137121

THE EVALUATION OF COMMUNITY POLICING:

FINAL REPORT OF THE

COMMUNITY SURVEY

AND

POLICE DEPARTMENT INTERNAL SURVEY

By

Nancy C. Daly, MMA II

and

Paula Jordan Morehead, MMA II

ST. PETERSBURG POLICE DEPARTMENT

PLANNING & RESEARCH UNIT

MARCH 1992

137121

INTRODUCTION

Two important components of the evaluation model that was developed to measure the impact of the implementation of community policing in the city of St. Petersburg are the community and internal survey instruments. The community survey was designed to measure levels of citizen satisfaction in the community. The internal survey, administered to Police Department employees, measured their perceptions of community policing and its impact upon their jobs and the community.

The Planning & Research Unit of the St. Petersburg Police Department designed, administered and analyzed two major survey instruments. The community survey was administered by a group of 40 volunteers from the community to a representative sample of 1,448 residents and business people throughout the city. The survey takers were trained prior to systematically canvassing their assigned areas, going door-to-door interviewing heads of household and business owners/managers. Data collection for the community survey was completed in November, 1991. The Police Department internal survey was also completed in November, 1991, with a total of 337 surveys returned by employees from every unit within the Department.

The purpose of the community survey was to establish baselines of the level of citizen satisfaction with police service; citizens' fear of crime; and, citizens' level of concern for several quality of life problems that they perceive exist in their neighborhoods. This baseline data will be used as a basis of comparison for data that will be collected via the community survey instrument on an annual basis.

The purpose of the internal survey administered to Police Department employees was to provide baseline data of employees' perceptions of their jobs; their feelings about the philosophy, implementation and effectiveness of community policing; their ratings of police functions along a continuum ranging from reactive to coactive; and, their level of concern for the same quality of life problems presented to citizens in the community survey. Additionally, employees were asked several open-ended questions that probed for their specific expectations concerning the impact community policing would have on their jobs, their personal definitions of community policing, and their recommendations for how the process of implementing community policing could be improved.

Data analysis for both surveys relied primarily upon descriptive statistics. Frequency distributions were computed for each data set. Mean scores were calculated for responses to certain questions. Statistically significant relationships between survey variables and demographic categories— gender, race, age, home ownership or job assignment— were examined via the computation of Pearson's r correlation coefficients. There was no attempt made to further measure the strength of those relationships nor to identify causative relationships via regression analyses. The

information presented in this report was intended to provide descriptive analysis only and the focus for this initial baseline report is, therefore, descriptive in nature.

If there are any questions about either the community survey or the survey done internally of Police Department employees, please contact Lieutenant Gary Mitchell, Staff Inspections Section, St. Petersburg Police Department, at (813) 893-7912, or Nancy C. Daly, Management Methods Analyst II, Planning & Research Unit, St. Petersburg Police Department, at (813) 892-5443.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the community survey was to establish baselines of
the level of citizen satisfaction with police service; citizens'
fear of crime; and, citizens' level of concern for several quali-
ty of life problems that they perceive exist in their neighbor-
hoods. This baseline data will be used as a basis of comparison
for data that will be collected via the community survey instru-
ment on an annual basis. The administration of the community
survey is a part of the overall evaluation of the impact of
implementing community policing operations in St. Petersburg.

During October and November of 1991, a total of 1,448 citizen
surveys were completed city-wide. Surveys were administered by a
group of 40 volunteers from the community. These volunteers
attended a training session and were assigned an area within
which they were to draw a systematic sample. They canvassed their
areas, attempting to make contact and complete a survey with the
head of household at every third residence. Survey takers working
in commercial areas also completed surveys from a sample of
business locations in the area.

There were neighborhoods in the city that were not adequately
sampled for a variety of reasons. A few volunteers dropped out
after receiving their training, some dropped out well into the
period of data collection, others were simply unable to complete
the number of surveys they originally committed to complete.
(Each volunteer had been asked to complete 50 surveys.) Their
areas were left uncovered, as there were simply not enough volun-
teers to replace them or handle larger areas than originally
assigned. Three volunteers refused to go door to door in their
own neighborhoods (the areas in and around Roser Park, Jordan
Park and Childs Park), expressing fear of retaliation from drug
dealers in the areas if they were associated with any police-
related activity. These individuals worked diligently in other
neighborhoods to complete surveys. The danger of going door to
door in some neighborhoods was prohibitive to the method of data
collection used, that is, having face to face interviews complet-
ed by citizen volunteers.

The following areas are under-represented in the survey sample:

        Central Ave., south to 22nd Ave. S
        Tampa Bay, west to 34th St. S.

        54th Ave. S., south to Tampa Bay
        Tampa Bay, west to 22nd Ave. S.

        5th Ave. N., north to 12th Ave. N.
        4th St. N., west to 9th St. N.

        Snell Isles/Eden Isles/Placido Bay

1

77th Ave. N., north to Gandy Blvd.
Tampa Bay, west to 16th St. N.

13th Ave. N., north to 40th Ave. N.
I-275, west to 34th St. N.

Since the survey sample under-represented the above areas and
also under-represented the proportion of minorities in the St.
Petersburg population, valid generalizations cannot be drawn from
the survey sample to the larger population. The information
reported below describes the perceptions, attitudes and experi-
ences of the sample population only and can only suggest findings
that may or may not be accurately applied to the population of
St. Petersburg.

Similar citizen surveys have been done in other cities. Surveys
were completed in Reno, Nevada (N= 731) in 1990; Ann Arbor,
Michigan (N= 475) in 1989; Madison, Wisconsin (N= 649) from 1987
through 1988; and, Kettering, Ohio (N= 389) in 1989. These data
will be compared to St. Petersburg data were applicable and are
presented in Table 3. The surveys fielded in Reno and Madison
were, as in St. Petersburg, a component of transitioning to
community policing operations and were managed by police depart-
ment quality assurance personnel. The surveys done in Ann Arbor
and Kettering were administered by outside research organizations
who were contracted by those cities to evaluate citizen satisfac-
tion with city services, of which police service was one compo-
nent of a more extensive survey.

A summary and discussion of the frequency distributions per
question for the St. Petersburg Community Survey are contained in
this report. Discussion of the frequency distributions by police
district is included when there were differences in responses by
district. The number of surveys completed by district were as
follows:

    District I   305
    District II   566
    District III   577

(Frequency distributions are presented in Table 1, for the city-
wide data, and in Table 2, for the comparison of responses by
district to the city-wide data.)

In addition to the calculation of the frequencies, the data were
examined further in order to identify significant relationships
between responses to the survey questions and certain demographic
variables— race, age, gender, and home ownership. Survey data
were also examined comparing respondents who had a fear of crime
versus those who did not; respondents who had contact with the
police versus those who did not; and, respondents who had been
victims of crime versus those that had not been. "Significant"
relationships were defined statistically to be those that yielded
correlation coefficients (Pearson's r) to the .001 level of
significance. (That is, in simple terms, knowing the value of one

2

variable would lead one to accurately predict the value of the related variable 99.9% of the time.) Additionally, chi squares were computed to test the strength of the relationship between significantly correlated variables.

In the community survey, for example, gender was found to be positively correlated to the fear of being out alone at night, that is, female respondents tended to be more afraid to be out alone at night than did males. Interpreting the relationship discovered between significantly correlated variables depends upon how the variable values are coded. In this survey, a "female" response to the question asking for the respondent's gender was coded with a numeric value of "2"; males were coded "1". A "no" response to the question asking if the respondent felt safe being out alone at night was coded with a value of "2", while a "yes" response (feeling safe) was coded with a numeric value of "1". Therefore, the positive correlation between gender and fear of being out alone at night meant that as gender "increased" (female = 2), so did the likelihood that the response to feeling safe at night "increased", that is, was "no", also the response with the higher numeric value (2). For variables that are inversely related, that is, yield negative correlation coefficients, as one variable's value increases, the other variable's value decreases, or vice versa.

There were several significant relationships between variables in this survey. These relationships will also be discussed in this report, where applicable, only for those relationships that were found to be statistically significant. If a certain demographic segment of the sample population is not discussed following the discussion of the frequency distribution for each question, than no significant differences were found in the responses to that question between subgroups of the total sample. (Frequency distributions for significantly correlated variables are presented in Table 4. The chi square and Pearson's r values are presented in Table 5.)

DISCUSSION OF SURVEY FINDINGS

The majority (57.9%) of respondents city-wide felt that the safety of their neighborhoods was unchanged over the past year. One-third (33.3%) of respondents felt their neighborhoods had become less safe. A small percentage (7.7%) felt that their neighborhoods had become safer. (See Table 1.)

Citizens' perception of the safety of their neighborhoods was similar in St. Petersburg and Kettering. Citizens in both Reno and Ann Arbor felt less safe. (See Table 3.)

In looking at responses from each of the three (3) police districts in St. Petersburg, perceptions varied widely between respondents from District I (south) and respondents from either District II (northeast) or District III (west). A majority (52.1%) of District I respondents felt that their neighborhoods

had become less safe during the past year. This compares to 27.6% and 28.9% of respondents in Districts II and III respectively, who felt that their neighborhoods had become less safe. (See Table 2.)

Females were significantly more likely than males to have felt that their neighborhoods had become less safe.

Respondents who were afraid of being out alone at night were significantly more likely than those who were not to feel that their neighborhoods had become less safe.

Respondents who were victims of crime during the past year were significantly more likely than respondents who were not to feel that their neighborhoods had become less safe.

(Again, see Tables 4 and 5 for the presentation of data on those variables that were significantly related.)

Half (50.8%) of all respondents city-wide named property crimes as the most serious problem in their neighborhoods. Drugs were named as the most serious problem in neighborhoods by 12.4% of respondents city-wide. Noise or nuisance problems were named by 10.2% of respondents.

Citizens in Ann Arbor also named property crimes as the most serious problem in their neighborhoods. Drugs were considered the most serious problem by citizens in Reno.

The nature of the crime problems in St. Petersburg varied by district. Less than half (43.0%) of respondents from District I named property crimes as the most serious problem; less than half (48.0%) of District III respondents named property crimes as their neighborhoods' most serious problem as well. A majority (57.8%) of District II respondents named property crimes as their neighborhoods' most serious problem. Property crimes were, however, the most frequently mentioned problem in each district.

Nearly one-quarter (24.3%) of District I respondents named drugs as the most serious problem in their neighborhoods, compared to 7.4% and 10.9% of respondents in Districts II and III respectively.

Assault/robbery was also named by a higher percentage of District I respondents (15.1%), compared to District II respondents (6.5%) and District III respondents (7.6%).

Blacks were significantly more likely than whites to name drugs as the most serious crime problem in their neighborhoods, and were significantly less likely than whites to name property crimes as most serious. The largest percentage of black respondents named drugs, not property crimes, as the most serious crime problem in their neighborhoods.

Respondents under the age of 25 were significantly more likely than those over 25 to name rape and domestic violence as serious problems. Respondents between the ages of 25 and 64 were significantly more likely than those both younger or older to name property crimes as the most serious problem. Respondents under the age of 25 or over the age of 65 were significantly more likely than those in other age groups to name assault/robbery as the most serious crime problem. Older respondents (over age 65) were significantly more likely than younger respondents to report that there were no serious crime problems in their neighborhoods. However, the largest percentage of respondents in each age group named property crimes as the most serious crime problem in their neighborhoods.

Females were significantly more likely than males to name assault/robbery and rape as serious crime problems. Males were significantly more likely than females to name traffic problems and prostitution as most serious.

Respondents who were afraid of being out alone at night were significantly more likely than those who were not to name assault/robbery, sexual assault and drugs as serious crime problems.

Respondents were asked whether they were "very concerned", "somewhat concerned" or "not concerned" about several problems that may affect the quality of life in their neighborhoods.

In order of the mean (average) responses, the top five (5) problems ranked as follows city-wide: (1= very concerned; 2= somewhat concerned; 3= not concerned)

    1. Crime   1.44
    2. Feeling safe and secure   1.70
    3. Adequate police patrol   1.71
    4. Quality of schools   1.82
    5. Housing appearance   1.92

Responses by district ranked as follows:

District I   District II   District III

1. Crime   1. Crime   1. Crime
2. Feeling safe   2. Feeling safe   2. Schools
3. Police patrol   3. Schools   3. Police patrol
4. Schools   4. Police patrol   4. Feeling safe
5. Juveniles   5. Housing appearance   5. Housing appear.

Blacks were significantly more likely than whites to be very concerned about the following quality of life problems:

Crime   Police patrol
Housing appearance   Code enforcement
Conditions of streets/sidewalks   Traffic/parking
Street/alley lighting   Noise
Feeling safe and secure   Litter/trash
Homeless people   Flooding/drainage
Neighbors   Juveniles

Younger respondents were significantly more likely than older respondents to be very concerned about the following:

Housing appearance   Noise
Street/alley lighting   Litter/trash
Feeling safe and secure   Flooding/drainage
Quality of schools   Juveniles

Females were significantly more likely than males to be very concerned about the following:

Feeling safe and secure
Homeless people

Respondents who were afraid of being out alone at night were significantly more likely to be very concerned about:

Crime
Feeling safe/secure
Juveniles

Victims of crime were significantly more likely to be very concerned about:

Crime
Feeling safe/secure
Juveniles

Respondents who had contact with a police officer during the past year were significantly more likely than those who did not to be very concerned about:

Street/alley lighting
Feeling safe/secure
Neighbors
Juveniles

Respondents were also asked to rate their level of concern for a variety of crime, or potential, crime problems. These problems, ranked by the mean responses, were as follows city-wide: (1= very concerned; 2= somewhat concerned; 3= not concerned)

    1. Burglary   1.64
    2. Vandalism   1.78
    3. Drugs   1.85
    4. Vehicle theft   1.98
    5. Assault/robbery   2.03

Responses by district ranked as follows:

District I   District II   District III

1. Burglary   1. Burglary   1. Burglary
2. Drugs   2. Vandalism   2. Vandalism
3. Vandalism   3. Drugs   3. Drugs
4. Assault/robbery   4. Vehicle theft   4. Vehicle theft
5. Vehicle theft   5. Assault/robbery   5. Assault/robb.

Blacks were significantly more likely than whites to be very concerned about the following crime problems:

    Assault/robbery   Drugs
    Sexual battery   Gangs
    Vehicle theft   Neighborhood disorder
    Vandalism   Domestic violence

Younger people were significantly more likely than older people to be very concerned about the following:

    Assault/robbery   Drugs
    Burglary   Gangs
    Sexual battery   Neighborhood disorder
    Vehicle theft   Barking dogs/nuisances
    Vandalism   Domestic violence

Females were significantly more likely than males to be very concerned about:

    Assault/robbery
    Sexual battery

Renters were significantly more likely than homeowners to be very concerned about:

    Vehicle theft
    Gangs
    Domestic violence

Respondents who were afraid to be out alone at night were signif-
icantly more likely to be very concerned about:

Assault/robbery   Vandalism
Burglary   Drugs
Sexual assault   Gangs
Vehicle theft

Respondents who were victims were significantly more likely to be
very concerned about:

Burglary
Vandalism
Drugs

Respondents who had contact with a police officer were signifi-
cantly more likely than those who did not to be very concerned
about:

Burglary
Vandalism

The fear of crime was measured by asking respondents whether or
not they felt safe being out alone in their neighborhoods both at
night and during the day.

Less than half (46.4%) of respondents city-wide reported feeling
afraid of being out alone at night in their neighborhoods. The
level of fear was highest in District I, with 61% of respondents
in that area saying that they were afraid to be out alone at
night in their neighborhoods. Just over half (50.4%) of respond-
ents in District III reported being afraid to be out alone at
night. The level of fear was lowest in District II, with 35% of
respondents reporting they were afraid to be out alone at night.

City-wide, only 8% of respondents reported being afraid to be out
alone in their neighborhoods during the day. In looking at re-
sponses by district, again the highest level of fear was in
District I, where 12% of respondents reported being afraid to be
out alone during the day. In District III, 8% of respondents were
afraid to be out alone during the day, while in District II, only
4% of respondents reported being afraid during the day.

Citizens in Kettering had a much lower fear of crime than citi-
zens in either St. Petersburg or Ann Arbor, whose fear of crime
was fairly equal.

In St. Petersburg, females were significantly more likely than
males to be afraid to be out alone in their neighborhoods at
night.

Respondents who were afraid of being out alone at night were also significantly more likely to be afraid of being out alone during the day.

Citizen satisfaction with police service was measured by having ALL respondents rate police performance as either "good", "fair" or "poor" on five (5) factors: speed of emergency response; the availability of officers to help with nonemergencies; officers' courtesy; officers' professionalism; sensitivity of officers to citizens' needs and feelings; and, overall satisfaction with police service.

The level of satisfaction with police service was fairly similar among residents of St. Petersburg and Madison. Residents in Reno and Kettering were more satisfied with police service in their cities.

City-wide, the majority of St. Petersburg respondents gave police officers "good" ratings on all but one factor- availability of officers to help with nonemergencies.

The ratings by respondents city-wide were as follows: (responses do not total 100% due to "don't know" responses)

	% GOOD	% FAIR	% POOR
Emergency response	59.0%	23.5%	7.6%
Help with nonemergencies	40.1	32.7	14.6
Officers' courtesy	74.4	15.6	3.0
Officers' professionalism	70.0	19.8	2.6
Officers' sensitivity	54.9	28.7	6.4
Overall satisfaction	59.0	28.7	5.2

Ratings by respondents by district were as follows:

EMERGENCY RESPONSE	% GOOD	% FAIR	% POOR
District I	47.2%	35.1%	13.1%
District II	66.4	21.2	5.3
District III	57.9	19.6	6.9

NONEMERGENCY AVAILABILITY	% GOOD	% FAIR	% POOR
District I	28.9%	35.4%	28.2%
District II	43.5	36.7	10.8
District III	42.6	27.2	11.1

OFFICERS' COURTESY	% GOOD	% FAIR	% POOR
District I	68.5%	25.9%	4.3%
District II	80.7	11.0	2.7
District III	71.4	14.7	2.8

OFFICERS' PROFESSIONALISM	% GOOD	% FAIR	% POOR
District I	59.7%	33.1%	4.3%
District II	76.0	16.3	1.6
District III	69.7	16.3	2.6

OFFICERS' SENSITIVITY	% GOOD	% FAIR	% POOR
District I	43.9%	40.0%	11.5%
District II	61.7	27.7	3.5
District III	54.1	23.6	6.6

OVERALL SATISFACTION	% GOOD	% FAIR	% POOR
District I	43.6%	43.9%	10.2%
District II	66.6	23.9	3.5
District III	59.6	25.3	4.3

Blacks were significantly more likely than whites to give lower ratings to the police on all of the variables discussed above.

Renters were significantly more likely than homeowners to also give lower ratings to the police on each of the above variables.

As age increased, satisfaction with police service and the ratings of the police on the above variables improved. Older people were significantly more likely than younger people to give higher ratings to the police.

Respondents who were victims of crime during the past year were significantly more likely than respondents who were not to give lower ratings to the police department for: the speed of emergency response; nonemergency availability; and, overall satisfaction with police service.

Nearly half (46.1%) of all respondents city-wide reported having had contact with a St. Petersburg police officer during the past year. There were insignificant differences in responses by district.

Contact with the police was fairly equal in St. Petersburg, Reno and Ann Arbor. Residents in Kettering were less likely to have had contact with the police.

In St. Petersburg, people under the age of 55 were significantly more likely than people over age 55 to have had contact with a police officer.

As would be expected, respondents who were victims of crime during the past year were significantly more likely than those who were not to have had contact with a police officer.

Contact with a police officer in St. Petersburg came as a result of a call for service for the majority of respondents. Nearly two-thirds (63.5%) of respondents city-wide had contact with an officer as a result of a call for police service. This held true in each of the three (3) districts.

Citizen satisfaction was measured further by asking only those respondents who had contact with the police during the past year for their perceptions of that particular interaction. City-wide, the majority of respondents (well over two-thirds) who had contact with a specific officer rated that officer's performance as "good" on all factors measured. Factors included: appearance; conduct; helpfulness; concern; the ability to put the respondent at ease; and, problem solving. Additionally, the majority of respondents (over 80%) reported that they had been treated fairly; felt that the officer listened to them; and, that the officer used good judgment.

The only deviation from the perceptions expressed above occurred in District I where less than half (41.9%) of respondents who had contact with an officer felt that the officer had good problem solving skills. All other responses from District I conformed to the city-wide data.

Blacks were significantly more likely than whites to rate their contact with a specific police officer lower for the following variables: officer's concern; officer's helpfulness; officer's appearance; officer's conduct; officer's ability to put you at ease; officer's problem solving ability; fair treatment; good judgment; and, officer listened to you. However, the majority of black respondents still gave police officers "good" ratings for all but the following: helpfulness; being put at ease; and, problem solving. Race was unrelated to the reason for the contact with the officer. (See Table 4.)

Again, most respondents (63.5%) had contact with the police as a result of a call for service. Other reasons for contact included: phoning in a late reported crime; being interviewed as a witness to a crime or in the course of a police investigation; being involved in a traffic accident; being arrested or receiving a citation; attending a neighborhood meeting; or personally knowing a police officer.

Those respondents who had contact with a police officer for any reason listed above, except for neighborhood meetings or personally knowing an officer, differed in some of their ratings of the police due to the reason for the contact. Respondents who had contact with the police as a result of being arrested or cited were significantly more likely than those who had contact for any other reason to rate the police lower on the following: officer's concern; officer's helpfulness; officer's conduct; officer's ability to put them at ease; officer's judgment; and, officer's listening skills. There were no significant differences between

11

the reason for contact with a police officer and rating the officer for the following: officer's appearance; officer's problem solving skills; and, officer's treating you fairly. (See Table 12.)

Respondents who were victims of crime during the past year were significantly more likely than those who were not to rate the police officer lower on the following variables: officer's ability to put them at ease; officer's problem solving ability; and, fair treatment. There were no significant differences between victims and nonvictims on the following: officer courtesy; officer professionalism; officer sensitivity; officer concern; officer helpfulness; officer appearance; officer conduct; officer judgment; and, officer's listening skills. (See Table 13.)

Of those respondents who had contact with a police officer, nearly half (47.2%) said that the officer had offered them alternative solutions to their problems; 21% said that the officer did not do so; while one-third (32.9%) said that they did not have a specific problem.

City-wide, nearly 10% of those respondents who had contact with a police officer in the past year reported that the officer's behavior had offended them; 4% said that the officer's language had offended them.

There were no significant differences by district for the reporting of offensive behavior or language. Additionally, there were no significant differences between the reason for contact with police and the reporting of either offensive language or behavior.

Respondents who had been victims of crime during the past year were significantly less likely to have been offended by either an officer's language or behavior.

Blacks were significantly more likely than whites to have reported being offended by both an officer's language and an officer's behavior.

City-wide, only 2.6% of all respondents reported ever having registered a complaint against a St. Petersburg police officer. The highest percentage of respondents registering complaints was found in District I (4.3%). The percentage of respondents registering complaints in Districts II and III were 1.8% and 2.6% respectively.

Blacks were significantly more likely than whites to have registered a complaint against a police officer.

People between the ages of 35 and 54 were significantly more likely than those in other age groups to have registered a com-

plaint against a police officer.

The reason for contact with the police had no significant effect
on the registering of a complaint against an officer.

Respondents were asked who is MOST responsible for the quality of
life in their neighborhoods. City-wide, most respondents (81.4%)
said that residents and police TOGETHER were responsible for a
neighborhood's quality of life. 16% of respondents said residents
alone were most responsible, while 2% said the police alone were
most responsible. These percentages reflected the perceptions of
respondents regardless of district.

Respondents were then asked if they felt PERSONALLY responsible
for their neighborhoods' quality of life. Over half (56.5%) said
that yes, they were. One-third (32.5%) of all respondents felt
that they were somewhat personally responsible. Only 11% said
that they were NOT personally responsible for their neighbor-
hoods' quality of life. Again, these perceptions hold true re-
gardless of district.

Whites were significantly more likely than blacks to feel person-
ally responsible for the quality of life in their neighborhoods.

Homeowners were significantly more likely than renters to feel a
sense of personal responsibility for the quality of life in their
neighborhoods as well.

Generally, as age increased, so did the sense of personal respon-
sibility for the quality of life in one's neighborhood. Older
respondents were significantly more likely to feel personally
responsible for the quality of life in their neighborhoods.

Less than half (44.5%) of respondents city-wide reported being
aware of the Police Department's community policing plans. The
lowest level of awareness was in District III, where 38% of
respondents said they were aware of the Police Department's
community policing plans. In Districts I and II, 46% and 50% of
respondents reported awareness respectively.

Males were significantly more likely than females to be aware of
the plans for community policing in St. Petersburg.

Respondents who had contact with the police during the past year
were significantly more likely than those who did not to report
being aware of the St. Petersburg Police Department's community
policing plans.

Less than 5% of all respondents city-wide knew or could name
their Community Policing Officers, as would be expected in this
initial survey, which was administered prior to the deployment of

the Community Policing Officers. Most of the officers that were named as Community Policing Officers by survey respondents were, in fact, Crime Watch or Community Awareness Officers, who work with the Crime Watch Association coordinators.

City-wide, 14.4% of respondents reported being the victim of a crime once during the past year. Another 6.4% of all respondents had been victimized more than once during the past year. Over three-quarters (78.9%) of all respondents had not been victims of crime during the past year. Crime victimization varied little from district to district.

People under the age of 45 were significantly more likely than those over age 45 to have been the victims of crime in the past year.

The majority (60.0%) of all victims were victims of property crimes- burglary and/or theft. One-quarter (25.0%) had been victims of vandalism. 11% reported being the victims of an assault or robbery. 1% had been victims of domestic abuse, while less than 1% reported being the victim of a sexual assault. 2% were victims of other types of crime- namely, economic crimes and a variety of traffic-related problems.

Victimization by property crimes, vandalism and assault/robbery varied by district. In District I, 67% of victims reported being victimized by property crimes. This compares to 55% and 60% in Districts II and III respectively. Nearly one-third (32.8%) of victims in District II reported being victimized by vandalism, compared to 10.0% and 26.1% in Districts I and III respectively. In District I, 19% of victims were victimized by assault and/or robbery. This compares to 7% and 12% of victims in Districts II and III respectively.

City-wide, 84% of all victims said they reported the crime of which they were a victim to the police; 16% of all victims did not report the crime to police. There is virtually no difference in the reporting of crime by district.

Respondents were asked to assign either a "high", "medium" or "low" priority to a variety of problems, according to the attention they felt the police should give to each problem. The majority of respondents city-wide assigned a high priority to the following problems: burglary; rape; drunk driving; and, vehicle theft. Additionally, in Districts I and III, a majority of respondents also assigned a high priority to truancy. Burglary, rape and drunk driving were the highest priorities of respondents in every district, with well over three-quarters of respondents assigning a high police priority to each of these problems.

Blacks were significantly more likely than whites to assign a high police priority to the following:

    Loitering
    Truancy
    Neighborhood disorder

Females were significantly more likely than males to assign a high police priority to domestic abuse.

Respondents who were afraid of being out alone at night were significantly more likely than those who were not to assign a high police priority to loitering.

Respondents were asked for their sources of information about the St. Petersburg Police Department. This series of questions allowed for multiple responses, that is, respondents identified all of their sources of information about the police, not just one source upon which they might rely the most.

City-wide, T.V. and newspapers were both sources of information about the police to over 80% of respondents. A majority (62.5%) of respondents also said they relied on "other people's experiences" for information about the police. Nearly half (48.7%) said they got information from the radio. Over one-third (37.6%) reported getting information about the police first-hand, from their own personal experiences. These percentages varied only slightly by district.

Blacks and younger people were significantly more likely than whites and older people to get information about the police from the radio.

Homeowners were significantly more likely than renters to get information about the police from newspapers.

As would be expected, both those respondents who had contact with a police officer during the past year and those who were victims of crime during the past year were significantly more likely to report that they got information about the Police Department from first-hand, personal experience.

City-wide, 8% of all respondents said they were members of a Neighborhood Association; 15% were members of a Crime Watch Association. An additional 6% of all respondents said they were members of both Neighborhood and Crime Watch Associations. City-wide, 70% of all respondents did not belong to either type of association.

Association membership differed by district. The lowest level of participation in Neighborhood Associations was in District III (2.3%). The lowest level of Crime Watch participation was in

District I (3.9%). District II had the highest levels of partici-
pation in both Neighborhood and Crime Watch Associations at 12.2%
and 21.0% respectively.

Older people and homeowners were significantly more likely than
younger people and renters to be members of a Neighborhood Asso-
ciation and/or a Crime Watch Association.

Less than 2% of respondents city-wide reported that either they
or someone in their family was an employee of the St. Petersburg
Police Department.

Just over one-third (34.9%) of all respondents said that they
personally knew a St. Petersburg police officer. This equals the
percentage of Ann Arbor residents who reported knowing a police
officer.

In addition to the significantly related variables discussed
throughout this report, age and race were significantly related
to each other. That is, minorities in the sample were over-repre-
sented in the younger age groups, while whites were over-repre-
sented in the older age groups.

Tables 6 through 11 present data from those questions found to be
significantly related to both age and race.

Table 6 looks at the most serious crime problem by both age and
race. Across all age groups, black respondents were more likely
than whites to name drugs as a serious crime problem in their
neighborhoods, while whites in all age groups were more likely to
name property crime. The highest percentage of blacks in all age
groups named drugs as the most serious crime problem in their
neighborhoods. The highest percentage of whites in all age groups
named property crimes as the most serious crime problem, except
for whites ages 85 +, most of whom reported that there were no
serious crime problems in their neighborhoods.

Table 7 looks at quality of life concerns by age and race. Again,
the higher levels of concern expressed by black respondents
compared to whites held across all age groups. The levels of
concern for all quality of life and crime problems, however,
decreased for both blacks and whites as age increased.

Table 8 looks at the ratings of police service by age and race.
Younger black respondents were the most likely to give the police
poor ratings for all police service variables. As one looks at
black respondents across age groups, the older the respondents
were, the less likely they were to rate the police poorly.

16

There was no clear relationship between age groups for whites and their rating of police, except in their rating of police availability to help with nonemergencies, which younger whites were more likely to rate poorly.

Blacks across all age groups rated the police lower than did whites, however, the differences between the percentage of "poor" responses by race diminished for the older age groups.

Table 9 looks at the rating of police services by age and race only for those respondents who had contact with a police officer during the past year due to a call for service. The above findings, for the most part, still apply. Both blacks and whites, across all age groups, who had contact with the police as a result of calls for service, were more likely than those respondents who did not have contact to give the police lower ratings. This holds true virtually across the board for all variables, by race and for each age group.

Table 10 looks at registering complaints against a police officer by age and race. Both middle-aged blacks (ages 35-44) and middle-aged whites (45-54) were the most likely to have registered a complaint. With the exception of the 65-74 year old age group, blacks were more likely than whites to have registered a complaint, regardless of age. Complaints were virtually nonexistent by either blacks or whites ages 65+.

Finally, Table 11 looks at personal responsibility for neighborhood quality of life by age and race. Generally, for both blacks and whites, the older the respondent, the more likely he/she was to feel personally responsible for neighborhood quality of life. However, for all age groups, whites were significantly more likely than blacks to report feeling personally responsible for their neighborhoods' quality of life.

DEMOGRAPHICS

The survey sample was fairly representative of the city popula-
tion. The age distribution, percentages by gender, home ownership
and length of residency in St. Petersburg were all representative
of the city's population. Over one-third (37.8%) of all respond-
ents refused to report their approximate household income; the
sample over-represented middle income households and under-repre-
sented lower income households. Additionally, minorities were
under-represented in the survey sample. The percentages below
show how the sample's racial/ethnic distribution compares to 1990
census data for St. Petersburg: (see Table 1 for complete survey
sample demographic data)

	Survey sample	1990 Census
Asian	0.6%	1.7%
Black/African-American	13.6%	19.6%
Hispanic	1.5%	2.6%*
White	82.7%	78.0%
Others	1.2%	0.7%
No answer	0.4%	—

* Hispanics do not comprise a distinct racial group, but
   rather are an ethnic group, identified as being Spanish-
   speaking. Hispanics can be members of different racial
   groups and, therefore, when Census data are tabulated,
   percentages will exceed 100% due to showing the break-
   out of Hispanics as an ethnic group, having already
   counted Hispanics within their appropriate racial groups.

TABLE 1:

COMMUNITY SURVEY

FINAL FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION   N = 1,448

CHANGE IN SAFETY OF YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD IN PAST YEAR

Become safer	7.7%
Stayed the same	57.9
Become less safe	33.3
No answer	1.1

MOST SERIOUS CRIME PROBLEM IN YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD

Property crimes	50.8%
Drugs	12.4
Noise/nuisance	10.2
Assault, robbery	8.8
Traffic/speeding	1.8
Domestic violence	1.2
Rape/sexual assault	1.2
Loitering/prostitution	0.8
None	11.9
No answer	0.9

LEVEL OF CONCERN FOR NEIGHBORHOOD QUALITY OF LIFE PROBLEMS

% LEVEL OF CONCERN:

	VERY	SOME	NOT	N/A	MEAN SCORE
Crime	65.3%	24.4%	9.7%	0.6%	1.44
Feeling safe/secure	50.8	27.6	20.9	0.7	1.70
Adequate police patrol	49.3	29.2	20.6	0.9	1.71
Quality of schools	44.5	20.6	27.9	7.0	1.82
Housing appearance	34.9	37.0	27.2	0.9	1.92
Street/alley lighting	37.7	26.2	35.0	1.1	1.97
Juveniles	36.3	26.4	36.1	1.2	2.00
Homeless people	34.6	27.0	36.5	1.9	2.02
Code enforcement	30.2	33.0	34.3	2.5	2.04
Your neighbors	31.4	27.9	39.2	1.5	2.08
Conditions of streets	27.8	35.2	35.8	1.2	2.08
Litter/trash	29.0	26.9	43.0	1.1	2.14
Traffic/parking	25.6	32.5	40.7	1.2	2.15
Noise	23.0	32.0	43.9	1.1	2.21
Flooding/drainage	25.1	25.0	48.7	1.2	2.24

(MEAN SCORES: 1= VERY CONCERNED; 2= SOMEWHAT CONCERNED;
3= NOT CONCERNED. "No answers" were not included in the
calculation of means.)

LEVEL OF CONCERN FOR NEIGHBORHOOD CRIME PROBLEMS

% LEVEL OF CONCERN:

	VERY	SOME	NOT	N/A	MEAN SCORE
Burglary	53.2%	29.1%	17.5%	0.2%	1.64
Vandalism	46.6	28.7	24.4	0.3	1.78
Drugs	46.2	21.1	31.7	1.0	1.85
Vehicle theft	36.0	29.1	33.9	1.0	1.98
Assault/robbery	32.4	32.0	35.2	0.4	2.03
Sexual assault	32.0	24.2	42.5	1.3	2.11
Gangs	27.1	20.3	51.8	0.8	2.25
Neighborhood decay	24.7	23.5	51.0	0.8	2.26
Dogs/nuisances	16.2	27.6	55.5	0.7	2.40
Domestic violence	17.3	24.3	57.7	0.7	2.41

(MEAN SCORES: 1= VERY CONCERNED; 2= SOMEWHAT CONCERNED;
3= NOT CONCERNED. "No answers" were not included in the
calculation of means.)

FEAR OF BEING OUT ALONE IN NEIGHBORHOOD

	% YES	% NO	N/A
At night	46.4%	53.2%	0.4%
During the day	7.6	92.2	0.2

RATING OF POLICE SERVICE IN YOUR NEIGHBORHOOD

	% GOOD	% FAIR	% POOR	N/A	MEAN SCORE
Courtesy of officers	74.4%	15.6%	3.0%	7.0%	1.23
Professionalism	70.0	19.8	2.6	7.6	1.27
Overall satisfaction	59.0	28.7	5.2	7.1	1.42
Emergency response	59.0	23.5	7.6	9.9	1.43
Sensitivity of officers	54.9	28.7	6.4	10.0	1.46
Help with nonemergencies	40.1	32.7	14.6	12.6	1.71

(MEAN SCORES: 1= GOOD; 2= FAIR; 3= POOR.
"No answers" were not included in the calculations
of means.)

HAD CONTACT WITH A ST. PETE POLICE OFFICER IN PAST YEAR

Yes	46.1%
No	53.7
No answer	0.2

2

REASON FOR CONTACT WITH A POLICE OFFICER

	% OF TOTAL WHO HAD CONTACT
Call for service	63.5%
Telephoned late report	7.0
Know an officer	6.8
Neighborhood meeting	6.2
Witness to a crime	6.1
Traffic accident	5.2
Arrested/cited	5.2

RATING OF CONTACT WITH SPECIFIC OFFICER

(excludes those who attended meetings or who know officers)

% OF TOTAL WHO HAD CONTACT

	% GOOD	% FAIR	% POOR	MEAN SCORE
Officer's appearance	92.0%	7.0%	1.0%	1.09
Officer's conduct	83.4	10.9	5.7	1.22
Officer's concern	71.2	20.5	8.3	1.37
Officer's helpfulness	72.4	17.3	10.3	1.38
Officer put you at ease	63.1	26.4	10.5	1.47
Officer solved problem	56.2	26.6	17.2	1.61

(MEAN SCORES: 1= GOOD; 2= FAIR; 3= POOR.
"No answers" were not included in the calculations
of means.)

	% YES	% NO	MEAN SCORE
Treated you fairly	91.8%	8.2%	1.08
Listened to you	91.3	8.7	1.09
Used good judgment	85.6	14.4	1.14
Behavior offensive	9.7	90.3	1.90
Language offensive	4.0	96.0	1.96

(MEAN SCORES: 1= YES; 2= NO.
"No answers" were not included in the calculations
of means.)

OFFICER CONTACTED OFFERED ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS TO PROBLEM

Yes	47.2%
No	20.6
Didn't have a problem	32.2

EVER REGISTER A COMPLAINT AGAINST A ST. PETE POLICE OFFICER

        Yes   2.6%
        No   97.0
        No answer   0.4

WHO IS MOST RESPONSIBLE FOR NEIGHBORHOOD QUALITY OF LIFE

        Residents and Police   81.4%
        Residents   15.5
        Police   2.4
        No answer   0.7

ARE YOU PERSONALLY RESPONSIBLE FOR NEIGHBORHOOD QUALITY OF LIFE

        Yes   56.5%
        Somewhat   32.5
        No   10.6
        No answer   0.4

ARE YOU AWARE OF COMMUNITY POLICING

        Yes   44.5%
        No   55.1
        No answer   0.4

DO YOU KNOW YOUR COMMUNITY POLICING OFFICER

        Yes   4.2%
        No   94.8
        No answer   1.0

CAN YOU NAME YOUR COMMUNITY POLICING OFFICER

        Yes   2.8%
        No   96.0
        No answer   1.2

HAVE YOU BEEN A CRIME VICTIM IN PAST YEAR

        Yes, once   14.4%
        Yes, more than once   6.4
        No   78.9
        No answer   0.3

TYPE OF CRIME OF WHICH YOU WERE A VICTIM

                          % OF TOTAL VICTIMS

        Burglary, theft   60.0%
        Vandalism   25.0
        Assault, robbery   11.3
        Domestic abuse   1.3
        Sexual assault   0.7
        All others   1.7

DID YOU REPORT THE CRIME OF WHICH YOU WERE A VICTIM

              % OF TOTAL VICTIMS

    Yes   83.7%
    No   16.3

WHAT LEVEL OF PRIORITY WOULD YOU ASSIGN TO CERTAIN PROBLEMS

	% HIGH	% MEDIUM	% LOW	% N/A	MEAN SCORE
Burglary	85.6%	11.6%	2.1%	0.7%	1.16
Rape	85.3	5.6	8.1	1.0	1.22
Drunk driving	76.5	15.3	7.1	1.1	1.30
Vehicle theft	58.9	32.7	7.5	0.9	1.48
Truancy	48.1	29.4	21.1	1.4	1.73
Loitering	34.3	43.2	21.3	1.2	1.87
Domestic disputes	29.8	39.9	29.2	1.1	1.99
Run-down houses	28.1	32.3	38.9	0.7	2.11
Barking dogs	8.8	26.2	64.2	0.8	2.56

        (MEAN SCORES: 1= HIGH; 2= MEDIUM; 3= LOW.
         "No answers" were not included in the calculations
         of means.)

SOURCES OF INFORMATION ABOUT THE ST. PETE POLICE DEPARTMENT

	% YES	% NO	% N/A
T.V.	83.6%	16.0%	0.4%
Newspapers	82.9	16.6	0.5
Other people	62.5	37.1	0.4
Radio	48.7	50.6	0.7
First-hand	37.6	61.9	0.5

MEMBERSHIP IN LOCAL ASSOCIATIONS

Neighborhood Association	7.8%
Crime Watch Association	15.4
Both groups	5.8
Neither group	70.4
No answer	0.6

ARE YOU OR SOMEONE IN YOUR FAMILY AN EMPLOYEE OF THE SPPD

Yes	1.9%
No	97.8
No answer	0.3

DO YOU PERSONALLY KNOW A ST. PETE POLICE OFFICER

Yes	34.9%
No	64.9
No answer	0.2

DO YOU OWN OR RENT YOUR RESIDENCE/BUSINESS

Own	78.7%
Rent	20.9
No answer	0.4

AGE DISTRIBUTION

18-24	4.7%
25-34	14.9
35-44	20.9
45-54	13.8
55-64	13.2
65-74	18.6
75-84	10.4
85+	1.1
No answer	2.4

ANNUAL HOUSEHOLD INCOME DISTRIBUTION

less than $15K	14.6%
$15K-24.9K	15.0
$25K-34.9K	12.0
$35K-49.9K	12.8
$50K-74.9K	5.7
$75-99.9K	1.0
$100K+	1.1
No answer	37.8

GENDER

        Male   45.4%
        Female   54.5
        No answer   0.1

RESIDENT OR BUSINESS PERSON

        Resident   92.5%
        Business   7.4
        No answer   0.1

LENGTH OF RESIDENCE IN ST. PETE

        less than 1 year   2.9%
        1-2 years   5.4
        3-5 years   10.5
        6-10 years   13.8
        11+ years   66.2
        part-time   0.6
        No answer   0.6

RACIAL/ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION

        Asian   0.6%
        Black   13.6
        Hispanic   1.5
        White   82.7
        Others   1.2
        No answer   0.4

COMMUNITY POLICING AREAS INCLUDED IN SURVEY SAMPLE

        10S   20S   30R
        10T   21R   30S
        10U   21S   30T
        11R   21U   31S
        11S   22R   31T
        11U   22S   32R
        11W   22T   32S
        12R   23R   32T
        12S   23S   33R
        12T   23T   33S
        13R   33T
        13S
        13T
        13U

SUMMARY OF THE INTERNAL SURVEY

INTRODUCTION

In addition to the community survey, the Planning & Research Unit also designed, fielded and analyzed a similar survey within the Police Department. The purpose of the internal survey was to provide baseline data of police personnel's perceptions of their jobs; their feelings about the philosophy, implementation and effectiveness of community policing; their ratings of police jobs along a continuum ranging primarily from reactive to coactive functions; and, their level of concern for the quality of life problems that they perceive to exist within neighborhoods in which they have worked as officers or live. Police employee respondents were also asked an open-ended question dealing with the implementation of community policing and their recommendations as to how this process might be improved.

During November of 1991, a total of 714 surveys were sent out to all Police Department employees, both sworn and civilian. Labels were created for every current employee and attached to the surveys. Each unit within the Department received surveys to distribute to their personnel along with a cover memorandum from the Chief of Police asking for their participation. There were also explicit instructions concerning the return of the survey and a deadline for its completion.

A total of 337 completed surveys were returned to the Planning & Research Unit, a response rate of 47.2%.

Survey data were analyzed via frequency distributions and the computation of mean scores (see Table 1). Correlation coefficients (Pearson's r) were calculated in order to identify those variables that were significantly related to each other. Survey responses were correlated with race, gender, job assignment and sworn/civilian status. Variables found to be significantly related are discussed within this report; highly significant relationships between variables were defined as those yielding a significance level of .001 (see Table 2).

While there were no statistically significant differences in survey responses by current job assignment, there were trends in responses by job assignment that may be of interest. Where differences in responses to the survey existed by job area, these differences will be discussed. These data are presented in Table 3. Statistically significant relationships were found between certain variables and age, and sworn/civilian status. These differences will also be discussed in the findings.

DISCUSSION OF SURVEY FINDINGS

Police Department personnel were asked why they had chosen careers in law enforcement/public service. The reason given by the largest percentage of survey respondents (30.5%) was "to help people/community service." Nearly one-quarter (23.7%) of the respondents stated that such work was varied and interesting. The responsibility and meaning of such work was named by 19.3% of the respondents, while 12.2% of respondents replied that they were motivated by job security/pay and benefits/pensions. Only 4% of respondents said they chose law enforcement careers because they were exciting and adventurous.

Respondents were asked how their perceptions of police work/public service, the public and their particular jobs had changed over the past year. Nearly half (45.4%) of all respondents said that their perceptions of police work/public service had remained about the same. The majority of respondents (58.2%) also indicated that their perceptions of the public had remained about the same. Perceptions of their specific jobs had become more positive for nearly half (49.0%) of the respondents.

A greater percentage of survey respondents assigned to the Community Policing Division had positive perceptions of police work in general, of the public and particularly of their specific jobs, compared to respondents from any other job area.

A concern of police management may be addressing a potential morale problem in the Criminal Investigations Division (CIS). Nearly one-third (29.3%) of survey respondents from CIS said that their perceptions of their jobs had grown more negative during the past year. This compares to 14% of Communications Center personnel, 13% of Administration Bureau personnel, 12% of Operations Bureau personnel, 5% of personnel assigned to the Office of the Chief of Police, 5% of personnel assigned to undercover units and NO personnel assigned to Community Policing. (CIS personnel were almost evenly divided between feeling more positive, feeling the same and feeling more negative.) The highest percentages of respondents who felt more positive about their jobs were in Community Policing and the undercover units (Vice & Narcotics, Intelligence and Career Criminal.)

When asked whether or not they felt that community policing was the "wave of the future in law enforcement", nearly three-quarters (74.2%) of all respondents said that yes, community policing was "a step in the right direction, a needed change." Only 4% of respondents felt that community policing was a step in the wrong direction. 18% of respondents felt that community policing was a "passing fad" that would fade away.

Again, CIS personnel tended to be less enthusiastic about community policing. Less than half of CIS respondents (46.0%) felt that community policing was a step in the right direction. This compares to no less than three-quarters of respondents from every other area in the Department feeling that community policing is

definitely the wave of the future. The highest levels of support
for community policing were found in the Office of the Chief, the
Community Policing Division, the undercover units, and the Admin-
istration Bureau, in that order.

Over three-quarters of the respondents (78.6%) felt that the
transition to community policing would have at least some direct
affect on how they did their jobs. 21% felt that there would be
no affect on their jobs.

Respondents were asked which group would have the most signifi-
cant impact on the success of implementing community policing.
The majority of respondents (53.1%) felt that all of the groups
listed would have an equal impact. The groups included: Police
Department employees and management; city residents and business
people; city management and elected officials; and, other city
employees and service providers.

Over three-quarters of all respondents (80.1%) felt that they
could define or explain community policing as it was being imple-
mented in St. Petersburg, at least to some degree. Only 16% of
respondents felt that they could not do so at all.

Respondents from CIS felt less able to define or explain communi-
ty policing. One-third of CIS personnel (33.3%) felt that they
could definitely explain community policing. However, the commu-
nity policing message is not reaching well into other areas. Only
29% of personnel assigned to the Communications Center felt that
they could define community policing. Less than half of respond-
ents from the Operations Bureau and the undercover units did not
feel that they could adequately define community policing. A
majority of the respondents assigned to the Office of the Chief,
the Community Policing Division and the Administration Bureau
said that they could define community policing and understood how
it was to be implemented.

Respondents were asked in an open-ended survey question for their
personal definition of community policing. The keywords and
concepts mentioned most frequently were: partnership; problem-
solving; quality of life; service; communication; trust; respon-
sibility; understanding; accountability; policing excellence;
empowerment; and, respect.

A personal definition that got right to the heart of community
policing was:

    "A partnership with the community to resolve problems
     and improve the quality of life."

Or as one respondent put it, community policing is simply "people
helping people."

Police Department employees do not perceive the citizens of St.
Petersburg as having the same level of understanding of community
policing. However, a majority of all respondents (55.5%) felt

that the citizens had at least some degree of understanding of community policing. 41% felt that the citizens of our community had no understanding of community policing.

Nearly all of the respondents (94.7%) felt that community policing would positively impact the quality of life in St. Petersburg, at least somewhat. Only 3% felt that community policing would have no positive impact on the community.

Respondents from CIS were also more apt to feel that community policing would positively impact the community, however, there were differences in the degree to which they felt this would happen compared to personnel from other areas. Only 15% of CIS personnel felt that community policing's impact would be significant, compared to 71% of personnel assigned to the Office of the Chief, 67% of Community Policing personnel, 60% of personnel assigned to the undercover units, 40% of Administration Bureau personnel, 35% of Operations Bureau personnel and 35% of personnel assigned to the Communications Center.

Several questions then probed respondents' perceptions of certain expected impacts commonly associated with community policing operations.

Nearly all respondents (95.6%) felt that community policing would promote a sense of partnership between citizens and police officers, at least to some degree.

Again, there were differences in responses by job area. Less than half of CIS personnel (46.3%) and undercover personnel (35.0%) felt that community policing would lead to a significant improvement in the partnerships between citizens and police, compared to 89% of personnel assigned to the Office of the Chief, 82% of Community Policing personnel, 58% of Communications Center personnel, 57% of Administration Bureau personnel, and 52% of Operations Bureau personnel.

Less than half of the respondents (39.5%) felt that citizens' sharing in the accountability for the quality of life in their neighborhoods had increased during the past year. Nearly half (45.7%) felt that citizens' feeling of accountability had stayed about the same.

Respondents from CIS were the least likely to feel that citizens' sharing of accountability had increased, with only 13% of personnel assigned to CIS indicating they felt citizen accountability increased. Approximately one-third (35.4%) of personnel assigned to the Operations Bureau reported feeling that citizens' accountability had increased. A majority of respondents assigned to the Office of the Chief, the Administration Bureau and the undercover units felt that the level of citizens' accountability had increased over the past year.

Just about half of respondents (49.6%) felt that the amount of citizens' input into the prioritization of police activities was

already about right. One-quarter of respondents (22.5%) felt that
there was too little citizen input, while 19% felt there was too
much citizen input.

A greater percentage of undercover personnel (36.8%) felt that
citizens' input into police activities was too great, compared to
personnel from the Communications Center (28.9%), Operations
Bureau (23.9%), CIS (23.5%), the Administration Bureau (11.6%),
Community Policing (7.9%), and the Office of the Chief (0.0%).
Personnel from the Administration Bureau were most likely to feel
that there was too little input from citizens.

Nearly half of all respondents (47.5%) felt that the freedom they
had to do their jobs would stay about the same under community
policing. 31% felt the freedom to their jobs would increase,
while 18% felt it would decrease.

Only a majority of Community Policing personnel (68.4%) felt that
the degree of freedom they had to do their jobs had increased.
Most of the respondents from other job areas felt their autonomy
on the job had stayed about the same during the past year.

Employees were more positive about the potential for problem-
solving on the job. Almost half (46.6%) felt their ability to
solve problems on the job would improve under community policing;
a nearly equal percentage (41.8%) felt problem-solving would stay
about the same.

Again, only a majority of community policing personnel (61.5%)
and Communications Center personnel (56.0%) felt that their
ability to solve problems on the job had improved during the past
year. Other respondents were most likely to feel as though their
problem solving abilities had stayed about the same. The largest
percentage of respondents who felt that their problem solving
ability had decreased was from personnel assigned to CIS (17.1%).

Survey respondents were then asked to rate a variety of police
job functions along a continuum according to whether the primary
nature of those jobs was considered by respondents to be "reac-
tive", "proactive" or "coactive." "Reactive" job functions were
defined to be those felt to be more traditional in nature, basi-
cally involving activities that occur in response to a specific
situation or problem, after the fact. "Proactive" functions are
preventive or anticipatory in nature, seeking to prevent problems
or minimize the impact of existing problems. "Coactive" functions
involve teamwork between various problem-solvers— including
police employees, the citizens and other service providers— the
purpose of which is long-term problem solving and the building of
long-term partnerships.

Police functions rated as predominantly "reactive" by survey
respondents included:

    Patrol
    Criminal Investigations
    Internal Affairs
    Legal Services
    Vice & Narcotics
    Records/Property & Evidence
    Crime Scene Technicians
    Communications Center
    SWAT
    ORO

Functions perceived to be "reactive" form the core of what are
considered to be traditional police functions.

Those functions rated by respondents as basically "proactive"
included:

    Youth Resources
    Fiscal Services
    Training
    Public Information
    Computer Projects
    Special Events
    Intelligence
    Traffic/Marine
    Career Criminal
    Staff Inspections
    Crime Analysis
    Planning & Research
    Downtown Deployment Team

Many support functions were perceived as "proactive." Additional-
ly, some traditional policing functions- Training and Traffic,
for example- were also considered to be "proactive."

Functions perceived as predominantly "coactive" by the survey
respondents were:

    Community Policing
    Community Resources

Respondents were then asked whether community policing, tradi-
tional policing or both methods of operation together would be
most effective in achieving specific police objectives.

Community policing was felt to be the most effective method for achieving the following objectives:

To prevent future crime
To get needed information
To build better community/police relations
To solve problems
To improve communications
To improve juvenile outreach
To improve overall quality of life

Both community policing and traditional policing together were felt to be equally important in order to achieve the following:

To reduce present crime rates
To apprehend suspects
To help people
To improve the overall quality of police service

Traditional policing was not named, by itself, as the method considered to be most effective in achieving any of the objectives listed above.

The Police Department employees were asked to rate their level of concern for the same quality of life problems about which citizens were asked in the community survey. (Police employees were not asked about specific property and personal crimes, but rather were simply asked to express their level of concern for those categories of crime as a whole.)

The top five quality of life concerns of Police employee respondents, ranked by mean scores, were as follows (citizens' rankings of problems are shown for comparison):

Police employees rankings: Citizens rankings:

1. Crime   1. Crime
2. Feeling safe/secure   2. Feeling safe/secure
3. Adequate police patrol   3. Adequate police patrol
4. People in the area/neighbors   4. Quality of schools
5. Street/alley lighting   5. Housing appearance

Sworn personnel were significantly more likely than civilian personnel to be very concerned about: feeling safe and secure; people living in the neighborhoods in which they live/work; adequate police patrol; and, litter/trash.

Specific crime problems were ranked as follows:

Police employees rankings: Citizens rankings:

1. Property crimes   1. Burglary
2. Crimes against persons   2. Vandalism
3. Drugs/drug-related crime   3. Drugs
4. Sexual assaults   4. Vehicle theft
5. Domestic violence   5. Assault/robbery

Younger respondents were significantly more likely than older
respondents to be very concerned about domestic violence.

Sworn personnel were significantly more likely than civilian
personnel to be very concerned about: crimes against persons;
property crimes; drugs; gang activity; domestic violence; and,
sexual assault.

Respondents in both surveys also were asked to rate their percep-
tions of the priorities they felt the police should assign to
specific situations. These ratings compared as follows:

Police employee priorities: Citizens priorities:

1. Rape   1. Burglary
2. Burglary   2. Rape
3. Drunk driving   3. Drunk driving
4. Vehicle theft   4. Vehicle theft
5. Domestic disputes   5. Truancy

Civilian respondents were significantly more likely than sworn
personnel to assign a high police priority to drunk driving.

Finally, Police Department survey participants were asked in an
open-ended question what recommendations they would make to
improve the process of implementing community policing in St.
Petersburg.

A total of 178 respondents took the time to answer this final
open-ended question. Many of their comments, observations and
recommendations were insightful and represent a serious commit-
ment to and desire to make the vision of community policing a
workable, successful and meaningful reality in this city. The
summary below captures the essence of this important contribution
on the part of the survey participants. Their thoughts and recom-
mendations merit serious consideration. Their time and efforts
are much appreciated. The comments below represent feelings
shared by many respondents.

All responses to each of the open-ended survey questions are
available for review in Planning & Research.

SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS' RECOMMENDATIONS

"Making the community feel they are an important part of the shared partnership is probably the most important."

"Increased communication between divisions, sections, units and between all levels... Get rid of all the power-playing that is going on between the major divisions and get down to business. Need increased cooperation, everyone working toward the same goal. There exists some exceptional filters of information within this organization..."

"Greater direction from and consistency in actions of Chief and Command Staff. Less empire-building so all have an equal say and can contribute in their area of expertise. Greater input from the community. More effective inter-departmental and intra-departmental communication. Concrete, measurable outcomes. Better handle on goals and objectives, expectations and possible results. More time devoted to planning and broader participation in planning."

"There are 'dead zones' in the chain of command. Areas where information is not passed in either direction. There are also some one-way information gates..."

"More information to the community. Keep a tight feedback loop. See what works and what doesn't work. Make timely corrections. Designate individuals to act as a point of contact within each area of the department to address community policing problems as they occur."

"Allow all persons interested in working to improve community policing to get involved... when putting a cap on numbers, not only hindering the flow of potential ideas, but dampens the potential moral boost desperately needed in every area of the police department. Interest denotes action."

"Make Community Policing part of Patrol instead of a separate unit which has already driven a wedge between regular Patrol and Community Policing... other sections throughout the department are being neglected and disturbed to accommodate Community Policing... Even though Community Policing is a priority, don't disregard the 'core' of this police department which generated its professional reputation throughout the country prior to the "Curtsinger Campaign.'"

"The program seems to be moving in the right direction but feel more must be done to inform the public more thoroughly to achieve a faster response on their part."

"INFORM and simplify."

"Don't punish everyone else while switching to community-based items."

"To continue to make sure that all members of this department regardless of being involved in community policing or not are recognized for the contributions that they give."

"Ask the community how they want to be policed."

"Recommendations- what for? It will be done the way the community policing decision makers say it will be done. No one listened before, when fears of lack of patrol officers may get someone hurt, now out of the blue, they are scrambling to find bodies for the street. The program is probably a fine one, if we had the luxury of manpower and the public was afforded the same services as before, not less..."

"The most important thing that can be done to implement community policing is to better involve the Patrol Division... It is the patrol officers' worry that they will be doing the Community Policing Unit's work for them. The sergeants' opinions have been that they will be losing control over what happens in their areas of responsibility and their control will be heavily influenced by the Community Policing Officer. If any place can make it work, St. Petersburg can, but everyone in the agency must pull together. Everyone will only pull together if they feel as if they are an integral part of the concept."

"To stress that good public relations among officers versus people begin with consideration and respect... the importance of fairness and pride in working with the community is imperative to develop this program and have this program be a success."

"Involve CIS more, because the bottom line is that most of the follow-up investigation is done by CIS, and even if the community officer gets involved, the best way to get the crime follow-up, and handled correctly, is by CIS... I have never seen the amount of information lost, and not passed on, and the morale has never been lower..."

"... we need very good communication between the community policing officers and the patrol officers. Conventional officers will always be needed and will be basically reactive. They will need the input of the community policing officers so that problems can be handled together... If we all work together, I feel we could really improve the city. The key will be cooperation. We also need to make sure that we keep good patrol officers on patrol handling the hot calls."

"Make sure the new city manager buys into this."

"As a dispatcher, I would hope the officers involved with this program try and remember to listen to the calls going out and if they hear a call coming out in their area that they can handle, to take it. Stop chattering on the working channel, check on and off and let the dispatcher know what they are planning that day. If they keep us informed, we can keep them informed."

"As I have no idea how it is to be implemented, it is hard to say which direction or how much impact it will have. The scuttlebutt on the street officers indicate that this is going to be just another clique within the department. Information will only flow one way and there will be very little of a team effort. If this sounds negative, it is xx years of experience speaking. I will try my best to help this program work. It is a good idea..."

"What is needed is to make sure that there are enough uniformed officers on the street to handle the calls coming in from the public."

"The officers should not be spread so thin that they cannot handle the area they are assigned."

"Keep patrol officers and community officers communicating. Don't let walls build up between the two. Keep patrol officers involved with and updated by the community officers. Try to establish a feeling of zone ownership with patrol officers also."

"A plan with a time line and phases of implementation should be simple and available to all personnel so they feel part of the process and have time to plan and prepare for any changes."

"Work on the department as a whole, to improve the relationship police have with citizens. Try to lessen the anti-police attitude in the community. Improve supervisors' attitudes. Better training to become more open-minded. If the officers or workers in the department are happy and content, this will improve how citizens are treated. As the officers' relationships with supervisors get better, so will officers' relationships with persons in the community."

"Explain to all divisions how they are going to affected or be part of this policy."

"I don't think our supervisors are adequately trained in the area of interpersonal relations... Being able to give positive rein-forcement to the troops and credit for a job well done should be common practice. Making the officers feel important and that what they are doing is beneficial is a key to the officer wanting to work... Community policing is a great idea but the energy level has to be maintained. The city doesn't need another snow job... The officers need a sense of belonging instead of just coming to work and getting paid. Seek people's special skills and utilize them... Involve officers' families."

"Although we have progressed very quickly to where we are today, I think we need to slow down just a little. Personnel from various areas throughout the police department need to be more involved in some of the decisions being made within the community policing division... Bringing more people into the team will ease the tension of 'them and us.'"

"The key to the whole situation is communication between the
community and the police department, and other agencies involved
in the overall plan. Nothing aggravates me more than to hear an
officer refuse to tell a citizen what is happening and why or
just ignore their questions."

"Day to day evaluation of community policing by area and define
the needs within each neighborhood. Rapid deployment of community
policing officers to address manpower shortages on the street,
and answer calls for service... Attempt to maintain a balance
between the new concept of community policing and the proven
methods of traditional policing. Diversity of philosophy should
give the department some stability during the period of transi-
tion."

"Make a better survey. There are more answers to the questions
you have addressed. The selection of answers you give are very
narrow. I don't think your results will give you a clear picture
of the information you want."

"Education of the philosophy to members not a part of the initial
implementation. Media presentation to the community to develop
interest and awareness."

"First, I would set a minimum length of service for officers to
be considered community policing officers. I also would like to
see more television coverage since I feel most people rely on
this media for their news... I also believe city council needs to
allocate more money so officers could be hired and other officers
transferred to community policing so that the large areas could
be made smaller. Also, some areas need more than one person."

"Community policing should not be city-wide, it should be in
problem areas first and then expanded city-wide. The process is
moving too fast... We first need to work smaller areas to solve
problems."

"Don't move so fast. Wait until you have sufficient manpower and
resources and city commitment before you strip officers from the
street."

"Community policing is great and is very much needed. Unfortu-
nately, this department has forgotten that community policing
starts within. As community policing has become this department's
main focus, the rest of us have fallen by the wayside..."

"Involve the citizens in community policing training. Make more
information available through pamphlets or handouts for people
who do not have cable or access to Channel 15. Have Youth Re-
sources involved more so they can get to our youth and explain
community policing and how they can play a part in making it
succeed."

"Strong involvement and communication with all of patrol in
reference to progress and ideas. Stress participation of all

officers. Teach the importance of values and family structure to
the communities that have large numbers of juvenile offenders and
put responsibility back on the parents. Strong communications
between supervisors and officers. Need more feedback on perform-
ance in a more personal form, rather than standard evaluations.
Involve community members that have been viewed as 'anti-police'
(for example, the media, minority leaders, activists). Involve
other municipal agency managers in the implementation process."

DEMOGRAPHICS

Demographic information on Police Department personnel is readily
available on gender, race, level of education, sworn/civilian
status and distribution of personnel by rank and job assignments.

In comparing the sample of Police Department employees who re-
sponded to the survey to the entire population of Police Depart-
ment employees, it was found that the survey sample was fairly
representative on each of the above variables, except level of
education. The sample was skewed in under-representing personnel
with a high school education and over-representing personnel who
have had some college or have completed Associates degrees.
However, the survey sample should still be considered to be a
fair representation of the perceptions of the Department's popu-
lation, therefore the information discussed in this report is
generalizable to the Department's population as a whole.

The survey sample and Department population demographics are
summarized below:

	Survey sample	All Department personnel
% Male	69.1%	72.2%
% Female	30.0	27.8
% no response	0.9	0.0
% Sworn	69.1%	72.2%
% Civilian	30.9	27.8
% Asian	0.6%	0.6%
% Black/African-Amer.	11.0	15.5
% Hispanic	0.6	1.2
% White	86.0	82.3
% Others	1.2	0.4
% no response	0.6	0.0
% High school	19.6%	35.6%
% Some college/AA	55.2	42.5
% Bachelors degree	20.8	19.7
% Graduate degree	3.8	2.2
% no response	0.6	0.0
% Chief/Command staff	2.7%	2.0%
% Lieutenant/Sergeant	13.1	9.0
% Officer/Detective	53.1	60.7
% Manager/Supervisor	3.9	2.0
% Technicians/ECW's Dispatchers/Civilian Investigators	13.3	14.6
% Other civilians	13.3	11.7
% no answer	0.6	0.0

Distribution of personnel by job assignment:

	Survey Sample	All Department personnel
% Office of the Chief	5.3%	3.5%
% Operations Bureau	35.9	42.9
% Administration Bureau	13.6	9.8
% Communications Center	15.1	14.1
% Criminal Invest.	12.2	11.1
% Community Policing	11.6	12.2
% Vice & Narcotics/ Intelligence/Career Criminal	5.9	6.4
% no answer	0.4	0.0

NOTE: Data on Police Department personnel were taken from the December 1991 strength report. Data on the level of education of Police Department personnel were taken from a educational survey completed in 1991 by the Training Division.

TABLE 1:

INTERNAL SURVEY

FINAL FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION   N=337

WHY A CAREER IN LAW ENFORCEMENT/PUBLIC SERVICE WAS CHOSEN

To help people/community service	30.5%
Variety/interesting work	23.7
Responsibility/meaningful work	19.3
Job security/pay & benefits/pension	12.2
Adventure/exciting work	3.8
No particular reason	4.2
Other	4.2
No answer	2.1

PERCEPTIONS OF POLICE WORK/PUBLIC SERVICE

More positive	36.8%
Stayed about the same	45.4
More Negative	17.5
No Answer	0.3
Mean score	2.2

(1= more positive; 2= stayed the same; 3= more negative.
"No answer" responses were not included in the calculation
of the mean score.)

PERCEPTIONS OF THE PUBLIC

More positive	14.8%
Stayed about the same	58.2
More negative	26.4
No Answer	0.6
Mean score	1.9

(1= more positive; 2= stayed the same; 3= more negative)

PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR SPECIFIC JOB

More positive	49.0%
Stayed about the same	38.0
More negative	12.4
No Answer	0.6
Mean score	2.3

(1= more positive; 2= stayed the same; 3= more negative)

PERCEPTIONS OF COMMUNITY POLICING

        Yes, a step in the right direction, needed change   74.2%
        Yes, but is a passing fad and will fade away   18.1
        No, a step in the wrong direction   4.2
        No Answer   3.5

        Mean score   2.7

        (1= wrong direction; 2= a fad; 3= right direction)

PERCEPTION OF THE AFFECT COMMUNITY POLICING HAS DIRECTLY ON
RESPONDENTS' JOBS

        Yes   43.3%
        Somewhat   35.3
        No   20.8
        No Answer   0.6

        Mean score   2.2

        (1= yes; 2= somewhat; 3= no)

GROUP WHICH WILL HAVE THE MOST SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ON THE SUCCESS
OF IMPLEMENTING COMMUNITY POLICING

        Police Department employees and management   27.3%
        City residents and business people   15.4
        City management and elected officials   1.8
        Other city employees and service providers   0.3
        All of the above having equal impact   53.1
        No Answer   2.1

CAN YOU DEFINE OR EXPLAIN COMMUNITY POLICING

        Yes   40.9%
        Somewhat   39.2
        No   16.3
        No Answer   3.6

        Mean score   2.3

        (1= yes; 2= somewhat; 3= no)

PERCEPTION OF THE IMPACT COMMUNITY POLICING WILL HAVE ON QUALITY
OF LIFE IN ST. PETERSBURG

        Impact significantly   38.0%
        Impact somewhat   56.7
        Not impact at all   3.3
        No Answer   2.0

        Mean score   2.4

        (1= no impact; 2= impact somewhat; 3= impact significantly)

WILL   COMMUNITY POLICING PROMOTE A SENSE OF PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN
CITIZENS AND POLICE OFFICERS

        Yes   57.3%
        Somewhat   38.3
        No   4.1
        No Answer   0.3

        Mean score   2.5

        (1= no; 2= somewhat; 3= yes)

DO CITIZENS OF ST. PETERSBURG UNDERSTAND COMMUNITY POLICING

        Yes   2.4%
        Somewhat   53.1
        No   40.9
        No Answer   3.6

        Mean score   1.6

        (1= no; 2= somewhat; 3= yes)

PERCEPTION OF CITIZENS' WILLINGNESS TO SHARE ACCOUNTABILITY FOR
THE QUALITY OF LIFE IN THEIR NEIGHBORHOODS

        Increased   39.5%
        Stayed the same   45.7
        Decreased   11.0
        No Answer   3.8

        Mean score   2.3

        (1= decrease; 2= stay the same; 3= increase)

CHANGE IN PAST YEAR IN DEGREE OF FREEDOM YOU HAVE TO DO YOUR JOB

    Increased   30.8%
    Stayed the same   47.5
    Decreased   18.4
    No Answer   3.3

    Mean score   2.1

    (1= decrease; 2= stay the same; 3= increase)

PERCEPTION OF THE AMOUNT OF CITIZENS' INPUT INTO PRIORITIZING
POLICE ACTIVITIES

    Too much   19.0%
    About right   49.6
    Too little   22.5
    No Answer   8.9

    Mean score   2.0

    (1= too much; 2= about right; 3= too little)

PERCEPTION OF CHANGE IN YOUR ABILITY TO SOLVE PROBLEMS ON THE JOB
DURING THE PAST YEAR

    Improved   46.6%
    Stayed the same   41.8
    Gotten worse   10.1
    No Answer   1.5

    Mean score   2.4

    (1= got worse; 2= stayed the same; 3= improved)

RATING OF POLICE DEPARTMENT JOB FUNCTIONS

	REACTIVE	PROACTIVE	COACTIVE	MEAN SCORE
Patrol	76.3%	9.2%	9.5%	1.30
Criminal Investigations	79.5	6.3	9.2	1.26
Community Policing	2.4	15.4	73.3	2.78
Youth Resources	19.6	41.3	32.0	2.13
Internal Affairs	82.8	4.4	4.8	1.15
Legal Services	46.6	18.1	8.3	1.48
Fiscal Services	31.1	13.6	10.7	1.63
Training	22.3	45.7	18.4	1.96
Public Information	33.2	16.9	37.7	2.05
Computer Projects	21.4	26.7	15.7	1.91
Special Events	39.2	17.8	25.8	1.84
Vice & Narcotics	57.3	23.4	11.0	1.50
Intelligence	33.2	43.3	10.1	1.73

RATING OF POLICE DEPARTMENT JOB FUNCTIONS

	REACTIVE	PROACTIVE	COACTIVE	MEAN SCORE
Traffic/Marine	43.3%	35.9%	8.0%	1.60
Career Criminal	36.2	36.2	11.0	1.70
Staff Inspections	26.1	19.0	7.7	1.65
Crime Analysis	32.2	40.6	12.5	1.77
Records/Prop. & Evi.	57.9	5.9	9.8	1.35
Crime Scene Techs.	84.3	1.8	4.4	1.12
Communications Center	76.3	4.7	11.3	1.30
Planning & Research	9.8	35.0	30.3	2.27
SWAT	83.1	6.2	3.9	1.16
Community Resources	6.8	21.4	51.3	2.56
ORO	76.0	4.4	9.8	1.26
Downtown Deployment	29.1	29.4	31.7	2.04

(Mean scores- 1= reactive; 2= proactive; 3= coactive.)

NOTE: Percentages above do not total 100% due' to "don't know" responses.

IS COMMUNITY POLICING OR TRADITIONAL POLICING MORE EFFECTIVE IN ACHIEVING THE POLICING GOALS LISTED BELOW

	COMMUNITY POLICING	BOTH EQUAL	TRADIT. POLICING	MEAN SCORE
Reducing present crime	45.1%	38.3%	14.2%	1.68
Preventing future crime	68.6	24.0	5.0	1.35
Apprehending suspects	24.3	37.1	36.5	2.12
Getting needed information	59.9	33.2	4.8	1.44
Building community relations	80.4	16.1	1.5	1.19
Problem solving	59.1	34.4	3.8	1.43
Good Communications	62.3	31.8	3.2	1.39
Helping People	50.7	42.7	4.8	1.53
Juvenile outreach	70.9	23.1	3.3	1.31
Quality of service	43.0	46.6	8.0	1.64
Improving quality of life	55.2	38.8	3.3	1.47

(Mean score- 1= Community policing; 2= both equal; 3= Traditional policing.)

NOTE: Percentages above do not total 100% due to "don't know" responses.

LEVEL OF CONCERN FOR NEIGHBORHOOD QUALITY OF LIFE PROBLEMS

	VERY	SOMEWHAT	NOT	N/A	MEAN SCORE
Housing Appearance	33.0%	37.2%	15.5%	14.3%	1.80
Conditions of streets	25.0	40.2	20.8	14.0	1.95
Street/Alley lighting	43.7	29.2	12.8	14.3	1.64
Feeling safe	63.0	16.7	6.0	14.3	1.34
Quality of schools	41.6	25.8	18.2	14.4	1.73
Homeless people	26.5	37.1	21.7	14.7	1.94
People living nearby	44.9	29.8	11.3	14.0	1.61
Adequate police patrol	54.5	21.7	9.2	14.6	1.48
Code enforcements	33.6	38.7	13.4	14.3	1.77
Traffic/Parking	15.2	45.2	25.6	14.0	2.12
Noise/nuisances	21.4	42.0	22.6	14.0	2.02
Litter/trash	36.0	30.1	19.9	14.0	1.82
Flooding/drainage	24.7	32.7	28.3	14.3	2.05
Juveniles in the area	48.2	28.9	8.9	14.0	1.85
Crimes against persons	64.9	11.6	9.5	14.0	1.36
Property crimes	61.0	19.3	5.4	14.3	1.35
Drugs/related crime	62.5	15.2	8.3	14.0	1.37
Gang activity	41.7	23.5	20.5	14.3	1.75
Domestic violence	42.8	28.0	14.6	14.6	1.67
Sexual Assaults	51.7	22.6	11.3	14.4	1.53

(Mean scores— 1= very concerned; 2= somewhat concerned; 3= not concerned.)

RATING OF POLICE PRIORITIES

	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW	N/A	MEAN SCORE
Vehicle theft	46.6%	43.0%	8.9%	1.5%	1.61
Burglary	74.2	24.0	0.3	1.5	1.25
Drunk driving	54.3	39.5	4.7	1.5	1.50
Loitering	16.3	54.9	26.7	2.1	2.10
Rape	91.1	6.5	1.2	1.2	1.09
Truancy	26.5	51.8	20.5	1.2	1.94
Barking dogs	2.7	12.2	83.3	1.8	2.82
Domestic disputes	42.1	42.1	14.0	1.8	1.72
Run-down property	19.3	44.8	34.4	1.5	2.15

(Mean scores— 1= high priority; 2= medium priority; 3= low priority.)

AGE DISTRIBUTION

19 - 24	5.6%
25 - 34	33.5
35 - 44	41.8
45 - 54	14.3
55+	4.2
No Answer	0.6

GENDER

Male	69.1%
Female	30.0
No Answer	0.9

RACE/ETHNICITY

Asian	0.6%
Black/African-American	11.0
Hispanic	0.6
White	86.0
Other	1.2
No Answer	0.6

EDUCATION LEVEL COMPLETED TO-DATE

High school	19.6%
Some college/Assoc. degree	55.2
Bachelors degree	20.8
Graduate degree	3.8
No Answer	0.6

NUMBER OF YEARS EMPLOYED WITH POLICE DEPARTMENT

0 - 5 years	27.3%
6 - 10 years	27.6
11 - 20 years	38.0
20+ years	7.1

SWORN/CIVILIAN

Sworn	69.1%
Civilian	30.9

CURRENT RANK/POSITION

        Chief/Command Staff   2.7%
        Lieutenant or Sergeant   13.1
        Police Officer or Detective   53.1
        Manager or Supervisor   3.9
        Technicians/ECW's/Dispatchers/
                Civilian Investigators   13.3
        Other civilian positions   13.3
        No Answer   0.6

CURRENT JOB ASSIGNMENT

        Office of the Chief of Police   5.3%
        Operations Bureau   35.9
        Administration Bureau   13.6
        Criminal Investigation Section   12.2
        Community Policing Division   11.6
        Vice & Narcotics; Intelligence;
                Career Criminal   5.9
        Communications Section; ORO's   15.1
        No answer   0.4