, 57, 21	45, 28, 76, 19, 24
2000	8, 14, 1, 36, 31	51, 68, 73, 33, 41
2001	78, 15, 1, 53, 3	77, 4, 70, 65, 30
Assessment for all people surveyed		
1999	57, 21, 14, 62, 64	76, 45, 28, 19, 24
2000	8, 14, 36, 58, 31	51, 41, 76, 19, 33
2001	78, 1, 15, 53, 16	70, 77, 30, 28, 65

One must treat the results of table 3.26 carefully, especially if it is decided to use them in order to make administrative decisions. The results, presented in table 3.26, also confirm the aforementioned greater stability of opinion among those who did not appear as victims and were not detained by the police. A possible explanation for this might be that the sites of incidents (assaults and other crimes) tend not to coincide with the place of residence, that is, the territory served by the corresponding police department. In this case the answers might not be applicable to the nearest police department. Unfortunately, this circumstance could not be elucidated: the questionnaire did not make this possible.

The second consideration that occurred to us after carrying out our analysis of how respondents were nominated, was that it was completely natural to take various questions for the different categories of respondents as a criterion for evaluating the police. For example, for the "victims", we chose as such criteria answers to the questions:

1. Did you inform the police about what happened?
2. Did the police react quickly to your appeal?
3. Reasons why you did not report to the police about what happened (the police would not do anything anyway, the policemen would not be pleased with the request, the police couldn't do anything, the individual concerned didn't want to contact the police);

For those who contacted the police on their own initiative:

1. Were the police attentive enough to your request?
2. Were you given any real help and assistance?
3. When you contacted the police were the personnel polite enough?
4. Were you satisfied with the actions of the police in response to your contacting them?

For people who were detained:

1. Was it clear to you, from what the police said and did, why you were detained?
2. When you were detained, were the police sufficiently polite?
3. When you were detained, were you certain that the police acted strictly within the framework of the law?

Having applied the method already described, we obtained the ranking of assessments of the activity of police departments for 2000-2001 (table 3.27).

Ranking of police departments of St. Petersburg according to multiple-measure average, answers of "victims", "detained", those who contacted the police on their own initiative

Police department	«Victims»						«Detained»						Contacted police on their own initiative					
	1999		2000		2001		1999		2000		2001		1999		2000		2001	
	Average	Police department	Average	Police department	Average	Police department	Average	Police department	Average	Police department	Average	Police department	Average	Police department	Average	Police department	Average	Police department
78	1,58	73	1,41	1,37	42	1,37	21	1,67	45	1,79	04	1,61	19	1,77	42	1,68	25	1,60
20	1,38	32	1,37	1,36	36	1,36	70	1,49	74	1,79	07	1,61	76	1,65	54	1,68	35	1,52
23	1,28	29	1,37	1,32	52	1,32	20	1,38	12	1,63	47	1,61	24	1,55	01	1,60	24	1,51
14	1,28	07	1,33	1,31	73	1,31	76	1,31	49	1,63	53	1,61	75	1,47	22	1,59	45	1,50
10	1,20	65	1,31	1,30	18	1,30	05	1,28	06	1,60	64	1,61	17	1,45	41	1,44	54	1,43
03	1,15	01	1,27	1,25	22	1,25	79	1,24	19	1,47	72	1,61	45	1,44	36	1,44	60	1,43
75	1,13	45	1,25	1,22	24	1,22	63	1,24	28	1,47	37	1,48	21	1,34	44	1,43	57	1,42
49	1,06	44	1,24	1,20	33	1,20	14	1,24	54	1,47	75	1,48	20	1,30	06	1,43	31	1,35
76	1,05	37	1,23	1,19	20	1,19	23	1,14	26	1,43	45	1,43	27	1,27	32	1,42	75	1,34
59	1,05	21	1,21	1,18	06	1,18	59	1,10	73	1,36	10	1,34	05	1,25	37	1,41	36	1,34
07	1,04	33	1,19	1,17	76	1,17	31	1,06	71	1,31	16	1,34	78	1,25	30	1,34	70	1,33
28	1,04	05	1,18	1,17	34	1,17	58	1,06	64	1,28	31	1,34	58	1,10	43	1,33	27	1,33
24	1,04	63	1,17	1,17	04	1,17	45	1,03	42	1,27	35	1,34	65	1,08	60	1,27	12	1,25
58	1,04	49	1,16	1,17	53	1,17	27	1,03	43	1,27	32	1,25	63	1,08	27	1,25	15	1,25
19	1,03	59	1,16	1,17	45	1,17	36	1,03	65	1,26	61	1,25	32	1,06	52	1,25	07	1,25
45	1,01	22	1,13	1,12	32	1,12	65	1,03	53	1,22	15	1,16	70	1,05	72	1,25	23	1,24
62	1,00	40	1,12	1,12	64	1,12	32	0,96	70	1,22	30	1,16	64	1,00	11	1,24	05	1,24
31	1,00	76	1,12	1,12	65	1,12	03	0,92	76	1,22	18	1,15	28	0,98	15	1,19	30	1,24
79	1,00	11	1,09	1,12	11	1,12	24	0,92	13	1,20	71	1,11	31	0,91	53	1,19	32	1,24
32	0,99	43	1,09	1,12	60	1,12	06	0,92	04	1,17	42	1,11	49	0,89	61	1,19	11	1,16
36	0,96	13	1,08	1,11	07	1,11	17	0,89	20	1,17	44	1,11	10	0,89	75	1,19	44	1,16
63	0,94	27	1,07	1,11	23	1,11	78	0,89	23	1,15	60	1,11	03	0,83	64	1,16	16	1,16
57	0,93	41	1,07	1,11	70	1,11	61	0,85	30	1,15	66	1,11	07	0,83	20	1,15	62	1,16
05	0,92	06	1,06	1,10	37	1,10	08	0,82	68	1,15	77	1,11	62	0,80	13	1,09	17	1,15
61	0,89	17	1,06	1,09	19	1,09	62	0,82	59	1,11	09	1,10	15	0,78	07	1,09	72	1,15
65	0,84	12	1,05	1,07	15	1,07	07	0,82	02	1,10	01	1,06	59	0,76	29	1,09	74	1,15
06	0,84	74	1,03	1,05	17	1,05	49	0,78	52	1,07	36	1,06	08	0,73	74	1,09	58	1,15
08	0,83	30	1,03	1,04	54	1,04	64	0,78	32	1,06	05	1,06	79	0,63	34	1,06	22	1,15
15	0,82	42	1,02	1,04	25	1,04	75	0,78	01	1,02	23	1,06	06	0,59	38	1,06	28	1,15
27	0,80	23	1,01	1,04	71	1,04	28	0,74	40	1,02	41	1,06	61	0,54	25	1,04	34	1,15
64	0,78	72	1,00	1,03	31	1,03	19	0,71	25	1,01	43	1,06	23	0,51	68	1,02	38	1,15

70	0,74	34	0,99	35	1,02	15	0,57	60	0,99	57	1,06	14	0,47	02	1,01	52	1,08
17	0,69	53	0,99	68	1,00	10	0,50	62	0,99	58	1,06	36	0,37	12	1,01	68	1,07
21	0,67	04	0,98	30	1,00			11	0,95	17	1,06	57	0,37	76	1,01	47	1,06
		10	0,97	44	0,98			17	0,95	40	1,06			57	1,00	02	1,05
		64	0,97	40	0,97			29	0,95	34	1,02			05	0,98	20	1,05
		70	0,96	75	0,97			03	0,94	11	1,01			45	0,94	59	1,05
		19	0,95	74	0,97			66	0,94	74	1,01			09	0,93	01	1,00
		26	0,94	08	0,97			37	0,86	78	1,01			26	0,92	18	0,98
		31	0,94	62	0,97			07	0,86	73	0,97			71	0,91	06	0,98
		75	0,94	26	0,97			38	0,85	24	0,97			08	0,91	37	0,98
		60	0,90	38	0,96			57	0,84	54	0,92			31	0,90	64	0,97
		61	0,89	12	0,94			21	0,81	65	0,92			18	0,90	26	0,90
		18	0,89	51	0,93			05	0,75	25	0,92			04	0,85	40	0,90
		78	0,89	27	0,92			14	0,75	26	0,88			21	0,85	61	0,90
		66	0,89	77	0,92			22	0,75	70	0,88			65	0,83	19	0,90
		58	0,88	78	0,91			24	0,75	12	0,83			33	0,83	63	0,88
		24	0,87	41	0,91			27	0,75	33	0,83			58	0,83	43	0,88
		36	0,87	59	0,90			75	0,75	22	0,79			59	0,82	78	0,88
		51	0,87	14	0,89			44	0,74	59	0,78			19	0,77	29	0,88
		54	0,87	29	0,89			33	0,73	28	0,78			40	0,75	42	0,87
		57	0,87	61	0,88			41	0,73	21	0,74			23	0,74	77	0,82
		71	0,86	47	0,88			08	0,72	14	0,70			24	0,74	10	0,81
		52	0,85	72	0,88			58	0,64	38	0,70			28	0,74	82	0,80
		15	0,84	58	0,87			63	0,57	13	0,69			35	0,67	04	0,71
		02	0,83	21	0,87			15	0,56	51	0,69			17	0,66	14	0,71
		28	0,82	49	0,87			72	0,56	19	0,65			49	0,66	71	0,71
		09	0,81	03	0,86			10	0,54	52	0,65			73	0,66	49	0,71
		62	0,80	63	0,85			34	0,54	27	0,64			51	0,60	09	0,71
		03	0,79	13	0,84			35	0,54	76	0,60			62	0,59	08	0,62
		20	0,76	28	0,84			36	0,45	20	0,60			70	0,57	41	0,62
		25	0,76	09	0,80			78	0,45	49	0,51			10	0,51	33	0,62
		08	0,75	01	0,80			18	0,36	02	0,32			63	0,51	51	0,62
		68	0,75	05	0,79			31	0,36	03	0,32			78	0,51	65	0,54
		14	0,73	16	0,78					29	0,32			66	0,50	53	0,54
		38	0,73	57	0,77					62	0,32			03	0,42	21	0,53
		35	0,71	43	0,77					63	0,32			14	0,34	73	0,45
				02	0,77											03	0,45
				10	0,73											13	0,36
				82	0,70											66	0,36
				66	0,51											76	0,36

The range of evaluations according to the answers of “victims” was significantly smaller than for answers of those who independently contacted the police. In 1999, according to the answers of “victims” the maximum range of answers was observed. In 2001 the “poor” and “good” police departments received evaluations that were better than in 2000. The return results were obtained on the basis of questions of the first block of the questionnaire.

Multiple-measure average	1999	2000	2001
Max	1,58	1,41	1,37
Min	0,67	0,71	0,51
Range	0,91	0,70	0,86

The range of evaluations for answers from respondents who independently contacted the police was reduced each year. In 1999, as for the category of “victim”, the maximum range of answers was observed.

Multiple-measure average	1999	2000	2001
Max	1,77	1,68	1,60
Min	0,37	0,34	0,36
Range	1,40	1,34	1,24

Thus people who were detained by the police in 2001 assessed the work of “good” departments was better than in 1999-2000. “Poor” departments were recognized as such to a lesser degree in the last year of the survey.

The stability of ranks of police departments according to the data of the two surveys was evaluated, as before, on the basis of coefficients of the correlation.

Multiple-measure average	1999	2000	2001
Max	1,67	1,79	1,61
Min	0,50	0,36	0,32
Range	1,17	1,43	1,29

Coefficients of the correlation of ranks for “victims”:

1999-2000 = -0,229
 2000-2001 = 0,105
 1999-2001 = -0,071.

Coefficients of correlation of ranks for “detained”:

1999-2000 = 0,333
 2000-2001 = 0,22
 1999-2001 = 0,363.

Coefficients of correlation of ranks for “people who contacted the police”:

1999-2000 = -0,047
 2000-2001 = 0,268
 1999-2001 = -0,004

Thus according to the category of “detained” the correlation of ranks was more noticeable. More stable assessments of the activity of the police were obtained.

According to the assessments of the various categories of persons, five “better” and five “worse” police departments were picked out (table 3.28).

Table 3.28

Year	«Better» police departments	«Worse» police departments
Assessment of victims of crime		
1999	21, 17, 70, 64, 27	78, 20, 23, 14, 10
2000	35, 38, 14, 68, 8	73, 32, 29, 7, 65
2001	66, 82, 10, 2, 43	42, 36, 52, 73, 18
Assessment of people who were detained		
1999	10, 15, 19, 28, 75	21, 70, 20, 76, 5
2000	31, 18, 78, 36, 35	45, 74, 12, 49, 6
2001	63, 62, 29, 3, 2	4, 7, 47, 53, 64
Assessment of those who contacted the police		
1999	57, 36, 14, 23, 61	19, 76, 24, 75, 17
2000	14, 3, 66, 78, 63	42, 54, 1, 22, 41
2001	76, 66, 13, 3, 73	25, 35, 24, 45, 54

The grouping of police departments according to the assessments of people who were subject to criminal acts does not coincide with the results obtained earlier on the basis of general questions for all categories of people surveyed (table 3.26). This once again confirms the theory already proposed about the possible distortion of evaluations because the scene of the crime and the place of residence are in different areas. More stable results were obtained according to the answers of those who contacted the police on their own initiative. Thus in the group of “better” departments both in 2000 and in 2001, the 66th and the 3rd departments were included while the 54th department was included in the group of the “worse” departments.

The stability of the rank of police departments was assessed also on the basis of correlation coefficients for two categories (“victims” and “detained”) on the basis of different blocks of questions (table 3.27 and tables 3.22-3.23).

Coefficients of the correlation of ranks of police departments according to years were:

	According to answers of “victims”	According to answers of people who were “detained”
1999	0,245	0,188
2000	0,328	0,440
2001	0,146	0,441

According to the two categories the correlation was positive and more noticeable according to the answers of “detainees” in 2000-2001.

4. RESULTS OF THE RESEARCH

Part I PETERSBURG 1998 - 2000

4.1. Characteristics of the sample aggregate

4.1.1. Demographic structure

The proportions of men and women in the aggregate sample corresponds to their proportions in the population of Petersburg and is extremely stable for the duration of all three years of the investigation. In the sample, representatives of the two age groups 36-45 and 46-55 obviously dominate. These are the "older groups of the active employed population". Their total proportion for the years, amounted respectively to: 46,7%, 41,2% and 43,1%. The age groups at either extreme were also quite fully represented: 18-25 years old (17, 14 and 15%) and older than 60 (14, 19 and 16%). According to ethnic groups, the Russians dominate absolutely (91, 86, 86%), other Slavic groups are also represented to a significant extent (5, 8, 7%). "Caucasian peoples" are at the level of one per cent, and each of the remaining ethnic groups comprised less than one per cent of the total. 'Others' comprise, according to the years, respectively: 2,3 and 3%).

4.1.2. Social-status structure

As a whole the distribution of per capita income, both within the framework of each current survey, and in the dynamic, reflects the real picture very plausibly. In table 4.2., in particular, the inflation process is clearly surveyed. If in 1998 the modal interval of per capita income was an interval of 301-500 rubles, and the average income (according to the data of various studies) was within the range of 740-815 rubles, then in 1999 and 2000 the modal was an interval of 1 to 5 thousand rubles, and the average income in 1999 was in the range of 1320-1795 rubles, and in 2000 in the range of 1770-2250 rubles. Thus if in 1998 the proportion of incomes higher than 5.000 rubles was slightly less than 1%, in 1999 it was 5,5%, and in 2000 – 7,1%, then this by no means signifies that there were more rich people in St. Petersburg, it simply reflects monetary inflation.

The educational status of people surveyed was very high. The modal group - people with higher education – amounted to 28-30%. Alongside that, the proportion of those with an academic degree was a third of those surveyed. The next most representative educational group was people with a secondary specialized education, which comprised 25-27%. If we add to this people with incomplete higher education, then the number of this group exceeds a third of all who were surveyed. Consequently, people who possess special education in the sample make up more than 60%. About another quarter of the people surveyed have completed secondary or vocational-technical education. Since, as a rule, vocational-technical schools, along with teaching a profession, confer a document of complete secondary education, such a combination is entirely correct. It is worth while to note that among this fourth, just half reported that they have secondary education and the rest insisted that they had vocational-technical education.

Accordingly, in the social-professional section, the group of employees with secondary or higher specialized education was dominant.

Table 4.1.

Demographic characteristics of respondents, %

Characteristics	Proportion in aggregate			
	Sex			
	Year of survey			Average
	1998	1999	2000	
Men	42,0	44,1	42,7	43,1
Women	58,0	55,9	57,3	56,9
Total	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
Age				
	1998	1999	2000	
18-25 years	17,1	14,3	15,2	15,3
26-30 years	7,7	10,0	9,9	9,5
31-35 years	8,1	8,6	8,7	8,5
36-45 years	27,1	21,8	22,1	23,1
46-55 years	19,6	19,4	21,0	20,0
56-60 years	6,3	6,9	7,0	6,8
61 and older	14,0	18,9	16,1	16,7
Average age (years)	43,4	45,2	44,3	44,5
Ethnic origin				
	1998	1999	2000	
Russians	90,6	85,6	86,2	86,9
Other Slavic peoples	5,3	8,1	7,2	7,1
Caucasian peoples	,8	1,5	1,6	1,4
Turkic peoples	1,0	,5	,6	,7
Peoples of the Finno-Ugric group	,4	,6	,6	,6
West European peoples	,0	,5	,6	,4
Other	1,8	3,3	3,2	2,9
Total	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

The proportion of skilled workers was also quite high in the sample (per year: 15, 12.5 and 12%) and pensioners (respectively: 17, 21 and 19%). The proportion of students fluctuated over the years in the range of 6-9%, the proportion of people employed in the service sector was in the range of 3-5%, employees without special education, and the unemployed, are represented in the sample at approximately the same level. The proportion of business people in 1998 amounted to 2.5%, and in 1999 and 2000 it was at the level of 4%. Thus in a more detailed analysis it would seem expedient to differentiate between employees with specialized education, skilled workers, and pensioners, and all the other social-occupational categories as one group.

Table 4.2.

Social-status characteristics of respondents, %

Characteristics	Proportion in aggregate			
	Average monthly income			
	Year of survey			Average
	1998	1999	2000	
Up to 100 rubles	1,0	0,1	0,2	0,3
101-300 rubles	9,9	1,3	0,4	2,9
301-500 rubles	33,7	8,3	2,9	11,8
501-700 rubles	24,8	14,1	5,2	13,0
701-900 rubles	15,6	16,0	11,4	14,1
901-999 rubles	7,6	18,8	19,9	16,8
1.000 – 5.000 rubles	6,5	36,0	52,8	36,0
5.000 – 10.000 rubles	0,7	4,6	6,1	4,3
10.000 – 15.000 rubles	0,0	0,6	0,8	0,5

15.000 rubles and above	0,1	0,3	0,2	0,2
Total answered	99,5	99,7	99,6	99,6
Average for aggregate (in rubles)	743,9	1795,5	2247,1	1739,1
According to surveys of Inst. of Sociology Rus. Acad. Sciences (rubles)	813,3	1319,3	1768,0	
According to data of SNITs 2000	-	-	1090,0	
Education				
	Year of survey			Total
	1998	1999	2000	
Elementary	1,0	,7	,7	,7
Incomplete secondary	5,3	5,4	5,0	5,2
Complete secondary education	13,6	14,8	13,6	14,1
Vocational-technical school	12,6	13,4	12,2	12,8
Secondary specialized	26,9	25,7	24,7	25,6
Incomplete higher education	7,2	10,9	11,4	10,3
Higher	30,1	26,3	29,8	28,5
Academic degree	3,1	2,6	2,5	2,7
Total answered	99,80	99,80	99,90	99,90
Social group				
	1998	1999	2000	Average
Unskilled workers	3,5	2,1	2,1	2,4
Skilled workers	15,2	12,5	12,2	13,0
Employees without specialized education	4,9	5,1	4,1	4,7
Employees with secondary specialized education	15,0	12,6	12,6	13,1
Employees with higher education	22,1	16,6	19,3	18,9
Business people	2,5	4,3	4,4	4,0
Managers	1,9	2,8	2,9	2,6
Free professions	1,2	1,7	1,6	1,6
People providing services	3,4	4,1	5,0	4,3
Unemployed	3,3	2,8	2,0	2,6
Housewives	3,7	4,0	4,4	4,1
Students	5,7	8,4	8,6	7,9
Pensioners	16,8	20,7	18,7	19,1
Other groups	,8	2,1	2,2	1,9
Total	100	100	100	100

4.1.3. Years of residence in micro-district

Since our attention was focussed on questions of the daily activity of the police in a specific area, the question of how long a respondent had been living in a given micro-district also served as a test of competence. That is, it gave evidence of how well a respondent adapted in this district and how certainly he can judge the state of affairs in this area.

From table 4.3. it is obvious that almost half of the people who were surveyed are long-term residents of their micro-districts, that is, they have lived there for more than 15 years. Around another third are people who have lived more than 5 years in the micro-districts studied, while a fifth of the people studied have lived there 10-15 years. From this one can draw the conclusion that the evaluations that respondents gave about the activities of the local police are fully competent and based on many years of experience and observations.

Table 4.3.

Years of residence in the micro-district, %

Characteristic	Proportion of aggregate			
	Length of time of residence in micro-district			
	Year of survey			Average
	1998	1999	2000	
Less than a year	2,4	1,7	1,2	1,7
1-3 years	6,0	6,1	5,4	5,8
3-5 years	6,6	7,3	7,4	7,2
5-10 years	15,2	15,6	15,4	15,4
10-15 years	20,9	21,7	21,7	21,5
15-30 years	35,4	33,4	34,4	34,2
More than 30 years	13,6	14,2	14,4	14,1
Average duration of residence in city (years)	17,5	17,5	17,8	17,6

4.2. How the population perceives police activity in the micro-district

4.2.1. How noticeable are the police in the micro-district

As is evident from table 4.4. the residents of the micro-district constantly sense the presence of the police, between one third and two fifths of those surveyed say that most recently they saw a policeman in the last week, and another third – in the last 24 hours. However, about 20% of those surveyed notice the police significantly more seldom, and approximately every tenth person found it hard to answer this simple question.

Table 4.4

How noticeable are the police in the micro-district, %

When did you see a policeman most recently?	Year of survey			Average
	1998	1999	2000	
	in the last 24 hours	29,9	30,4	
In the last week	34,6	37,4	42,5	38,8
In the last month	14,9	14,6	15,5	15,0
More than a month ago	7,6	6,8	5,1	6,3
Hard to answer	13,1	10,8	10,5	11,2
	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

According to table 4.5. (the situations are arranged according to the frequency of encounter) it can be seen that the residents more clearly see, not so much people in police uniform, but the special vehicles associated in citizens' minds with the police. According to the observations of the people surveyed, the police pay quite a great deal of attention to keeping an eye on the work of business (from 27 to 30%). Other aspects and situations of the activity of the police were registered considerably less often (in order).

Table 4.5.

Situations of the last visual contact with the police, %

Situation	Year of survey			Average
	1998	1999	2000	
Police patrol	57,5	53,0	49,5	52,6
Police vehicle	61,4	58,0	60,6	59,8
Patrolling shopping zone	30,0	28,1	27,5	28,3
Detaining, searching someone	8,8	7,8	6,7	7,6
At the scene of an incident	7,9	7,3	7,6	7,6
Talking with residents	7,5	8,0	7,4	7,6
Separating people in a fight	2,2	1,5	1,8	1,8
One or several policemen on motorcycles	,3	,6	,6	,5

The *depersonalization* of contacts between citizens and the police is also corroborated by the answers to the direct question about the extent that the people surveyed are acquainted with the police who work in their micro-district (table 4.6.). The overwhelming majority of the people surveyed (two thirds) do not know any police officers.

Here we shall note that for the most part differences in the distribution of answers between different years of research are statistically insignificant. In cases when these differences are significant and suggest any kind of change or tendency, we make special comments on them.

Table 4.6.

Personification – depersonification of contacts, %

Acquaintance with policemen in the micro-district				
	Year of survey			Average
	1998	1999	2000	
Know by name	11,1	12,4	10,3	11,3
Know by sight	21,4	24,1	22,9	23,0
Do not know anyone	67,5	63,4	66,8	65,6
	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

4.2.2. The population's level of evaluation of police activity

For the evaluation, respondents were presented with 10 criteria or aspects of the work of the police. How the residents perceive the police is reflected in table 4.7.

Above all we note *the relative balance of positive and negative assessments according to practically all proposed criteria*, and also a very large proportion (from 17 to 37%) of difficulties in answering the questions under consideration.

Table 4.7.

The population's perception of police activity in the micro-district, %

Responsibility of the police for the state of public order in the micro-district				
	Year of survey			Average
	1998	1999	2000	
Absolutely no, or almost no	18,2	16,9	18,1	17,7
Partially or completely yes	68,7	73,7	71,9	71,8
Hard to answer	13,2	9,4	10,0	10,5
	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
Success of police in preserving public order in the micro-district				
	Year of survey			Average
	1998	1999	2000	
Very poor or quite poor	48,4	48,8	46,2	47,7
Quite good or very good	30,3	35,7	37,7	36,3

Hard to answer	21,3	15,6	16,0	17,0
	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
Police cooperation with residents in solving problems of public order				
	1998	1999	2000	
Very poor or quite poor	54,9	58,9	54,3	56,2
Quite good or very good	17,	17,1	17,9	17,4
Hard to answer	28,1	24,1	27,8	26,4
	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
Effectiveness of help given by police to victims of crimes				
	1998	1999	2000	
Absolutely no or rather no	41,0	47,3	45,6	45,2
Rather yes or definitely yes	26,7	17,0	17,4	17,8
Hard to answer	39,4	35,7	37,1	37,1
	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
Regulation of the work of the police in crime prevention in the micro-district				
	Year of survey			Average
	1998	1999	2000	
Very poor or quite poor	44,3	48,8	46,6	46,9
Quite good or very good	16,0	14,9	15,1	15,2
Hard to answer	39,6	36,4	38,3	37,9
	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
Maintaining order on the streets and in public places of the micro-district				
	1998	1999	2000	
Absolutely no or rather no	37,7	36,5	35,4	36,3
Rather yes or completely yes	49,9	55,6	55,0	54,1
Hard to answer	12,3	7,8	9,6	9,5
	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
Politeness of policemen working in the micro-district				
	1998	1999	2000	
Very impolite, or impolite	13,6	14,0	15,3	14,4
Not very polite	34,1	33,5	31,0	32,6
Very polite	16,7	17,4	16,8	17,0
Hard to answer	35,6	35,2	37,0	36,0
	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
Policemen's attentiveness to problems that concern residents of the micro-district				
	1998	1999	2000	
Absolutely inattentive or quite inattentive	28,3	28,6	27,3	28,0
Quite attentive or very attentive	19,4	17,2	15,3	16,9
Some are attentive, others – not	28,6	31,0	29,6	29,9
Hard to answer	23,7	23,2	27,9	25,2
	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
Readiness of the police to help residents of the micro-district in their difficulties				
	Year of survey			Average
	1998	1999	2000	
Of course no, or rather no	29,8	27,7	28,1	28,3
Rather yes or of course yes	21,3	18,1	15,1	17,6
Some ready to, others – not	28,7	29,7	29,1	29,2
Hard to answer	20,4	24,6	27,7	24,8
	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
Fairness to people on the part of policemen working in the micro-district				
	1998	1999	2000	
Absolutely unfair or generally unfair	15,2	15,2	15,1	15,1
Generally fair or completely fair	16,9	15,6	14,7	15,5
Some fair, others not	32,3	33,0	30,8	32,0
Hard to answer	35,5	36,3	39,4	37,3
	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

The people surveyed were most confident in evaluating the degree of responsibility taken by the police for: maintaining order on the streets (9,5% found it hard to answer) and the state of public order (10,5%). Already 17% of the people surveyed found it difficult to answer concerning the success of the police's work in preserving public order, granted, this proportion was 21% of the respondents in 1998.

Incidentally, the numbers of those who found it difficult to assess their attitude must differ significantly when different criteria are considered. Let us say that if 37% (on average for all three years of research) of people surveyed find it difficult to assess how fairly the police treated people, this signifies that they do not encounter the police and do not have personal experience, nor personal grounds for such an assessment. And this can be interpreted as a positive factor. It is another matter when almost 25% of the respondents find it hard to assess how ready the police were to help residents in their difficulties. This is hardly evidence that the police are popular or that the citizens have very much confidence in them. This is especially so when here we observe that more and more people being surveyed tend to find it hard to evaluate this: in 1998 they were 20%, in 1999 almost 25, and in 2000 – already 28%.

The answers to a direct question about changes in the work of the police during the last year, (table 4.8.), also confirmed our observation about the stability of the distribution through the evaluation criteria.

Table 4.8.

Evaluation of changes in the work of the police

Changes of the work over a year				
	Year of survey			Average
	1998	1999	2000	
For the worse	8,2	9,2	9,3	9,0
Did not change	45,6	54,1	57,4	53,5
For the better	8,8	11,9	9,4	10,3
Hard to answer	37,4	24,8	24,0	27,3
	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

As we see, the overwhelming majority of the respondents either did not notice any changes, or found it hard to give a reply. Only every fifth gave a definite answer to this question, and these voices are distributed approximately equally between change for the worse and change for the better.

Now we will consider which aspects of police activity are perceived by the residents as problems that disturb them (the citizens) (see table 4.9.).

The question itself highlighted the attention paid by respondents to the “problematic” aspect and concern about of the proposed aspects of police activity. Therefore it is not surprising that in all six questions of this block, either the version “**serious problem**”, or “**hard to answer**” were modal.

In this case the large proportions of people who found it hard to answer can be evaluated as a positive manifestation. Of course it is possible to explain such a result as the fear of the respondents of unpleasant consequences or as a sincere reaction to the question. However, another explanation seems preferable, one related to a lack of personal experience.

A simple interpretation of quite major weight in the distribution of different versions of the answer “serious problem” is that either people yield to a different opinion about the policemen's tendency to treat detained people illegally and inhumanly, or actually they have had their own negative experience. However, both variants of the interpretation demand additional careful verification and justification.

“Problem” area in police treatment of residents of the micro-district

Unjustified detention on the streets				
	Year of survey			Average
	1998	1999	2000	
Not a problem	11,9	12,6	12,2	12,3
Insignificant problem	21,8	26,0	23,0	23,9
Serious problem	29,8	30,9	30,1	30,4
Hard to answer	36,4	30,5	34,7	33,4
	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
Brutal treatment of detained people				
	1998	1999	2000	
Not a problem	5,9	6,3	6,4	6,2
Insignificant problem	13,0	16,6	16,7	15,8
Serious problem	39,2	36,9	35,1	36,7
Hard to answer	42,0	40,3	41,8	41,2
	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
Unjustified use of physical force against detained people				
	1998	1999	2000	
Not a problem	5,3	5,1	6,3	5,6
Insignificant problem	10,7	13,8	14,5	13,4
Serious problem	39,4	39,3	35,4	37,8
Hard to answer	44,5	41,9	43,8	43,2
Using insults when detaining a person				
	1998	1999	2000	
Not a problem	5,5	5,4	6,3	5,8
Insignificant problem	12,5	15,3	14,3	14,3
Serious problem	39,0	38,9	36,5	38,0
Hard to answer	43,1	40,5	42,9	42,0
Taking bribes				
	1998	1999	2000	
Not a problem	4,6	2,6	3,2	3,3
Insignificant problem	4,7	6,8	6,6	6,2
Serious problem	36,5	41,9	39,8	39,9
Hard to answer	54,2	48,8	50,4	50,6
Participation in underground business activity				
	1998	1999	2000	
Not a problem	4,1	3,9	5,1	4,4
Insignificant problem	5,6	6,9	7,7	6,9
Serious problem	31,7	30,3	24,9	28,5
Hard to answer	58,6	58,9	62,3	60,2

Also, as in the research of 1998, we applied the algorithm of factor analysis in studying the public's perception of police activity. As a whole, five factors were singled out as “axial” indicators among them.

- Factor 1 – forcible methods;
- Factor 2 – culture of treatment
- Factor 3 – effectiveness in maintaining public order,
- Factor 4 – professionalism of the police;
- Factor 5 – criminal activity by the police.

These factors were obtained for the united aggregate of the three surveys. However, it is worth while to note that in a separate analysis of the aggregates according to the years of the surveys, in spite of

the fact that the general character of factors remains unchanged, in specific factor decisions several variants are noticed, which demand attention. In particular, for the aggregate of 1998, the factor of “effectiveness” was very informative, and the factor of “professionalism” was not discovered at all. Its place was occupied by a factor that stood on its own as the one indicator of responsibility, whereas the aggregates of 1999 and 2000 gave absolutely identical factor decisions (see table 4.10.)

Table 4.10.

Matrix of factor loads: the population’s perception of police activity (“axial” indicators)²

Initial indicators	Factors				
	1 (3,1)	2 (2,4)	3 (2,2)	4 (2,0)	5 (1,7)
	Forceful method	Culture of treatment	Effectiveness	Professionalism	Crimininalisation
Detention without justification	,737				
Harsh treatment	,869				
Unjustified application of force	,866				
Assault when detaining people	,828				
Polite to residents		,482			
Attentive to residents		,803			
Ready to help people		,812			
Fair with people		,787			
Responsibility			,757		
Preserving public order			,682		
Order on the streets			,702		
Changes in work during the year			,583		
Cooperation with residents				,715	
Helping victims				,701	
Preventing crimes				,773	
Taking bribes					,839
Participating in underground business activity					,841
Total information quotient of factors = 67,0 %	18,3 %	14,1 %	13,1 %	11,7 %	9,8 %

4.3. Population’s perception of contacts on initiative of the police (detentions)

Among all the people who were surveyed, 16,4% mentioned that in the last year they had been stopped on the streets or in public places by policemen. The methodical effect explains the circumstance that according to the results of the 1998 survey, the number of those stopped was equal to the number of those detained. In 1999 and 2000 instead of one question, two were suggested to the respondents: first, were they stopped by policemen and second, was this followed by detention. Therefore the line “Fact of detention” in table 4.11 is somewhat different in its content from the concluding line “Proportion of people detained out of the overall number of respondents”.

² Here and subsequently - the method of main components, with rotation according to Varimax - the criterion, the five-factor decision. In the corresponding tables only the value of the factor loads that achieved statistical significance is presented.

Table 4.11.

Contacts with police on the initiative of policemen: detention on the streets and in public places, (% of the number of those who mentioned the fact of detention)

A. Fact of questioning of police on the street or in public places				
	Year of survey		Average	
	1998	1999	2000	
Fact of detention	14,4	17,6	16,4	16,4
B. Where it occurred				
	1998	1999	2000	
In your micro-district	50,0	45,2	48,0	47,9
In another micro-district	46,6	51,0	51,0	49,3
In another city	3,4	3,7	1,0	2,8
Proportion of people detained out of total number of respondents	14,4	6,7	5,5	8,0
C. Reason for detention on the street				
	1998	1999	2000	
Verification of documents	42,3	36,9	44,0	41,0
State of intoxication	12,4	23,7	22,5	18,8
Being suspected of something	9,7	12,4	11,5	11,1
Violation of public order	5,7	7,9	1,5	5,3
Involvement in fight	2,7	2,9	3,5	3,0
Violation of business regulations	1,3	2,5	1,0	1,6
Vagrancy		,4	,5	,3
Other reason	20,1	8,3	10,0	13,5
Hard to answer	5,7	5,0	5,5	5,4
Proportion of detentions out of total number of respondents (%)	14,4	6,7	5,5	8,0
Were they polite on this occasion				
	1998	1999	2000	
Very impolite or impolite	35,6	60,6	61,0	50,6
Not very polite	35,9	31,1	30,5	32,9
Very polite	24,2	2,9	3,0	11,5
Hard to answer	4,4	5,4	5,5	5,0
Proportion of people detained out of total number of those surveyed	14,4	6,7	5,5	8,0
Were they fair on this occasion				
	1998	1999	2000	
Absolutely unfair or rather unfair	48,3	57,6	61,0	54,8
Rather fair or completely fair	41,9	32,3	25,0	34,2
Hard to answer	9,7	10,0	14,0	11,0
Proportion of people detained out of total number of people surveyed	14,5	6,7	5,5	8,0
Did they act within the framework of the law				
	1998	1999	2000	
Not certain at all or rather not certain	50,6	45,2	57,0	50,6
Rather certain or completely certain	37,3	32,8	25,0	32,5
Hard to answer	12,1	22,0	18,0	16,9
Proportion of people detained out of total number of people surveyed	14,5	6,7	5,5	8,0

It is characteristic that detentions about which respondents speak took place both on the territory of the micro-district where they lived and on the territory of other micro-districts of the city, and in approximately equal proportions. There were considerably fewer detentions in other populated areas.

The most frequent reason why policemen stop and detain citizens on the street, according to the testimony of respondents, is to check documents, the next most common reasons are that a person is in a state of intoxication and that a person is suspected of something.

Respondents' impressions of the contact with the police is rather negative, the data of table 4.11 give evidence of this. This table records an unfavorable tendency. Particularly noticeable is the decrease (from 42% in 1998 to 25% - in 2000) of the proportion of people who more or less certainly consider that the policemen treated them fairly in a case of detention. The same unfavorable trend is less conspicuously marked with reference to assessments of whether the police acted legally on these occasions. And here the proportion of positive judgements decreases from 37% in 1998 to 25% - in 2000.

Table 4.12.

Vehicle ownership among people surveyed, %

	Year of survey			Average
	1998	1999	2000	
Own an automobile	23,5%	36,8%	35,5%	33,4%
Own a motorcycle	1,0%	1,6%	1,1%	1,3%

As we see, there is a very high proportion of vehicle owners among those surveyed. However, an even higher proportion of people had contact with the police on the initiative of the police in connection with vehicles. The data presented in table 4.13. give evidence that employees of the GBDD (vehicle and traffic police) operate increasingly actively every year.

It is not surprising that vehicles are considerably more often stopped by policemen in other micro-districts of the city and even in other cities. Evidence of the activity of the street and highway patrol service of the GIBDD is the fact that the most common reason for stopping vehicles (in nearly 60% of the cases) is "routine verification". Such reasons as "violation of traffic regulations" and "exceeding the speed limit" were mentioned by respondents about a third as often.

Table 4.13.

**Contact with the police on the initiative of policemen: detaining vehicles
(% of the number of those who mentioned incident of detention)**

A. Occasion when vehicle was stopped				
	Year of survey			Average
	1998	1999	2000	
Occasion when vehicle was stopped	26,6	39,2	40,5	37,0
B. Where was the automobile stopped				
	1998	1999	2000	
In another micro-district	63,9	59,6	58,7	59,9
In another city	19,9	24,4	25,4	24,1
In your micro-district	16,1	16,0	15,8	16,0
Proportion of those detained out of total number of people surveyed	26,6	39,2	40,5	37,0
C. Reason for detaining automobile				
	1998	1999	2000	
Routine verification	53,4	57,7	58,6	57,4
Violation of traffic regulations	19,6	14,9	13,1	14,9
Excessive speed	12,7	17,3	16,2	16,1
Driving in state of intoxication	2,7	1,2	1,6	1,6
Violations of the registration regulations	2,5	2,8	3,8	3,2
Running into a pedestrian, etc.	,9	,5	,8	,7
Other reason	4,0	2,6	2,8	2,9
Do not know	4,2	3,0	3,2	3,3
Proportion of people detained out of total number of those surveyed	26,6	39,2	40,5	37,0

4.4. Victims' experience and victims' contact with the police

539 people were the victims of different types and forms of crime in 1998, in 1999 – 960, in 2000 – 923. Precisely these figures serve as the basis for calculating the percentage correlations in the tables printed in this section of the report. We notice that the level of victimisation (at least according to the testimony of respondents) over the last three years of the research is very stable and takes in more than a fourth of those surveyed.

4.4.1. Respondents who were victims of crimes

Table 4.14.

Types of criminal activity (% out of the number victims)

	Year of research			Average
	1998	1999	2000	
Theft	56,7	53,0	54,4	54,4
Fraud	19,3	20,6	19,8	20,0
Assault	9,2	10,5	11,6	10,6
Holdup (robbery)	8,2	7,0	8,0	7,6
Extortion	5,4	6,7	4,7	5,6
Sexual violence	1,1	2,2	1,4	1,7
Proportion of victims among people surveyed in this year	26,0	26,7	25,5	26,1

Data in table 4.14. are arranged according to the proportion of the overall number of victims, the last line presents the proportion of victims out of the total number of people surveyed according to years and on the average for all three surveys. And here we observe the high stability of statistics: differences in the proportions do not go beyond the boundaries of the normal error of measurement, called the "error of frequency". We can confirm a very weak trend toward a relative increase only for such types of crime as assault. We speak of the trend with caution since in this case the differences of percentages also are statistically insignificant.

Table 4.15.

Number of incidents (% of the number of victims)

	Year of research			Average
	1998	1999	2000	
One	63,5	69,4	72,0	69,1
Two-three	31,0	25,0	24,6	26,2
Four and more	5,6	5,6	3,4	4,7
Proportion of victims among people surveyed in this year	26,0	26,7	25,5	26,1

The overwhelming majority among those who testified to having been victims of crime them during the period of the research were victims one time. Only every fourth victim was subjected to this two or three times and only every twentieth was a victim four or more times during the year.

The most widespread type of crime suffered by the respondents was theft, as follows from table 4.16. In the overwhelming majority of cases this was street theft. Holdups and robberies (indicated on one line in the questionnaire) are encountered considerably more seldom, but citizens come up against these also more often on the street than in the home.

Table 4.16.

Incidence of holdups or thefts (% from the number of victims of these types of crimes)

Robbery, holdup				
	Year of research			Average
	1998	1999	2000	
In the home	22,7	32,8	25,7	27,6
On the street, in public place	77,3	67,2	74,3	72,4
Proportion of victims among people surveyed in this year	8,2	7,0	8,0	7,6
Theft				
	Year of research			Average
	1998	1999	2000	
In the home	25,7	30,6	23,7	26,9
On the street, in public place	74,3	69,4	76,3	73,1
Proportion of victims among people surveyed in this year	56,7	53,0	54,4	54,4

4.4.2. Members of respondents' families who were victims of crimes

Table 4.17.

Family members who were victims (% of the number of people surveyed)

Types of criminal activity	Year of research			Average
	1998	1999	2000	
Theft	7,9	10,2	10,5	9,8
Fraud	3,0	6,2	6,7	5,7
Assault	3,8	4,0	4,1	4,0
Holdups	2,2	2,8	2,5	2,5
Extortion	1,2	2,0	1,4	1,6
Sexual violence	,3	,4	,2	,3
Other crime	,1	,3	,7	,4
Proportion of respondents who told about family members being victims of crimes	15,0	21,8	22,2	20,4

It is interesting that family members were victims of crime considerably less frequently than the respondents themselves. This is especially noticeable with reference to the more "popular" types of criminal activity. The general picture of crime suffered among respondents and among members of their families is practically identical. This also relates to circumstances of holdups and theft (comparison of tables 4.16. and 4.18.). Table 4, 18

Incidence of holdups or theft suffered by respondents' family members (% of the number of victims of these kinds of crimes)

Where was family member robbed	1998	1999	2000	Total
In the home	34,9	34,3	27,1	31,7
On street, in public place	65,1	65,7	72,9	68,3
Proportion of respondents who told about family members being victims of crimes	2,2	2,8	2,5	2,5
Where was family member a victim of theft	1998	1999	2000	Total
In the home	23,4	26,8	22,0	24,2
On street, in public place	76,6	73,2	78,0	75,8
Proportion of respondents who told about family members being victims of crimes	7,9	10,2	10,5	9,8

The typical and widespread type of criminal activity of which respondents were direct or indirect victims was trespass on residential buildings and vehicles (see table 4.19.).

Either every two out of three people surveyed mentioned the first of these, or every second; either every third or every fourth among vehicle owners encountered the second.

Experience as victims — trespass on residential buildings and vehicles, %

Table 4.19.

Residential building	Year of survey			Average
	1998	1999	2000	
Obscene inscriptions on walls	69,0%	64,3%	59,9%	63,6%
Damage to doors, glass, light fixtures	67,9%	60,3%	57,6%	60,9%
Damage and/or breaking open mail boxes	58,7%	50,2%	46,1%	50,5%
Vehicles	Year of survey			Average
	1998	1999	2000	
Theft of personal articles from (with) vehicle	27,5%	26,4%	25,5%	26,2%
Deliberately inflicting damage	22,0%	21,1%	19,1%	20,4%
Breaking into storage area	4,2%	3,9%	4,2%	4,1%
Stealing	3,8%	3,9%	3,4%	3,7%
Proportion of owners of vehicles who were victims, from among all those who were surveyed	23,8	37,7	35,9	34,0

4.4.3. Victims' contacts with the police

At the least, *only about a third of victims (this number fluctuates between 26% and 31%) informed the police about what happened.* In turn, a third of this number stated that the police reacted "immediately", in the opinion of another third the reaction came "after some time". Granted that every seventh person of those who turned to the police confirmed that there was no such reaction and approximately the same proportion of those who contacted the police "know nothing" about their reaction.

Reporting to the police by victims of crimes, %

Table 4.20.

A. Fact of reporting to police				
	Year of survey			Average
	1998	1999	2000	
Did not report	70,3%	69,2%	73,7%	71,2%
Reported	29,7%	30,8%	26,3%	28,8%
Proportion of victims out of the number of people surveyed, %	26,0	26,6	25,3	26,0
B. Reaction of police to report				
	Year of survey			Average
	1998	1999	2000	
Did not react at all	13,8	11,9	15,4	13,5
A long time afterward	5,0	5,1	8,7	6,3
Some time afterward	30,0	33,6	33,6	32,8
Immediately	36,3	38,3	29,0	34,6
Do not know anything about actions of police	15,0	11,2	13,3	12,8
Proportion of those who reported incidents to police out of total number of victims (%)	29,7	30,8	26,3	28,8

C. Reasons for refusing to report				
<i>Why did they not report, %</i>	1998	1999	2000	Average
Nothing would be done	38,3	34,2	34,5	35,2
The suspect is unknown	26,1	22,7	22,4	23,4
The police could not do anything	19,5	18,8	17,2	18,3
Injury was insignificant	16,6	14,1	17,3	15,9
There was no injury	10,5	16,8	15,4	14,8
There was no proof	10,6	9,8	9,4	9,9
Did not want to contact police	8,2	7,8	7,5	7,8
It was possible to manage without the police	5,5	7,7	6,8	6,9
They were themselves to blame for what happened	5,3	4	4,7	4,5
There was no chance to contact the police	4,5	3,3	3,8	3,8
The police were not pleased with the report	3,1	3,4	3,5	3,4
They detained the guilty person themselves	1,8	2,3	2,8	2,4
They were afraid of revenge by the criminal	2,6	1,7	2,6	2,3
Felt sorry for the one who did it	0,6	0,8	2,4	1,3
Applied to other agencies	0,8	1,9	0,5	1,1
Afraid of publicity about what happened	0	0,8	0,8	0,7
Can not precisely say what the reason was	0,8	2,4	0,9	1,8
Can not answer the question	1,3	1,8	1,6	1,5
Proportion of victims who did not report incident to the police	70,3%	69,2%	73,7%	71,2%

Section "C" of table 4.20. presents the reasons why victims did not report to the police. We note that approximately two thirds of the crime victims did not report to the police.

During the course of the survey, each respondent had the chance to indicate simultaneously no more than three reasons for refusing to report to the police. 100% of all the victims cited one reason for not wanting to report to the police, two reasons were referred to (respectively, according to years: 54%, 44% and 65%) on average by 53%, and respectively: 23, 18,5 and 17,0% referred to three reasons, on average – 22%. The table presents the general number of references to each of the listed reasons without taking into account the circumstance of whether it was mentioned in first, second, or third place.

As we see, respondents were most inclined to the attitude that policemen "would not do anything". Approximately a fifth of those who declined to inform the police consider that "the police could not do anything". About 10% explain their refusal by saying that they "did not want to have contact with the police". The other reasons were chosen by a significantly smaller number of respondents.

4.5. Independent contact with the police by the population

The fluctuations of the proportion of respondents who independently contacted the police during the year preceding the survey seem quite accidental and hard to explain. Also, the structure (rank) of motives for such contact changes quite appreciably from year to year. The reasons for these "movements" also seem very random.

Reasons for independently contacting the police by people who were not victims of crime

Motives for contact, %	Year of survey			Average
	1998	1999	2000	
To obtain certificate, document	48,4	58,5	56,1	56,3
Concerning personal problems	14,3	22,4	22,9	21,6
Because of other problems or difficulties	8,7	15,4	14,9	14,4
As a witness	8,7	13,2	12,9	12,5
Concerning law and order in the micro-district	9,4	11,8	8,4	10,1
Reporting suspicious noises	1,8	11,6	7,3	8,6
Reporting a suspicious person	2,7	9,7	7,3	7,9
Reporting an accident	3,8	3,6	9,1	7,8
Presenting information to the police	3,1	9,1	7,6	7,7
Reporting about another incident	1,3	7,8	5,2	5,9
Total of those who contacted the police	99,8	100,0	100,0	100,0
Number of those who made contact out of number of people surveyed	8,7	15,4	14,9	14,4

Properly speaking, a certain stability is observed. The following motives (reasons) continue to occupy the first four places from year to year: receiving certificates or documents, personal problems and "other problems or difficulties". For unknown reasons, the other reasons for contacting the police that were proposed for the respondents to choose from move sometimes up, sometimes down in this rating, on average, 2 positions. This circumstance requires the most constant attention and the development of a definite strategy aimed at raising the authority of the police in public opinion, at restoring trust in the police on the part of the population.

Table 4.22.

Assessment of the results of independent contact with the police by people who were not victims of crime, %

Was their attitude attentive				
	Year of survey			Average
	1998	1999	2000	
Yes	68,1	72,5	74,2	72,6
Did they give genuine help				
	1998	1999	2000	
Not at all or not completely	28,4	26,8	25,0	26,2
Yes, but not enough or yes, completely	68,1	66,8	69,9	68,2
Hard to answer	3,6	6,4	5,1	5,5
Were they polite				
	1998	1999	2000	
Very impolite or impolite	10,0	14,3	14,4	13,7
Not very polite	29,0	75,9	73,9	69,2
Very polite	54,9	5,7	6,9	12,4
Hard to answer	6,0	4,1	4,8	4,6
Did they act fairly				
	1998	1999	2000	
Were not fair at all or rather unfair	18,3	17,4	15,6	16,7
Rather fair or completely fair	65,9	68,8	68,1	68,0
Hard to answer	15,8	14,0	16,3	15,2
Were they satisfied with the way they were treated				
	1998	1999	2000	

Absolutely no or rather no	31,7	30,8	29,5	30,4
Rather yes or completely yes	64,7	64,1	65,4	64,7
Hard to answer	3,6	5,1	5,0	4,9
Those who contacted the police who were not victims of crime (proportion of all who were surveyed)	21,4	46,4	39,9	38,5

In spite of the fact that as a whole the evaluation of results of contact have a "positive balance", there are no grounds for assessing the state of affairs as favorable. Especially disturbing are the assessment of how polite policemen are in their treatment of citizens and the assessment of how satisfied the people surveyed were with their contact with the police. Differences that were discovered among proportions of these or other values of the assessments are statistically insignificant and can not be evidence of even a hint of any kind of tendency, any kind of "movement".

Part II PETERSBURG, VOLGOGRAD, BOROVICHI

4.6. Characteristics of the sample aggregate

4.6.1. Demographic structure

The sex-age structure of the sample aggregates in the three cities is very similar.

Table 4.23.

Social-demographic characteristics of people surveyed

Sex				
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	Average
Men	42,7	44,6	44,6	43,4
Women	57,3	55,5	55,4	56,6
	3617	2000	502	6119
Age				
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	Average
18-25 years	15,2	12,7	13,7	14,3
26-30 years	9,9	9,5	9,0	9,7
31-35 years	8,7	8,5	8,2	8,6
36-45 years	22,1	19,9	20,3	21,2
46-55 years	21,0	16,9	16,3	19,3
56-60 years	7,0	7,4	7,2	7,1
61 and older	16,1	25,2	25,3	19,8
Average age (years)	44,3	47,4	47,3	45,6
Ethnic origin				
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	Average
Russians	86,2	94,2	79,9	88,3
Other Slavic peoples	7,2	2,9	12,7	6,2
Peoples of the Finno-Ugric group	,6	,1	1,2	,5
Turkic peoples	,6	,9	2,0	,8
Caucasian peoples	1,6	1,5	3,6	1,7
Western European peoples	,6	,1	,2	,4
others	3,2	,4	,4	2,0
	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

Although in the population of all three cities the Russians dominate in absolute terms, there are substantial differences in the ethnic makeup of each of them. Borovichi was the most multi-national.

4.6.2. Social-status structure

Differences were also noticeable in the status characteristics of the population. Thus, the average per capita income of respondents in Petersburg was almost twice as much as the average income of people surveyed in Volgograd and almost 700 rubles higher than the income of respondents from Borovichi. The average income in Borovichi in turn is almost 400 more than the same indicator for Volgograd. This is while in Borovichi the sample did not include representatives of the highest income group.

Table 4.24.

Social-status characteristics of respondents

Per capita income				
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	Average
Up to 100 rubles	0,19	0,26	0,4	
101-300 rubles	0,44	1,64	0,2	0,8
301-500 rubles	2,95	7,78	7,85	4,9
501-700 rubles	5,2	16,13	13,9	9,4
701-900 rubles	11,4	25,65	28,37	17,41
901-999 rubles	19,95	24,27	21,73	21,47
From 1 to 5 thousand rubles	52,9	23,24	20,9	40,67
From 5 to 10 thousand rubles	6,1	0,87	6,6	4,45
From 10 to 15 thousand rubles	0,78	0,15	1,0	0,59
More than 15 thousand rubles	0,25	0,15		0,2
Total who answered	99,4	97,65	99,00	98,8
Average per capita income (in rubles)	2506,0	1374,5	1782,3	2080,9
Education (scale)				
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	Average
Higher	29,8	21,9	8,6	25,5
Secondary specialized	24,7	29,4	24,9	26,2
Complete secondary	13,6	22,8	25,3	17,6
Vocational-technical school	12,2	6,9	17,1	10,9
Incomplete higher	11,4	4,1	9,6	8,9
Incomplete secondary	5,0	12,1	11,6	7,8
Academic degree	2,5	,4		1,6
Elementary	,7	2,4	1,2	1,3
Special institution for disabled	,1	,1	1,8	,2
	3617	2000	502	6119
Social-professional group				
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	Average
Unskilled worker	2,1	4,0	4,0	2,9
Skilled worker	12,2	13,6	8,4	12,3
Employee without specialized education	4,1	4,5	4,0	4,2
Employee with secondary specialisation	12,6	11,6	12,7	12,2
Employee with higher education	19,3	12,3	4,2	15,8
Entrepreneurs	4,4	3,2	9,2	4,4
Managers	2,9	1,7	3,2	2,5
Free professions	1,6	,3	2,0	1,2
Service sphere	5,0	1,6	4,2	3,8
Unemployed	2,0	4,3	10,0	3,4
Housewives	4,4	5,7	2,8	4,7
Pupils	8,6	6,0	1,2	7,1
Pensioners	18,7	30,4	28,5	23,3
Other groups	2,2	1,2	5,8	2,1
	3617	2000	502	6119

Among people surveyed in Borovichi, the proportion of entrepreneurs amounted to 9% against 4% in Petersburg and 3% in Volgograd. The proportion of managers here also is somewhat higher. However, the proportion of unemployed in Borovichi also was maximum: 10% against 2 in Petersburg and 4 in Volgograd. With reference to pensioners, their proportion in Volgograd and Borovichi noticeably exceeds the proportion of this group in Petersburg.

Discussing the Petersburg sample, we noted that the educated and qualified groups of the population were most noticeable in it. In the two other cities the unskilled workers were represented at the same level (for 4% against 2% in Petersburg). And if the groups of specialists with higher education in Petersburg and Volgograd are wholly comparable (13 and 12%, respectively), then in Borovichi, its representatives are practically nonexistent (in all, 4%).

4.6.3. Length of residence in the micro-district

Differences in the period of time the people surveyed had lived in each of the cities may be considered not very important. Nevertheless it is worth while to note that the proportion of long-time residents in Borovichi noticeably exceeded the proportion of long-time residents of Petersburg and Volgograd. The average length of residence here is somewhat greater.

Table 4.25.

Period of residence in the city

Length of residence in micro-district				
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	Average
Less than a year	1,2	3,3	,2	1,8
1-3 years	5,4	5,5	8,4	5,7
3-5 years	7,4	5,8	12,5	7,3
5-10 years	15,4	12,8	13,1	14,3
10-15 years	21,7	16,6	16,3	19,6
15-30 years	34,4	38,1	18,5	34,3
More than 30 years	14,4	18,1	30,9	17,0
Average length of residence (years)	16,1	17,3	19,3	16,7

4.7. Population's perception of police activity in the micro-district

Against the background of revealed differences in social-status characteristics of the sample aggregates it is right to expect equally noticeable differences in the way the population perceives the activity of the police. Incidentally, the different status of the surveyed cities is by itself already a significant factor that influences this perception. In particular, residents of the small town of Borovichi, when answering the questionnaire questions, chose the position "difficult to answer" much more often than did Petersburgers or Volgogradians.

4.7.1. How noticeable are the police in the micro-district

Also as in Petersburg, residents of Volgograd and Borovichi *constantly feel the presence of the police*. The modal (most often mentioned) version of the answer to the question: "When was the last time when you saw one or several policemen in your micro-district?" in Petersburg and Borovichi was "during the last week", and in Volgograd, exactly every third person surveyed said "in the last 24 hours". Granted that in Volgograd 12% of those surveyed chose the version "more than a month ago".

Visibility of the police in the micro-district

	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borobichi	Average
Seen in the last 24 hours	26,4	33,3	21,9	28,3
in the last week	42,5	25,9	42,8	37,1
In the last month	15,5	13,6	19,1	15,1
More than a month ago	5,1	12,1	2,6	7,2
Hard to answer	10,5	15,3	13,5	12,3
	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

In table 4.27. the situations in which the respondents observed police in their micro-district were ordered according to the frequency of encounter. The respondents from Volgograd and Borovichi, as also the Petersburgers, have visual contact not so much with people in police uniform as with special vehicles associated in the citizens' minds with the police. The Volgograd and Borovichi police are encountered only half as often by Petersburgers during checkups of business zones. However, residents of Borovichi substantially more often encounter police "at the place of incidents" (12% against 8 in Petersburg and 4 in Volgograd). 15% of the respondents from Volgograd observed policemen talking with residents while in Petersburg this was only 4%, and in Borovichi this version of the answer was not countered at all. Other aspects and situations of police activity are registered considerably (in sequence) more rarely.

Table 4.27.

Situations of most recent visual contact with police, %

	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	Average
Police patrol	49,5	48,9	64,5	50,5
Police car	60,6	25,4	77,5	50,5
Checking business zone	27,5	10,7	10,0	20,6
At the place of an incident	7,6	4,2	11,6	6,8
Talked with residents	3,7	14,9		6,8
Detained, searched someone	6,7	1,8	4,6	4,9
Broke up a fight	1,8	1,1	6,6	2,0
One or more policemen on motorcycles	,6	,3	,2	,5
	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

From the following table (4.28.) it is obvious that *the size of the city manifests itself in the degree of personalisation – de-personalisation* of citizens' relations with the police officers. Naturally the largest (and approximately equal) proportions of people who know no one in the police force in their micro-district occur in Petersburg and Volgograd. However, in Volgograd a statistically significant larger number of respondents chose the position "I know them by name", that is, demonstrated the maximum personification of contacts with the police. Petersburg and Borovichi are here on the same level (10%). In Borovichi almost 31% of those surveyed confirmed that they "know by sight" their police.

Table 4.28.

Personalisation – de-personalisation of contacts, %

	City			Total
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	
Know by name	10,3%	16,1%	10,8%	12,2%
Know by sight	22,9%	17,1%	30,9%	21,7%
Do not know anyone	66,8%	66,9%	58,4%	66,1%
	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%

4.7.2. Level of evaluation by the population of the activity of the police

For greater contrast in considering the assessments of police activity, the scales were reshaped into bipolar (in essence, into dichotomous) scales. The position "hard to answer" was retained, since it contains information very important for interpretation.

Thus in the respondents' opinion, to what extent the police are responsible for the state of public order that has come about in the micro-district? In Petersburg 19% do not assign this to the responsibility of the police, 27% – in Volgograd and 18% - in Borovichi. There is no tendency noticeable here. But the number of those who consider the police responsible is formed in a certain order, specifically: the smaller the populated area, the lower the proportion of people inclined to make the police responsible. Simultaneously there is an increased proportion of those who find it hard to evaluate (or decline to do so). Is such an apportionment of voices coincidental or normal?

Table 4.29.

Perception by the population of police activity in the micro-district, %

Responsibility				
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	Average
Absolutely no or almost no	19,1	27,5	17,6	21,1
Partially or completely yes	71,9	58,1	53,2	65,8
Hard to answer	10,0	14,5	29,3	13,1
Preservation of public order				
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	
Very poor or rather poor	46,2	53,7	41,7	48,2
Rather good or very good	37,7	27,8	35,1	34,2
Hard to answer	16,0	18,7	23,3	17,5
Cooperation with residents				
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	
Very poor or rather poor	54,3	61,0	40,9	55,4
Rather good or very good	17,9	18,5	10,6	17,5
Hard to answer	27,8	20,6	48,6	27,1
Help for victims				
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	
Absolutely no or rather no	45,5	41,7	37,5	43,6
Rather yes or definitely yes	17,4	23,0	9,8	18,6
Hard to answer	37,1	35,5	52,8	37,8
Prevention of crimes				
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	
Very poor or rather poor	46,6	49,9	34,3	46,7
Rather good or very good	15,1	19,0	16,9	16,5
Hard to answer	38,3	31,2	48,8	36,8
Order on the streets				
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	
Absolutely no or rather no	35,4	42,6	38,3	38,0
Rather yes or completely yes	55,0	41,7	38,9	49,3
Hard to answer	9,6	15,7	22,9	12,7
Polite with residents				
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	
Very impolite or impolite	15,3	18,7	8,0	15,7
Not very polite	31,0	25,4	35,5	29,5
Very polite	16,8	20,8	9,8	17,5
Hard to answer	37,0	35,2	46,8	37,2

Attentive to residents				
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	
Completely inattentive or rather inattentive	27,3	31,4	23,1	28,2
Rather attentive or very attentive	15,3	22,6	12,2	17,4
Some attentive, others – not	29,6	17,1	27,1	25,3
Hard to answer	27,9	29,0	37,6	29,1
Ready to help residents				
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	
Of course no or rather no	28,1	30,1	27,5	28,6
Rather yes or of course yes	15,1	25,0	11,2	18,1
Some ready, others – not	29,1	17,1	21,7	24,6
Hard to answer	27,7	27,9	39,6	28,7
Fair to people				
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	
Absolutely unfair or rather unfair	15,1	20,1	6,8	16,0
Rather fair or completely fair	14,7	20,5	9,0	16,1
Some fair, others – not	30,8	18,5	22,7	26,1
Hard to answer	39,4	41,2	61,6	41,8

A picture of distribution that is strictly similar to what is described above is found only in the part of the table devoted to the answer to the question “*Are the police successful in maintaining the necessary order on the streets and in public places in your micro-district?*”. An order of distribution of answers that is not so precise, but gravitating toward what was described, is very typical for table 4.29.

As a whole, a similar trend is revealed also in the distribution of evaluations of changes in the work of the local police (table 4.30.). *The larger the city, the lower the proportion of those who note changes for the worse and, in contrast, the higher the proportion of those who note changes for the better.* The growth also in the proportion of those who find it hard to answer is not so marked.

Table 4.30.

Evaluation of changes in the work of the police, %

	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	Average
For the worse	9,3	9,3	4,0	8,8
Did not change	57,4	47,1	50,0	53,4
For the better	9,4	12,5	14,7	10,9
Hard to answer	24,0	31,1	31,3	26,9

In assessing the “problematic” nature or tension of various aspects of the activity of the police (table 4.31.), the modal is the version “hard to answer”. Thus, the overwhelming majority of those surveyed in all three cities reported that they were not competent (or not informed well enough) to answer this question. This essential fact is reflected in the character of the distribution of “informative” versions of the answer. Here no stable order is discovered.

Table 4.31.

“Problem” area in relations of the police with the residents of the micro-district, %

Detention without justification				
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	Average
Not a problem	12,2	12,5	11,2	12,2
Insignificant problem	23,0	15,1	18,3	20,0
Serious problem	30,1	38,5	7,4	31,0
Hard to answer	34,7	34,0	63,1	36,8
Harsh treatment				
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	
Not a problem	6,4	7,0	11,0	7,0
Insignificant problem	16,7	12,2	15,7	15,1
Serious problem	35,1	43,2	13,7	36,0
Hard to answer	41,8	37,7	59,6	41,9
Unjustified application of force				
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	
Not a problem	6,3	6,7	7,6	6,5
Insignificant problem	14,5	11,7	16,1	13,7
Serious problem	35,4	42,2	11,8	35,7
Hard to answer	43,8	39,5	64,5	44,1
Using insults when detaining someone				
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	
Not a problem	6,3	7,5	5,0	6,6
Insignificant problem	14,3	11,9	13,1	13,4
Serious problem	36,5	41,3	18,9	36,6
Hard to answer	42,9	39,4	62,9	43,4
Taking bribes				
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	
Not a problem	3,2	4,8	1,6	3,6
Insignificant problem	6,6	6,3	12,7	7,0
Serious problem	39,8	45,0	13,1	39,3
Hard to answer	50,4	44,0	72,5	50,1
Participation in underground business				
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	
Not a problem	5,1	5,7	2,6	5,1
Insignificant problem	7,7	6,2	4,2	6,9
Serious problem	24,9	34,7	4,8	26,4
Hard to answer	62,3	53,5	88,4	61,6

When the interrelations between the evaluations of different aspects of police activity are considered, it is possible to reveal the latent structure of this complex.

Matrix of factor-loads: the population's perception of police activity ("axial" indicators)³

	Factors (latent variable)				
	Forcible methods	Culture of treatment	Effectiveness	Professionalism	Corruption
Detention without justification	,713				
Harsh treatment	,860				
Unjustified use of force	,859				
Using insults when detaining people	,823				
Polite to residents		,511			
Attentive to residents		,779			
Ready to help residents		,782			
Fair to people		,759			
Responsibility			,665		
Maintenance of public order			,666		
Order on the streets			,688		
Changes in work during the year			,616		
Cooperation with residents				,705	
Help for victims				,704	
Crime prevention				,726	
Taking bribes					,820
Participation in underground business activity					,837
Information content of factors	17,8	13,6	12,4	11,6	9,4

Earlier we considered in detail the factor solution received for the Petersburg aggregate. In table 4.32. a similar solution is presented for the combined aggregate of the three cities. As we see, they are practically alike (compare with table 4.10). However, the matrices for the separate cities differ from each other somewhat. Thus in Borovichi factors that have the same sense (latent variables) have a different content. In addition to this, for this city the assessment of the fairness of policemen's treatment of people acquired special significance – it formed a separate factor (information quotient almost 9%). The evaluation of changes in the work of the police here has a high correlation with the latent variable which we interpreted as the syndrome of professionalism. In the Volgograd aggregate the assessment constituted an autonomous factor with quite a high information quotient (6%). The syndrome (factor) of professionalism included the first six indicators of the questionnaires.

4.8. The population's perception of contacts on the initiative of policemen (detention)

The proportion of those who had experience of contact with the police on the streets in Petersburg and Borovichi was approximately the same – at the level of 16-17%. In Volgograd they were somewhat fewer – a total of 11%. Here the residents of Petersburg have such experience predominantly within the boundaries of the city (this happens in other micro-districts slightly more frequently.), while for 75% of those surveyed in Volgograd and Borovichi, they were stopped by the police in the micro-districts where they lived. About one fifth of the respondents from Borovichi had experience of contacts with the police in other populated areas.

³ Here and further on – the method of the main components with rotation according to the Varimax – a criterion of the five-factor variable. In the corresponding tables we present only the values of the factor loads that achieve statistical significance.

**Contacts with the police on the initiative of policemen:
detention on the streets and in public places,
(% of the number of those who mentioned the fact of detention)**

	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	
They stopped you on the street ⁴	16,4	11,1	17,5	14,7
Detained after this ⁵	33,8	24,0	42,0	32,2
Where this took place				
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	
In your micro-district	48,0	75,5	75,7	56,6
In another micro-district	51,0	22,6	2,7	39,7
In another city	1,0	1,9	21,6	3,8
Reason for detention on the street				
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	
Verification of documents	44,0	34,0	35,1	41,0
State of intoxication	22,5	41,5	5,4	23,8
Suspected of something	11,5	5,7	21,6	11,7
Involvement in a fight	3,5	,0	2,7	2,8
Disrupting public order	1,5	3,8		1,7
Violating business regulations	1,0	1,9	5,4	1,7
Vagrancy	,5	,0	,0	,3
Other reason	10,0	5,7	18,9	10,3
Hard to answer	5,5	7,5	10,8	6,6
Proportion of people detained	33,8	24,0	42,0	32,2
Were they polite on this occasion				
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	
Very impolite or impolite	61,0	49,1	81,1	61,3
Not very polite	30,5	32,1	18,9	29,3
Very polite	3,0	9,4	,0	3,8
Hard to answer	5,5	9,4	,0	5,5
Were they fair on this occasion				
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	
Absolutely unfair or rather unfair	61,0	56,6	86,6	63,5
Rather fair or completely fair	25,0	32,1	13,4	24,9
Hard to answer	14,0	11,3	,0	11,7
Did they operate within the law				
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	
Absolutely not certain or rather not certain	57,0	52,8	89,2	60,3
Rather certain or completely certain	25,0	35,8	8,1	24,9
Hard to answer	18,0	11,3	2,7	14,8

The order of recollection of the reasons for detention on the street is essentially different in different cities. However, the verification of documents stands in first place, which is evidence of the fact that the police are quite watchful and oriented toward preventing crime. In Petersburg the second line in the list is occupied by a reason such as being in a state of intoxication. In Volgograd this reason was in first place and in Borovichi a total of 5% of the number of people detained on the street cited this reason. Here the second most important reason was that a person was suspected of something. This coincidence is interesting – the proportion of Borovichians who indicated this reason coincides (precisely up to the figure after the decimal point) with the proportion of people detained in other populated areas. It is also noteworthy that in Borovichi the reason “disrupting public order” is not mentioned at all.

⁴ % of total number of those surveyed

⁵ % of number of those who were stopped on the street

The respondents' evaluation of policemen's behavior in a situation of detention is very indicative. The overwhelming majority of those who were detained on the street consider the conduct of the guardians of order as very impolite or impolite. The Volgogradians are more fair in this evaluation. The overwhelming majority also think that the police are not fair to them. 25% of the Petersburgers, 32% of the Volgogradians, and only 13% of the Borovichi inhabitants who were detained on the streets regard the behavior of the police as fair.

The legality of the police's actions is evaluated similarly. 25% of the Petersburgers, 36% of the Volgogradians, and 8% of the Borovichians recognized it as legal. It is also worth while to mention that this is the only block of questions in which the Borovichians had practically no difficulties with answers.

Before considering the experience of contacts with the police (on their initiative) in connection with vehicles, we will pay attention to the quite high rate of vehicle ownership in all three cities (table 4.34.).

Table 4.34.

Ownership of vehicles among people who were surveyed, %

	City			Average
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	
Own an automobile	35,5	31,7	30,1	33,8
Own a motorcycle	1,1	1,9	1,8	1,4
Total	36,6	33,6	31,9	35,2

The distribution of places where vehicle owners were detained by the police in Volgograd and Borovichi substantially differ from the same distribution in Petersburg. If the Petersburgers were prevailingly stopped in other micro-districts and in other populated points, then in Borovichi, 55% of the detentions took place in the micro-district where the resident lived, and in Volgograd – almost 37%.

Table 4.35.

Contacts with the militia on the initiative of policemen: stopping vehicles, (% of the number of those who mentioned the fact that they were stopped)

	City			Average
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	
Stopped in automobile ⁶	40,5	21,8	25,7	33,1
Where was automobile stopped				
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	
In your micro-district	15,8	36,8	55,0	22,8
In another micro-district	58,7	51,0	20,9	54,7
In another city	25,4	12,2	24,0	22,5
Proportion of owners of vehicles	40,5	21,8	25,7	33,1
Reason for stopping automobile				
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	
Routine verification	58,6	52,2	46,5	56,4
Violation of traffic regulations	13,1	26,7	19,4	16,4
Excessive speed	16,2	12,9	20,2	15,7
Violation of registration regulations	3,8	1,1	1,6	3,1
Driving in a state of intoxication	1,6	1,1	1,6	1,5
Running into a pedestrian, etc.	,8		2,3	,7
Other reason	2,8	3,9	3,9	3,1
Do not know	3,2	2,1	4,7	3,1
Proportion of owners of vehicles	40,5	21,8	25,7	33,1

⁶ % out of the overall number of those who own vehicles

As in Petersburg, the commonest reason for stopping and/or detaining vehicles is routine verification. Violation of traffic regulations is mentioned quite often, in particular exceeding the speed limit. Special note should be taken of the relatively high proportion of respondents of Borovichi who mentioned this reason (20%). Other reasons are mentioned by less than five per cent of the number of those who were detained.

4.9. Experience of victims and victims' contact with the police

Theoretically, residents of large cities are those most likely (and in actuality) to have the experience of being victims of various types and forms of crime. In fact the largest proportion of persons who have this unpleasant experience are in Petersburg. And although the proportion of those who have such experience among the inhabitants of the small town of Borovichi is 2% greater than such people in the large city of Volgograd, statistically this difference is not significant and is within the range of the error of frequency. Thus it can be stated that approximately the same proportion of respondents from Volgograd and Borovichi have the experience of being victims of crimes.

4.9.1. Experience of respondents who were victims of crimes

Theft is the form of crime encountered most frequently by respondents in all three cities. Fraud occupies second place in this "rating" in Petersburg and Borovichi, and in Volgograd – "assault", which "sank" to a lower row in the two other cities. In Volgograd a noticeable proportion of those surveyed also mentioned a type of crime such as "burglary, robbery" (14%). To determine the order further than the fourth position, as is evident in table 4.36., is practically senseless, for the differences in percentages here are statistically insignificant.

Table 4.36.

Types of criminal activity (% of the number of victims)

	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	
Theft	54,4	57,3	40,8	54,1
Fraud	19,8	9,8	22,3	17,5
Assault	11,6	14,7	14,6	12,6
Holdup, robbery	8,0	14,1	4,9	9,3
Extortion	4,7	3,2	16,5	5,2
Sexual violence	1,4	,9	1,0	1,3
Total of those who were victims	25,5	18,0	20,5	22,9
	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

Table 4.37 gives evidence of the continuity or regularity of the experience of being victims of crimes, and it scarcely requires special commentary (at least the first part of this table).

Respondents' description of the last instance when they were victims of crimes adds practically nothing to the picture described above. The general picture of table 4.37. differs slightly from the previous table.

Table 4.37.

Number of incidents (% of victims)

How many incidents				
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	
One	72,0	72,8	86,4	73,3
Two-three	24,6	24,4	13,6	23,7
Four and more	3,4	2,8		3,0
	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
Total who have been victims	25,5	18,0	20,5	22,9
What sort of crime was it				
	City			
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	Average
Theft	14,6	10,5	8,4	12,7
Fraud	6,9	2,6	5,4	5,4
Assault	4,0	3,9	3,0	3,9
Holdup, robbery	2,4	2,8	1,2	2,4
Extortion	1,6	,9	3,4	1,5
Other crime	1,0	1,9	,2	1,2
Sexual violence	,4	,4	,2	,4
Total who have been victims	25,5	18,0	20,5	22,6

By way of commentary on table 4.38. we devote attention to the figures picked out in boldface type, which give evidence of the fact that *in contrast to Petersburg, in Volgograd and Borovichi, theft from apartments is more widespread than street theft*. And in Borovichi, moreover, the burglary of homes stands out as statistically significant - at least in the experience of respondents who have been included in our research.

Table 4.38

Circumstance of holdups or thefts, (% of victims of this type of crime)

Where was the holdup, theft				
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	
In the home	25,7	38,8	28,6	30,8
On the street	74,3	61,2	71,4	69,2
Proportion of those who were victims of this type of crime	8,1	13,6	1,4	9,4
	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
Where was the theft				
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	
In the home	23,7	40,7	61,9	30,5
On the street	76,3	59,3	38,1	69,5
Proportion of victims of this type of crime	53,8	55,3	8,3	53,2
	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0

4.9.2. Members of respondents' families who were victims of crimes

It appears that members of the family are not very eager to inform the members of their household about their experience of being victims of crimes. In the summary line of table 4.37. it is evident that the proportion of respondents here is noticeably lower than in table 4.35., where it was a matter of the respondents' own experience of being victims of crime.

Table 4.39.

Family members who were victims, % of people surveyed

	City			Average
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	
Holdup of member of family	11,2	20,2	8,5	13,0
Theft from member of family	10,5	5,8	3,2	8,4
Fraud against member of family	6,7	1,3	3,2	4,7
Assault of member of family	4,1	2,5	2,6	3,4
Extortion of member of family	1,4	,9	2,4	1,3
Other incident with member of family	,7	1,1	,2	,8
Sexual violence against member of family	,2	,2		,2
Proportion of respondents who told about member of family being victim of crime	22,2	11,6	11,8	17,9

The data in table 4.39. is ordered according to the degree of distribution in the family members' experience of being victims of different kinds of crimes. In all three cities here robbery and theft occupy the first places. In Petersburg and Borovichi third place is taken by fraud, in Volgograd assault takes third place. Thus the general picture of the hierarchy of crimes, recorded while taking into account the respondents' personal experience in being victims, is corroborated. The observation made earlier is also confirmed, about the specifics of robbery and theft committed in the different cities. And here we observe a distribution of theft and burglary from flats that is greater in Volgograd and Borovichi than in Petersburg.

Table 4.40.

Occurrence of robbery or theft from members of respondents' families, (% of percentage of the number of people victimised by this sort of crime)

Where was family member robbed				
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	Average
In the home	27,1	28,9	20,0	27,4
On the street	72,9	71,1	80,0	72,6
Proportion of respondents who told about member of family being victim of crime	2,4	2,25	1,0	2,2
Where did theft from family member occur				
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	
In the home	22,0	37,5	68,8	27,0
On the street	78,0	62,5	31,3	73,0
Proportion of respondents who told about member of family being victim of crime	10,3	5,6	3,2	8,2

4.9.3. Crimes against homes and vehicles

Unfortunately these types of crimes are extremely widespread in all three cities studies. More than 50% of the respondents mention each of the listed kinds of criminal acts. To a greater extent than residents of other cities, residents of Volgograd suffer from encroachment on residential buildings. People surveyed in Borovichi, more often than elsewhere confirm the presence of indecent graffiti in entry ways.

With reference to encroachments on vehicles, according to the results of the survey, the most unfavorable situation was recorded in Borovichi. Here there was more frequent mention of all types of encroachment on vehicles that were proposed for evaluation. In this respect Volgograd appears more favorable. Petersburg, accordingly, occupies an intermediate position.

Table 4.41.

Experience of victims — encroachments on residential buildings and vehicles, %

Encroachment on home				
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	Average
Indecent graffiti	59,9	61,7	66,7	61,1
Breaking of door	57,6	63,7	49,6	58,9
Burning of mail boxes	46,1	58,1	32,7	48,9
Suspicious persons	44,2	52,4	48,8	47,2
	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
Encroachment on vehicle				
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	Average
Theft from automobile	25,5	17,1	27,0	23,0
Damage to automobile	19,1	7,5	25,8	16,0
Car broken into (garage)	4,2	7,5	11,7	5,8
Proportion of vehicle owners	35,9	33,4	32,5	34,8

4.9.4. Victims' contacts with police

Among the elements of the victims' experience, the factor of interaction (or refusal) with the employees of law-enforcement agencies is of major importance. This section of the report is devoted to analysis of just this element.

Table 4.42. gives evidence that among the Petersburg residents who were victims of crimes in the year preceding the survey, only every fourth person decided to seek protection from the police (or in any case to inform the police about what happened). As the same time, two out of five inclined to this decision in Volgograd and Borovichi. Whether this means that in these cities the inhabitants have more trust in the police than in Petersburg, or signifies something else, remains to be investigated.

Table 4.42.

Crime victims' contact with the police, %

Did they report this to the police? (% of the number of those who were victims of crimes)				
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	Average
No	73,7%	58,6%	58,3%	68,6%
Yes	26,3%	41,4%	41,7%	31,4%
Proportion of victims of repeated crimes out of number of people surveyed, %	25,4	18,0	20,5	22,6
Did police react quickly, (% of number of those surveyed)				
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	Average
Did not react at all	15,4%	13,4%	2,3%	13,4%
After a long time	8,7%	12,1%	11,6%	10,2%
After some time	33,6%	29,5%	39,5%	32,8%
Immediately	29,0%	43,6%	46,5%	35,8%
Do not know anything about actions of police	13,3%	1,3%		7,9%
Reasons for refusing to contact the police (% of number of those who refused to contact the police)				
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	Average
They wouldn't do anything	34,5	27,0	18,3	31,8
The police couldn't do anything	22,9	21,8	23,3	22,6
Suspect was unknown	25,1	18,5	6,7	22,4

Injury was insignificant	17,4	21,3	25,0	18,8
There was no injury	15,4	9,5	26,7	14,8
Did not want to have contact with police	10,7	9,5	6,6	10,1
There was no proof	10,6	8,0	3,4	9,5
They were to blame themselves for what happened	9,1	7,5	3,3	8,4
Could manage without the police	7,5	7,1	6,7	7,4
There was no opportunity to get in touch with the police	5,7	2,8	10,1	5,4
They caught the guilty person themselves	3,5	3,8	23,3	4,9
Police would be displeased with contact	4,7	2,3	1,7	4,1
Felt sorry for the one who did it	2,5	1,4	10	2,8
Feared revenge from criminal	2,9	1,8	0	2,6
Contacted other agencies	1,2	1,4	11,6	2
Feared publicity about what happened	0,6	0,5	0	0,5
Can not state the reason precisely	0,8	6,2	3,4	2,2
Can not answer the question	1,7	11,8	1,7	4
Proportion of people who refused to contact police	73,7%	58,6%	58,3%	68,6%

Judging by the impression of the policemen's rapid reaction on the part of the respondents who contacted the police, *the inhabitants of Volgograd and Borovichi have more grounds to have confidence in the police*. More than 40% of those who contacted the police give assurances that the police reacted "immediately" and another 30% in Volgograd and 40% in Borovichi think that the police reacted "after some time" (a short time, it must be assumed). Whereas in Petersburg only less than 30% of the people who contacted the police spoke of the immediate reaction of the police and slightly more than a third (which is comparable to the data in the two other cities) mentioned the somewhat slow, but still quite rapid reaction. At the same time 15% of the Petersburgers said that the police did not react at all to what happened, and another 13% announced that they do not know at all whether the police reacted to their contact.

What are the motives of those who did not report an incident to police? Most often cited among the motives is a reason which gives evidence of the complete distrust of law-enforcement agencies, specifically: "They wouldn't do anything". However, the total proportion of this motive in Petersburg amounted to 34, in Volgograd – 27, and in Borovichi – 18%. In second place was the motive which somewhat conditionally can be described as "sympathetic". It expresses the point of view that (even with the best will in the world (the police *would not be able* to do anything. In all three cities the proportion of the adherents of this position were about equal and comprised a little more than 20%.

Among the reasons for refusing to contact the police, the reference to the scale (insignificant) of injury, of the lack of injury occupies an important place. The smaller the size of the city, the higher the proportion of those who cite this reason (in Petersburg 17, in Volgograd 21, and in Borovichi – 25%).

The specific Borovichi victims' situation involves two factors that either make it impossible to contact the police or no longer necessary. Both of these factors, specifically the impossibility of contacting the police and the respondents' own activity ("detained the guilty person themselves"), are not typical of Petersburg or Volgograd, where these factors, although they are mentioned, are at a very low level (3-6%). Whereas in Borovichi the first is mentioned by 10%, and the second by 23% of the victims. We can not fail to also mention such a factor in refusing to contact the police as "contacting other agencies". This factor was practically not mentioned in Petersburg and Volgograd (about 1%) and in Borovichi it was named by 12% of the number of victims who did not contact the police.

4.10. The population's independent contact with the police

As with the Petersburg aggregate, the data here can not reveal any clear tendencies either in the number of citizens who independently contacted the police or in the structure of reason for this refusal.

Table 4. 43.

Reasons for independent contact with the police by persons who were not victims of crimes

	City			Average
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	
To obtain certificate, document	56,1	36,5	56,8	51,3
Concerning personal problems	22,9	25,8	32,8	24,5
Because of other problems or difficulties	14,9	29,4	8,3	17,9
As a witness	12,9	22,4	25,5	16,4
Concerning law and order in the micro-district	8,4	16,2	22,9	11,6
Reporting an accident	9,1	8,1	16,7	9,5
Reporting a suspicious person	7,3	10,7	9,9	8,4
Presenting information to the police	7,6	9,4	9,9	8,3
Reporting suspicious noises	7,3	7,7	1,6	6,9
Reporting some other incident	5,2	9,4	7,8	6,5
Total who contacted the police	100,0	100,0	100,0	100,0
Proportion of those who made contact from among the respondents	39,6	26,6	38,2	35,2

We can easily explain only the motives that occupy first place in the hierarchy of motives – obtaining certificates and documents. In either of the other two cities that were studied, apart from Volgograd, almost 60% point to this reason for contact. In Volgograd these were almost two times more seldom. Second place in this rating of motives in Petersburg and Borovichi was occupied by citizens' "personal problems" – in Volgograd this reason was moved to third place and the second is occupied by "other problems and difficulties". In Borovichi third and fourth places were taken by such reasons for contact as given testimony "as a witness" and "concerning law and order in the micro-district". In Petersburg these reasons take, respectively, places 4 and 6-7 (problems of law and order share space with presenting information to the police).

The interpretation of these data demands more detailed information about the social-political, economic, and most import, social-psychological atmosphere in the cities studied, or more careful and more prolonged observation. In other words, in order to better understand the general picture, a longer trend of indicators is essential.

Incidentally, an analysis of the evaluation of the results of their contact with the police by the respondents themselves can help to a certain extent.

Assessment of the results of independent contact with the police by people who were not victims of crimes,
(% of the number who contacted the police on their own initiative)

Were they attentive				
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovochi	
No	12,8	26,5	8,8	15,6
Yes	81,6	68,1	88,0	79,0
Hard to answer	5,6	5,5	3,2	5,4
Did they give real help				
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	
Not at all or not entirely	17,7	34,5	19,2	27,7
Yes, but not sufficiently or yes, fully	78,3	60,0	70,4	73,3
Hard to answer	4,1	5,5	10,4	5,0
Were they polite				
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	
Very impolite or impolite	11,9	12,2	6,4	11,5
Not very polite	76,0	67,7	85,6	75,0
Very polite	8,3	17,1	8,0	10,3
Hard to answer	3,8	2,9		3,2
Were they fair				
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	
Completely unfair or rather unfair	11,0	18,4	13,6	13,0
Rather fair or completely fair	75,2	69,7	81,6	74,5
Hard to answer	13,8	11,9	4,8	12,5
Were you satisfied				
	Petersburg	Volgograd	Borovichi	
Absolutely no or rather no	21,2	37,1	19,2	24,6
Rather yes or completely yes	74,3	56,8	76,8	70,6
Hard to answer	4,5	6,1	4,0	4,8
Proportion of those who made contact out of number of those surveyed	25,0	15,5	24,9	21,9

The overwhelming majority (over 80%) of those who for some reason voluntarily contact the police think that the policemen were attentive to them. Volgograd is an exception, where this indicator amounts to 68%. For the sake of fairness it is necessary to note that this can also be called "an overwhelming majority". Two more parameters that describe the culture of the police's relations in a situation of working contacts with active citizens also looks positive. From 68 to 86% of those who contacted the police assessed the behavior of the police as polite. From 70 to 82% assess the police's attitude toward them as fair. Somewhat lower is the proportion of those who confirm that as a result of contacting them (or the issue on account of which they made contact), real help was given. The last indicator is maintained at the level of 60-78%.

And finally the overall assessment of satisfaction with the results of their contact. It is also quite high and is maintained at the level of 57-77%.

We notice that the general positive picture is somewhat spoiled by Volgograd. Specifically in this city the proportion of people who positively assessed the behavior and attitude of the police force in the situation of their contact is noticeably lower (by 15-20%) than in the other two cities.

5. EXPERTS ON THE CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING THE WORK OF THE PETERSBURG POLICE

At the end of 2000 we turned to the experts – employees of different divisions and departments of the GUV D (Main Administration of Internal Affairs) to ask questions about the criteria for evaluating the activity of the Petersburg police. The staff of experts was determined by the leadership of the GUV D, 124 people in all were surveyed.

The initial point for the survey of the experts was those criteria on the basis of which the activity of services and the subdivisions of the police are evaluated today, We were interested in the opinion of the experts as to what extent these criteria reflect the quality and content of the real activity, that is, the effectiveness of the criteria that are applied.

The results of the survey and the interpretation of them are presented below.

Table 5.1.

Ranking of criteria according to significance of average-weight assessments.

Criteria	Average	Standard deviation of average	Coefficient of variation
Detection of crimes	3,87	1,23	1,51
Holdups	3,70	1,15	1,33
Registration of crimes	3,64	1,21	1,47
Number of statements	3,63	1,28	1,63
Theft	3,60	1,19	1,41
Robbery	3,58	1,18	1,40
Homicide	3,56	1,31	1,73
Overall level of crimes	3,51	1,23	1,50
Serious injuries	3,50	1,23	1,52
Attempted homicide	3,38	1,26	1,59
Rapes	3,37	1,24	1,54
Hooliganism	3,35	1,23	1,51
Opinion of the population	3,28	1,19	1,41
Fraud	3,16	1,23	1,52
Records on juveniles	2,99	1,25	1,55
Criminal responsibility	2,90	1,44	2,06
Complaints to the police	2,90	1,20	1,44
Preventative record-keeping	2,90	1,16	1,36
Administrative detention	2,85	1,16	1,35
Disciplinary responsibility	2,81	1,29	1,67
Administrative crimes	2,79	1,12	1,25
Contacts to make statements	2,69	1,30	1,70
Traffic accidents	2,56	1,26	1,60
Fires	2,49	1,25	1,57

Values of the scale:
 1 – has no significance,
 2 – very little significance,
 3 – has significance,
 4 – great significance,
 5 – very great significance

Each criterion was assessed by the experts according to a standard five-point scale (see in the box). The table was ordered on a formal basis – the decrease of the absolute size of the average, nevertheless, here not only the character of the distribution of answers is reflected, but also the

mentality of the experts (“being determines consciousness”). Therefore it is not surprising that the criterion “detection of crimes” was in first place.

In order to better understand the result obtained, we will consider the distribution of answers of the experts in greater detail (see table 5.2).

Table 5.2.

Simple distributions of votes of experts⁷

	Has no significance	Not very great significance	Has significance	Great significance	Very great significance
Detection of crimes	8,1	4,0	21,8	25,0	41,1
Number of statements	10,5	5,6	26,6	25,0	32,3
Homicide	8,9	14,5	21,0	23,4	32,3
Holdups	4,8	11,3	22,6	31,5	29,8
Registration of crimes	8,1	9,7	20,2	34,7	27,4
Theft	5,6	13,7	23,4	29,8	27,4
Robbery	5,6	13,7	24,2	29,8	26,6
Overall level of crimes	7,3	14,5	24,2	28,2	25,8
Serious injuries	7,3	15,3	23,4	28,2	25,8
Attempted homicide	8,9	18,5	20,2	30,6	21,8
Rapes	8,9	16,1	25,8	27,4	21,8
Opinion of the population	7,3	16,9	37,1	17,7	21,0
Hooliganism	10,5	12,1	29,8	27,4	20,2
Fraud	12,9	13,7	33,9	23,4	16,1
Criminal responsibility	27,4	9,7	25,0	21,8	16,1
Records of juveniles	13,7	21,8	30,6	19,4	14,5
Disciplinary responsibility	21,0	18,5	32,3	15,3	12,9
Contacts with statements	22,6	25,8	23,4	16,9	11,3
Complaints to the police	14,5	21,8	33,9	18,5	11,3
Preventative record-keeping	12,9	23,4	34,7	18,5	10,5
Traffic accidents	25,8	25,0	25,8	14,5	8,9
Fires	27,4	25,0	27,4	11,3	8,9
Administrative detention	13,7	26,6	29,0	22,6	8,1
Administrative crimes	14,5	25,0	32,3	21,8	5,6

By comparison with the averages, the choice of the maximal value of the scale, as grounds for ranking (ordering), is a more “strict” solution. Naturally, the order of criteria according to the comparison with table 5.1. changes, but not very substantially. Gradually “softening” the principle of ordering, in particular after first having united the values “very great significance” and “great significance”, then having taken all positive values as bases, we received three variations of the ordering of the list and finally, evaluated the extent of coordination among them (we calculated the coefficients of the Spearman rank correlation -- r). See table 5.3.

⁷ Table 5.2. ordering according to the size of the decrease in the number (in this case - proportions) of the experts, who chose the answer “very great significance”.

Calculation of coefficients of rank correlation

	Ranks of assessments			Squares of difference of ranks		
	5 (A)	4+5 (B)	3+4+5 (C)	A-B	A-C	B-C
Detection of crimes	1	1	1	0	0	0
Number of statements	2	5	4	9	4	1
Homicide	3	8	11	25	64	9
Holdups	4	3	3	1	1	0
Registration of crimes	5	2	5	9	0	9
Theft	6	6	6	0	0	0
Robbery	7	7	7	0	0	0
Overall level of crimes	8	9	8	1	0	1
Serious injuries	9	10	9	1	0	1
Attempted homicide	10	11	14	1	16	9
Rapes	11	4	2	49	81	4
Opinion of the population	12	14	12	4	0	4
Hooliganism	13	12	10	1	9	4
Fraud	14	13	13	1	1	0
Criminal responsibility	15	15	18	0	9	9
Records of juveniles	16	16	15	0	1	1
Disciplinary responsibility	17	20	19	9	4	1
Contacts with statements	18	21	22	9	16	1
Complaints to the police	19	18	16	1	9	4
Preventative record-keeping	20	19	17	1	9	4
Traffic accidents	21	23	23	4	4	0
Fires	22	24	24	4	4	0
Administrative detentions	23	17	20	36	9	9
Administrative crimes	24	22	21	4	9	1
Total of squares of difference				170	250	72
Correlation of rank correlation (r)				0,926	0,891	0,969

Such high values of the coefficient r (almost equal to 1) are evidence of the stable evaluation of criteria by the experts and at the same time of the high level of uniformity of their mentality. Precisely of the uniformity of mentality and not of unanimity, since for each of the criteria the experts use the whole range of the scale, meaning that they give them sometimes opposing assessments.

For a more detailed and in-depth analysis of the results obtained, the interrelations among assessments of various criteria were also considered. With this aim a matrix of paired coefficients of correlations was constructed (see table 5. 4).

Таблица 5.4.

Matrix of paired coefficients of correlation (Pearson coefficient)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
1. Attempted homicide	1,000	,783	,767	,538	,854	,609	,580	,499	,596	,609	,379	,358	,535	,296	,364	,193	,422	,327	,083	,192	,186	,346	,117	,117
2. Serious injury	,783	1,000	,586	,733	,735	,597	,477	,429	,421	,392	,286	,298	,773	,268	,275	,260	,325	,226	,293	,104	,011	,155	,064	,268
3. Hooliganism	,767	,586	1,000	,646	,684	,614	,773	,457	,557	,847	,426	,491	,187	,206	,358	,284	,262	,246	,048	,390	,468	,156	,082	,041
4. Holdups	,538	,733	,646	1,000	,576	,727	,614	,368	,428	,395	,284	,266	,482	,179	,307	,346	,361	,216	,245	,091	,274	,032	,045	,167
5. Rape	,854	,735	,684	,576	1,000	,558	,516	,411	,403	,596	,242	,214	,474	,204	,143	,285	,195	,158	,182	,111	,205	,151	,048	,056
6. Robbery	,609	,597	,614	,727	,558	1,000	,677	,379	,572	,443	,454	,315	,415	,150	,367	,098	,294	,441	,050	,055	,289	,386	,052	,265
7. Theft	,580	,477	,773	,614	,516	,677	1,000	,515	,686	,562	,558	,502	,051	,307	,310	,285	,319	,460	,087	,234	,432	,316	,053	,260
8. General level of crimes	,499	,429	,457	,368	,411	,379	,515	1,000	,590	,416	,414	,491	,344	,672	,265	,326	,366	,291	,216	,384	,382	,261	,324	,355
9. Preventative record-keeping	,596	,421	,557	,428	,403	,572	,686	,590	1,000	,444	,331	,198	,286	,331	,139	,201	,726	,440	,024	,053	,299	,412	,017	,378
10. Fraud	,609	,392	,847	,395	,596	,443	,562	,416	,444	1,000	,387	,333	,083	,269	,203	,223	,180	,004	,068	,436	,476	,103	,058	,106
11. Citizens' contacts	,379	,286	,426	,284	,242	,454	,558	,414	,331	,387	1,000	,510	,026	,434	,519	,279	,130	,387	,002	,366	,272	,319	,405	,179
12. Traffic accidents	,358	,298	,491	,266	,214	,315	,502	,491	,198	,333	,510	1,000	,050	,333	,779	,516	,024	,257	,186	,458	,236	,195	,505	,199
13. Homicide	,535	,773	,187	,482	,474	,415	,051	,344	,286	,083	,026	,050	1,000	,214	,122	,018	,408	,165	,165	,078	,072	,155	,023	,312
14. Number of statements	,296	,268	,206	,179	,204	,150	,307	,672	,331	,269	,434	,333	,214	1,000	,218	,255	,334	,029	,180	,334	,029	,082	,389	,123
15. Fire	,364	,275	,358	,307	,143	,367	,310	,265	,139	,203	,519	,779	,122	,218	1,000	,427	,236	,225	,190	,287	,098	,275	,440	,134
16. Administrative offense	,193	,260	,284	,346	,285	,098	,285	,326	,201	,223	,279	,516	,018	,255	,427	1,000	,188	,020	,714	,447	,218	,100	,081	,021
17. Keeping record of juveniles	,422	,325	,262	,361	,195	,294	,319	,366	,726	,180	,130	,024	,408	,334	,236	,188	1,000	,290	,043	,013	,101	,308	,069	,327
18. Criminal responsibility	,327	,226	,246	,216	,158	,441	,460	,291	,440	,004	,387	,257	,165	,029	,225	,020	,290	1,000	,163	,246	,369	,812	,253	,753
19. Administrative detention	,083	,293	,048	,245	,182	,050	,087	,216	,024	,068	,002	,186	,165	,180	,190	,714	,043	,163	1,000	,161	,059	,141	,143	,042

The circumstance that the matrix is filled with statistically significant and various coefficients (both for the positive and negative indicators, and for the module), made it possible to propose that the structure of mutual relations between criteria are by no means homogeneous, but include definite syndromes (groups) with significant content.

In order to verify this hypothesis the apparatus of factor analysis was used (the method of main components), the results of the most optimum four factor solutions are presented in table 5.5. We note the high total information quotient of this solution – 64,81%.

Each factor constitutes a latent (concealed from direct observation and immediate registration) variable, which is a certain general reason that defines and at the same time explains the high degree to which the initial criteria are related to each other. The art of the researcher consists of defining the content of this concealed (not obvious) variable.

Thus four variables were discovered that unite the initial assessments in groups to which we gave respectively the following conditional designations: “Crime”, “Record-keeping and administrative crimes”, “Work of the police” and, finally, “Elements”.

Actually the first factor with large factor weights included criteria which are different kinds of crimes (theft, robbery, homicide, etc.). Only one initial criterion constitutes an exception in this number, specifically the “overall level of crime”. But it also correlates to a high degree with this latent variable and in its essence it generalises the particular criteria that are included in this group.

The essential fact is that practically all criteria that were included in the first factor have quite a uniform factor weight for the module (absolute significance). And even that criterion which at first glance seems an “exception” from the overall number is practically no different from the rest in terms of factor weight.

The second factor united all criteria that were connected in one way or another, on the one hand, with record-keeping, and on the other hand with such violations of the rules of communal life as are described as administrative crimes, administrative detention, preventative record-keeping, keeping records of juveniles, the number of statements, registration of crimes and the opinion of the population.

And here is its “exception” – “the opinion of the population” vividly stands out from the overall number of criteria. However, it is not difficult to find an explanation for this circumstance. In all probability, in the experts’ minds this criterion belongs to the category of those subject to being recorded (and nothing more than that). Granted that it is worth while to pay attention to the fact that here the initial criteria do not have such a uniform factor load. In particular the criteria of “detecting crimes” and “the opinion of the population” are weaker than others related to the latent variable uniting them all into one group.

The third factor included: criminal responsibility, disciplinary responsibility, complaints to the police, detecting crimes. There is no doubt that all these criteria, including the last-named ones, characterise the work proper of subdivisions of the police (and the police force as a whole).

Table 5.5

**Four-factor solution after rotation of factors
(Method of main components, method of rotation – Varimax)**

	Factors (latent variables)			
	Crime	Record and administrative violations	Work of the police	Element
Serious injury	,863	,163	,117	,216
Holdups	,860	,241	,153	0,09
Robbery	,857	,232	,125	0,09

Rape	,853	,172	0,05	,118
Theft	,841	,263	,149	0,03
Attempted homicide	,838	,182	,127	,186
Hooliganism	,809	,273	,165	0,01
Homicide	,806	0,09	,135	,211
Fraud	,723	,266	,149	,143
General level of crimes	,659	,383	,208	0,08
Administrative violation of the law	0,08	,715	-0,09	,263
Administrative detention	,158	,632	-0,07	,336
Preventative record-keeping	,362	,623	,208	-0,03
Keeping records of juveniles	,332	,598	,169	-0,14
Number of statements	,365	,582	,151	,105
Registration of crimes	,276	,467	,199	,251
Opinion of the population	,122	,414	,333	-0,06
Criminal responsibility	,145	0,08	,864	,118
Disciplinary responsibility	0,08	,107	,827	,130
Complaints to the police	,181	0,02	,783	,161
Discovering crimes	,244	,267	,446	-,143
Fires	,198	,134	0,08	,851
Traffic accidents	,165	,121	,121	,848
Contacts with statements	,248	,426	,191	,443
Information quotient of factors (in %)	30,7	13,6	11,5	9,0

In contrast to the two first factors, here the criterion that we called an exception, related to the group-forming variable, is considerably weaker than the rest. The integration (explanation) of this circumstance does not appear obvious.

And finally we called the fourth factor an “element” on the grounds that it included criteria which, to a significant extent do not depend directly on the activity of the police. These are fires, traffic accidents, and citizens’ statements to the police.

It is clear that the word “element” is used here as a metaphor rather than as a richly informative conceptual concept. We used this word since all the designated phenomena practically do not submit to prognosis and are defined by a multitude of various reasons. It would appear that in fact exactly this circumstance united them into one group.

It is not surprising that the information quotient of this factor is less than 10%. We recall that precisely these criteria brought up the end of the ranking lists. The overwhelming majority of experts assess them as having no significance or as having little significance.

In conclusion, a few words about what all this means and how this knowledge can be put to practical use. Above, it was already noted that the initial data just of themselves (the answers of experts), first of all *are characteristic of the mentality* (that is, the character and level of awareness) of experts. Of course this *awareness is a reflection of hard reality*.

At least a substantial result is distinguishing the four groups (syndromes) – they are not so obvious. We can also consider as important of itself the factor weights with which each of the criteria is included in this or that factor. Thus we obtain an idea of their actual significance. These results give grounds for further development of the system of evaluating the activity of the Petersburg police.

And, finally, they show in what areas it is expedient to conduct further research on this problem.

GUIDELINES FOR THE INTERVIEW

**Russian Academy of Sciences
Sociology Institute, St. Petersburg**

* * *

St. Petersburg University of Economics and Finance

COMPARATIVE SOCIOLOGICAL STUDY

"COMMUNITY AND THE POLICE IN A LARGE CITY"

Hello!

My name is I'm part of a group of sociologists who are researching the work of the police in our city. I am asking for roughly fifteen minutes of your time to answer some questions. I should inform you right away that you and your apartment have been chosen for our survey at random. The answers you give me will be processed by a computer and are strictly confidential. The results of our survey will be used only to improve the work of the police.

You should note that all the following questions have to do with the work of the police in your neighborhood. When a question relates to the city police as a whole or to the police of other localities, that will be specified.

4. How effective are the neighborhood police in helping crime victims?
1. Completely ineffective
 2. Rather ineffective
 3. Quite effective
 4. Very effective
 9. No answer

5. How effective are the crime prevention efforts of the neighborhood police?
1. Completely ineffective
 2. Rather ineffective
 3. Quite effective
 4. Very effective
 9. No answer

6. Are the police successful in maintaining an acceptable level of order on the streets and in public places in your neighborhood?
1. Completely unsuccessful
 2. Rather unsuccessful
 3. Quite successful
 4. Completely successful
 9. No answer

7. Are the policemen who work in your neighborhood polite in their dealings with residents?
1. Very impolite
 2. Impolite
 3. Not very polite
 4. Very polite
 9. No answer

8. Are the police officers in your neighborhood attentive to the problems that concern residents?
1. Completely inattentive
 2. Rather inattentive
 3. Quite attentive
 4. Very attentive
 8. Some are attentive, some aren't
 9. No answer

1. Are the police responsible for the conditions in your neighborhood?
1. Not at all responsible
 2. Practically not responsible
 3. Partly responsible
 4. Fully responsible
 9. No answer

2. How well do the police deal with problems concerning the residents of your neighborhood?
1. Very poorly
 2. Rather poorly
 3. Quite well
 4. Very well
 9. No answer

3. How well do the police cooperate with residents in solving the problems of your neighborhood?
1. Very poorly
 2. Rather poorly
 3. Quite well
 4. Very well
 9. No answer

9. Do the police officers in your neighborhood demonstrate a willingness to help residents with their problems?

1. Of course not
2. On the whole, no
3. On the whole, yes
4. Yes, of course
8. Some do, some don't
9. No answer

10. Are the police officers in your neighborhood fair to people?

1. Completely unfair
2. Rather unfair
3. Quite fair
4. Completely fair
8. Some are fair, some aren't
9. No answer

The following question is only for those respondents who don't have difficulties in assessing the work of the police in the neighborhood. If the respondent has such difficulties, go on to Question 12.

11. Your opinion about the work of the neighborhood police is based first of all on

(choose one answer):

1. your personal experience
 2. the experience of your family, friends, neighbors
 3. what you heard in the neighborhood
 4. information from papers, TV, radio, magazines
 5. other sources (please specify)
-
-
-

The following question is for those residents who have difficulties in assessing the police work.

12. Difficulties in assessing the neighborhood police work are primarily caused by (choose one answer):

1. Lack of personal experience
 2. Fear of negative consequences for yourself
 3. Lack of information
 4. Other reasons (please specify)
-
-
-

13. On the whole, has the work of the neighborhood police changed in the past year?

1. It's changed for the worse
2. It hasn't changed
3. It's changed for the better
9. No answer

Now a few questions about the seriousness of the following problems in your neighborhood.

14. Is detaining by the police of people on the streets without sufficient grounds a serious problem in your neighborhood?

1. It isn't a problem
2. It's not a significant problem
3. It's a serious problem
9. No answer

15. Is the excessively harsh treatment of detainees by the police a problem in your neighborhood?

1. It isn't a problem
2. It's not a significant problem
3. It's a serious problem
9. No answer

16. Is the excessive use of force against detainees by the police a serious problem?

1. It isn't a problem
2. It's not a significant problem
3. It's a serious problem
9. No answer

17. Is the use of verbal abuse against detainees by the police a serious problem?

1. It isn't a problem
2. It's not a significant problem
3. It's a serious problem
9. No answer

18. Is receiving bribes by neighborhood police officers a problem?

1. It isn't a problem
2. It's not a significant problem
3. It's a serious problem
9. No answer

18. Is black market earnings amongst neighborhood police officers a problem?

1. It isn't a problem
2. It's not a significant problem
3. It's a serious problem
9. No answer

The following question is only for those respondents who don't have difficulties in assessing the relationship of the police with residents of the neighborhood. If the respondent has such difficulties, go on to Question 21.

20. Your opinion about the relationship of the police with the neighborhood residents is based first of all on (choose one answer):

1. your personal experience
2. the experience of your family, friends, neighbors
3. what you heard in the neighborhood
4. information from papers, TV, radio, magazines
5. other sources (please specify)

The following question is for those residents who have difficulties in assessing the relationship of the police with the residents of the neighborhood.

21. Difficulties in assessing the neighborhood police work are primarily caused by (choose one answer):

1. Lack of personal experience
2. Fear of negative consequences for yourself
3. Lack of information
4. Other reasons (please specify)

Questions to all

Now we're going to discuss your own experiences with crime and policing.

22. This question relates to the building in which you live. Has any of the following acts of vandalism been committed in the entryway of your building in the past year? (Note the respondent's answer for each category)

	Yes	No
1. Broken doors, windows, lighting fixtures	1	0
2. Obscene graffiti painted on walls	1	0
3. Broken, burned, opened mailboxes	1	0

23. Have you had suspicious people (bums, alcoholics, drug addicts and the like) gathering in the past year on your staircase or in the entryway of your building?

1. Yes
2. No

24. Do you have a vehicle, an automobile or a motorcycle in your family that you can freely use?

	Yes	No
1. Automobile	1	0
2. Motorcycle	1	0

The following question is only for owners of the vehicles specified above. If the respondent does not own a vehicle, go on to Question 26.

25. Has any of the following crimes been committed or attempted in relation to your vehicle in the past year?

	Yes	No	Unsure
1. Theft	1	0	9
2. Breaking and entering into place of storage (garage)	1	0	9
3. Theft of personal belongings that were located in the automobile (on the motorcycle)	1	0	9
4. Intentional infliction of damage to the automobile (motorcycle)	1	0	9

Questions to all

26. During the past year, has an automobile (motorcycle) in which you were riding (whether it belonged to you or not) been stopped by the police?

1. Yes
2. No
9. No answer

The following questions, 27 and 28, are for those who were riding in vehicles that were stopped by the police. If this happened more than once, note only information relating to the last such incident. If no such incident occurred, go on to Question 29.

27. Where were you stopped?

1. Your neighborhood
2. Another neighborhood in the city
3. Another city or locality

28. What was the reason for your being stopped?

1. Traffic violation
2. Driving under the influence (of alcohol or drugs), or sobriety test
3. Speeding
4. Hitting a pedestrian or cyclist, or collision with another vehicle (automobile, motorcycle)
5. Violation of vehicle registration, or registration check
6. Routine check
8. Other
9. Unsure

Questions to all

29. During the past year, have you been stopped and questioned by the police on the street or in a public place?

1. Yes
0. No

30. Were you then detained by the police?

1. Yes
0. No

The following questions, 31-38, are only for those respondents who have been detained and questioned by the police. If there were no such incidents, go on to Question 39. If there was more than one such incident, note only information relating to the last such incident.

31. Where you were detained by the police?

1. Your neighborhood
2. Another neighborhood in the city
3. Another city or locality

32. Why were you detained?

1. Public drunkenness
2. Disturbance of the peace
3. Vagrancy
4. Violation of rules for street vending
5. Participation in fight or other disturbance
6. Suspected of violation
7. Document check
8. Other
9. No answer

33. Did the police officers make it clear to you why you had been detained?

1. Yes
0. No
9. No answer

34. When detaining you, did the police officers pay attention to what you were telling them?

- 1. Yes
- 0. No
- 9. No answer

35. Did the police officers make it clear what they intended to do with you?

- 1. Yes
- 0. No
- 9. No answer

36. Were the officers who detained you sufficiently polite?

- 1. Very impolite
- 2. Impolite
- 3. Not very polite
- 4. Very polite
- 9. No answer

37. Did the officers who detained you treat you fairly?

- 1. Completely unfair
- 2. Rather unfair
- 3. Quite fair
- 4. Completely fair
- 9. No answer

38. Are you sure that the police officers acted strictly according to the law when detaining you?

- 1. Absolutely unsure
- 2. Rather unsure
- 3. Quite sure
- 4. Absolutely sure
- 9. No answer

Questions to all

39. Has one or more police officers visited your place of residence in the past year?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

The following question is only for those respondents whose place of residence in the last year was visited by one or more police officers. If there have been no such visits, go on to Question 41. In case there was more than one such visit, note only information relating to the last such incident.

40. The purpose or reason for a visit was named by the police as:

- 1. To introduce themselves, establish personal contact
 - 2. To call in a resident (including you)
 - 3. To get some information from you or your family
 - 4. To provide some information to you
 - 5. The necessity to examine your place
 - 6. Search of a suspicious person
 - 7. Other purpose or reason (please specify)
-
-
-

Questions to all

41. Has any of the following happened to you personally during the past year? (Note the respondent's answer for each category)

	Yes	No
1. Assault and battery, or attempted assault	1	0
2. Sexual assault, including coercion to acts of a sexual nature, or attempted sexual assault	1	0
3. Fraud, i.e., the unlawful seizure of property, money, valuables by means of deception or abuse of trust, or attempted fraud	1	0
4. Robbery, i.e., the unlawful seizure of property, money, valuables by the use or threat of force, or attempted robbery	1	0
5. Theft, i.e., the unlawful and furtive seizure of property, money, valuables, or attempted theft	1	0
6. Racketeering, i.e. extorting property, money, valuables by means of blackmail or threat of using force against you or your family, or attempted racketeering	1	0
7. You were a victim of other crime (please specify)	1	0

The following questions, 42-47, are only for those respondents who have been victims of one of the above mentioned crimes, including attempts. If the respondent has not been a victim of these crimes, go on to Question 48. If the respondent has been a victim of these crimes more than once, note only the latest incident.

42. Have you been involved in one or more of such incidents in the past year?

1. One
2. Two-three
3. Four or more

43. Please specify what happened then. It was:

1. Battery
2. Sexual abuse
3. Fraud
4. Robbery
5. Theft
6. Racket

The following question is only for those respondents who have been victims of robbery or theft, including attempts. If the respondent has not been a victim of these crimes, go on to Question 45. If the respondent has been a victim of these crimes more than once, note only the latest incident.

44. Did the robbery or theft occur in a place of residence, or did it occur on the street or in a public place?

	place of residence	street or public place
1. Robbery	1	2
2. Theft	1	2

45. Did you report the incident to the police?

1. Yes
2. No

The following question is only for those respondents who reported the incidents to the police. If the respondent did not report the incident, go on to Question 47.

46. Did the police react promptly to your report?

4. Immediately
3. Some time later
2. A long time later
1. No reaction whatsoever
9. I don't know if the police have done anything with regard to my report.

The following question is only for those respondents who did not report the incidents to the police.

47. Name the reasons why you did not report the incidents to the police (you can choose up to three answers).

1. The police wouldn't do anything anyway
2. No damage done
3. Damage was insufficient
4. No proof of the crime
5. You didn't know who had done it
6. The police officers would be unhappy to receive your report
7. The police wouldn't be able to do anything
8. Couldn't get contact with the police
9. All could be solved without the police interference
10. The offender was detained without the police involvement
11. Did not want to contact the police
12. Addressed another agency
13. Was afraid of a revenge on the part of the offender
14. Did not want a scandal
15. It was my fault
16. Felt sorry for the offender
17. Can't name the reason
18. No answer

48. During the past year, has any of the following happened to family members residing with you? (Note the respondent's answer for each category)
- | | Yes | No |
|---|-----|----|
| 1. Assault and battery, or attempted assault | 1 | 0 |
| 2. Sexual assault, including coercion to acts of a sexual nature, or attempted sexual assault | 1 | 0 |
| 3. Fraud, i.e., the unlawful seizure of property, money, valuables by means of deception or abuse of trust, or attempted fraud | 1 | 0 |
| 4. Robbery, i.e., the unlawful seizure of property, money, valuables by the use or threat of force, or attempted robbery | 1 | 0 |
| 5. Theft, i.e., the unlawful and furtive seizure of property, money, valuables, or attempted theft | 1 | 0 |
| 6. Racketeering, i.e. extorting property, money, valuables by means of blackmail or threat of using force against you or your family, or attempted racketeering | 1 | 0 |
| 7. You were a victim of other crime (please specify) | 1 | 0 |

The following question is only for those respondents whose family members have been victims of robbery or theft, including attempts. If the respondent has not been a victim of these crimes, go on to Question 50. If the respondent has been a victim of these crimes more than once, note only the latest incident.

49. Did the robbery or theft occur in a place of residence, or did it occur on the street or in a public place?

	place of residence	street or public place
1. Robbery	1	2
2. Theft	1	2

50. Have you contacted the police during the past year, that is, at your own behest, to report a violation you witnessed?
- Yes
 - No
 - No answer
51. Have you contacted the police during the past year, at your own behest, to report a traffic accident?
- Yes
 - No
 - No answer
52. Have you contacted the police during the past year, at your own behest, to report a suspicious person?
- Yes
 - No
 - No answer
53. Have you contacted the police during the past year, at your own behest, to report suspicious sounds or noises?
- Yes
 - No
 - No answer
54. Have you contacted the police during the past year, at your own behest, to report an incident that may have been connected with a crime?
- Yes
 - No
 - No answer
55. Have you contacted the police during the past year, at your own behest, to address problems in your neighborhood?
- Yes
 - No
 - No answer

56. Have you contacted the police during the past year, at your own behest, to ask for advice or information concerning personal problems?

1. Yes
7. No
9. No answer

57. Have you contacted the police during the past year, at your own behest, to provide information to the police?

1. Yes
8. No
9. No answer

58. Have you contacted the police during the past year, at your own behest, to obtain a passport, a certificate or other necessary documents?

1. Yes
9. No
9. No answer

59. Have you contacted the police during the past year, at your own behest, because of other problems or difficulties?

1. Yes
10. No
9. No answer

The following questions, 60-65, are for those respondents who contacted the police during the past year. If the respondent has not contacted the police, go on to Question 66. If he has contacted the police more than once, note only information relating to his last contact.

60. Were the police sufficiently attentive to your problem?

1. Yes
2. No
9. No answer

61. Did the police explain clearly what they would do in response to your contact?

1. Yes
2. No
9. No answer

62. Were you rendered practical and effective assistance?

1. Not at all
2. Not really
3. Yes, but not enough
4. Yes
9. No answer

63. Were the officers who dealt with your problem sufficiently polite?

1. Very impolite
2. Impolite
3. Not very polite
4. Very polite
9. No answer

64. Were the officers who dealt with your problem sufficiently fair to you?

1. Completely unfair
2. Rather unfair
3. Quite fair
4. Completely fair
9. No answer

65. Were you satisfied with the actions taken by the police in response to your contact?

1. Completely unsatisfied
2. Rather unsatisfied
3. Quite satisfied
4. Completely satisfied
9. No answer

Questions to all

66. When was the last time you saw a police officer or several police officers in your neighborhood?

1. In the past twenty-four hours
2. In the past week
3. In the past month
4. More than a month ago
9. No answer

67. What were the circumstances?
(Note the respondent's answer to each category)

	Yes	No	No Answer
1. A police officer or police patrol passed by	1	0	9
2. A police cruiser passed by	1	0	9
3. One or several police officers passed by on motorcycles	1	0	9
4. The police officers were at the scene of an incident or accident	1	0	9
5. Police officers were inspecting a trading zone	1	0	9
6. Police officers were detaining, arresting, or searching someone	1	0	9
7. Police officers were breaking up a fight or dispersing a gathering	1	0	9
8. A police officer was having a friendly chat with a neighborhood resident	1	0	9

68. Do you know any of the police officers permanently posted in your neighborhood?

1. Yes, by name
2. Yes, by sight
3. No, I don't know any of them

69. To summarize,

1. How many personal contacts with the police have you had in the past year?
(circle a relevant figure)

None Code 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	More than 10 Code 11
----------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	-------------------------

The following questions are only for those respondents who have had at least one personal contact with police officers

2. You personally contacted police officers on the street, in public places

None Code 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	More than 10 Code 11
----------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	-------------------------

3. You went to a local police office, a district office, Police Department

None Code 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	More than 10 Code 11
----------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	-------------------------

4. Police officers stopped and questioned you on the street or in a public place

None Code 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	More than 10 Code 11
----------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	-------------------------

5. Police officers detained you on the street or in a public place

None Code 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	More than 10 Code 11
----------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	-------------------------

6. Your automobile (motorcycle) in which you were riding was stopped by the police

None Code 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	More than 10 Code 11
----------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	-------------------------

7. A police officer has visited your apartment

None Code 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	More than 10 Code 11
----------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	-------------------------

8. You happened to be at a place of law enforcement actions taken by the police

None Code 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	More than 10 Code 11
----------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	-------------------------

Now a few questions about you

70. Sex of respondent (noted by interviewer)

1. Male
2. Female

71. How old are you?

1. 18-25
2. 26-35
3. 31-35
4. 36-45
5. 46-55
6. 56-60
7. 61 or older

72. What is your ethnicity? (Mark only one ethnic group)

1. Russian
2. Other Slavic
3. Finno-Ugric
4. Turkic
5. Caucasian
6. Western European
7. Other

73. What was the average monthly income of your family per family member in the past year?

1. Less than 100 rubles
2. 101-300 rubles
3. 301-500 rubles
4. 501-700 rubles
5. 701-900 rubles
6. Greater than 901 rubles, but less than 1,000 rubles

74. (A question for respondents whose average monthly income per family member was greater than 1000 rubles.) Your monthly income per family member was ...

1. Greater than 1,000 rubles, but less than 5,000 rubles
2. Greater than 5,000 rubles, but less than 10,000 rubles
3. Greater than 10,000 rubles, but less than 15,000 rubles
4. 15,000 rubles or greater

75. Your education (On the right hand, indicate total number of years you studied)

0. Special educational institution for invalids (school, vocational school, technical college)	1	10	19
1. Elementary (3-4 years or less)	2	11	20
2. Incomplete secondary (7-8 years or less)	3	12	21
3. Full secondary (10-11 years)	4	13	
4. Vocational (8-13 years)	5	14	
5. Special secondary (12-14 years)	6	15	
6. Incomplete higher (13-15 years)	7	16	
7. Higher (15-17 years)	8	17	
8. Graduate school, post-graduate degree (18 years and longer)	9	18	

76. How would you classify yourself? (Mark only one category)

1. Unskilled worker
2. Skilled worker
3. White-collar worker with no special education
4. White-collar worker with special secondary education
5. White-collar worker with higher education
6. Entrepreneur
7. Manager
8. Professional (lawyer, writer, artist, etc.)
9. Service industry worker
10. Unemployed
11. Homemaker
12. Student
13. Pensioner
14. Other

77. How long have you lived in this neighborhood?

1. Less than one year
2. 1-3 years
3. 3-5 years
4. 5-10 years
5. 10-15 years
6. 15-30 years
7. Over 30 years

And finally, a few questions about your opinion of such surveys.

78. In your opinion, are the results of such surveys trustworthy?

1. Rather, no
2. Likely, yes
3. No answer

79. Listed below are the reasons why people sometimes don't trust the results of the surveys. Choose up to three main reasons that in your opinion can confound the survey results.

1. Those respondents are questioned whose opinion suit the survey organizers.
2. The questions are worded in such a way as to get required answers.
3. Interviewers suggest on purpose the required answers.
4. People would not give their opinion in fear of negative consequences.
5. The surveys data are calculated in a way to get required results.
6. The published figures are made up and do not show real opinions.
7. People are asked things they have no idea about.
8. People often give answers that suit the interviewers, just to be polite.
9. People refuse to answer many questions that concern their personal interests.
10. People give wrong answers on purpose, because they don't want to be fooled by such surveys.
11. People do not understand the meaning of many questions in such surveys.
12. No one would pay for the survey that has produced results contradictory to the organizers' interests.
13. Interviewers fill out the questionnaires themselves without questioning anyone, in order to earn easy money.

80. In your opinion, would the results of this survey be trustworthy?

1. Likely, yes.
2. Rather, no.

81. Please evaluate the questions about the police work you answered, using a 7-point scale, where 1 means the lowest, and 7 – the greatest degree.

Interesting	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Clear	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Precise wording	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Easy to answer	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Dangerous for the interviewees	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Important for improving the situation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
It is possible that the information will be contorted, accidentally or deliberately	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION AND HELP!

CONTENTS

1. General description of the research	2
2. Brief description of the crime situation in St. Petersburg	3
3. Structure of the sample and results of the survey	9
4. Results of the research	
Part I – Petersburg 1998 – 2000	38
Part II – Petersburg, Volgograd, Borovichi	54
5. Experts on the criteria for evaluating the work of the Petersburg police	71
Appendix. Guidelines for the interview	77





