Citizen Opinion Survey: How a Mid-Sized California Community Perceives their Police Department

Robert Werling[*], Sriram Chintakrindi, Nicholas Clark, Gregory Morris, Mark Perry, Blake Randol

Stan State University, Department of Criminal Justice, 1 University Circle, Turlock, CA 95382, USA

Abstract: Successful community policing is, in part, dependent on the community's perception of their police officers. The police department of a mid-sized community in California's Central Valley conducted a survey to gain some measure of the citizen's perception of their police. The survey was conducted in conjunction with a nearby California State University. The results of the survey are being used to make revisions in the policies and procedures of the police department. It also proved to be an interesting activity for the professors and students of the university.

Keywords: Survey, police, community perception, research partnership, canvassing a community.

INTRODUCTION

In 2017-2018, a survey was conducted to evaluate citizen perception of the police. Early in 2017, the police department of a mid-sized (~210,000 citizens) city in California's central valley contacted the criminal justice department of a nearby California State University (CSU) and requested assistance with a community survey. During Spring of 2017, after several meetings between the two groups, agreement was reached on what questions to ask and how to conduct the survey. The survey has 24 questions that seek insight into how the citizens view the police and an additional seven questions that address demographic specifics (age, gender, race, etc.). A comment section allows a citizen to speak on issues that they consider to be important but are not found in the survey or to further amplify an answer on a survey question.

Meetings between representatives of the police department and CSU were conducted during late Spring and Summer. The meetings centered on specific concerns the department wished to have addressed and method of deploying the surveys. Delays in completing the survey were exacerbated with the advent of Summer. Summer has an opposite effect on teaching and law enforcement. Faculty have no teaching responsibility and tend to disperse for leisure activities and police officers are busiest because young people do not have school to control their activities and are more likely to become a concern of police. Despite these and other issues, the survey instrument (Appendix A) was approved and a method of distribution was decided. After some discussion, a

Memorandum of Understanding was written and a plan to survey the community began.

ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

This study was approved by the University Institutional Review Board. This study did not receive any external or internal funding. Therefore, we do not believe that there are any conflicts of interest associated with the publication of the aggregate results from the data collected for this study.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Perception of police is an important element in today's policing. It is widely recognized that police cannot do their job without the consent and support of the community they serve. A variety of factors influence the perception people have of the police.Citizen's perceptions of the police are important for determining whether someone sees the police in a positive or negative light. Over the past several decades, many studies have been conducted on different aspects of citizen perceptions of the police to determine what makes up these perceptions and opinions on the police. Certain perceptions have been found to play an important role in how citizens see the police. Fair treatment (Sunshine & Tyler, 2003; Wentz &Schlimgen, 2012), trustworthiness (Tyler, 2005; Sunshine & Tyler, 2003), concern for community problems (Goldsmith, 2005; Hinds, 2009), and respectful of citizens (Tyler, 1997; Tyler &Wakslak, 2004) are all actions and attitudes by the police that influence community perception.

Because studies have indicated that the perception of police may be influenced by demographic variables, several question on demographic information were

*Address correspondence to this author at the Stan State University, Department of Criminal Justice, 1 University Circle, Turlock, CA 95382, USA; Tel: 1-209-667-3416; Fax: 1-209-667-7134; E-mail: rwerling@csustan.edu

included in the survey. Such variables as: race (Weitzer&Tuch, 2005; Lai & Zhao, 2010), household income (Frank, Smith, & Novak, 2005; MacDonald & Stokes, 2006), level of education (Chu, Song, &Dombrink, 2005; Reisig& Parks, 2006), and employment status (MacDonald & Stokes, 2006; Wu, 2014) are believed to influence a person's perception of the police.

While race's effect on perceptions of the police has been documented in numerous studies (Weitzer&Tuch, 2005; Lai & Zhao, 2010; Wu, 2014), these and other studies have not been conducted in the mid-size city where this study was conducted. While the survey was being conducted, an unarmed black man (Stephon Clark) was shot and killed by police in Sacramento, California.The shooting sparked outrage in the community and was reported across the United States and in foreign countries. The incident was on the news nightly during the canvassing period.

In agreement with Hennigan, Maxson,.Sloane, and Ranney (2002), a citizen's income level and employment status were considered important factors to study by the faculty of the criminal justice department. Those with low income and who are unemployed are often living in more socially disorganized areas of a city. These areas of the city often garner more attention from the police and bring the citizens into more personal contact with the police.

For citizens who have an employment status that stops them from being employed, such as being retired or homemaker, knowing how these citizens perceive the police can allow researchers to begin to study how these groups come about to forming their perceptions of the police if they are not in the workforce. Studying these groups of citizens will let researchers know if they have significantly different perceptions on the police since they are not employed. Knowing how citizens with high household incomes might differ from those with low household incomes can allow researchers to study what these different groups might have in common about their perceptions of the police, and how lessons from one group can be applied to the other to potentially create more positive perceptions of the police.

There are several reasons why studying the effects educational achievement has on perceptions of police is important. Studying this factor will build on past research (Weitzer&Tuch, 2002; Sunshine & Tyler, 2003; Schafer, Huebner, & Bynum, 2003; Thompson & Lee, 2004), which has found mixed results.

Survey Methods

With an agreement of what was going to be distributed to the community, the concern became: which citizens and how to distribute the surveys. Eventually, a stratified random sample of 1,500 residents was determined to be the best sample size.

The police department divides the city into five areas and each area is divided into three beats. The resulting 15 beats were analyzed to allow equal representation in each beat. A list of every residential address in each beat was created by the police department and given to CSU. CSU took the number of homes on the provided list and divided it by 1,500. This simple calculation (63,596/1,500) results in ~42 and that allowed CSU to determine who would receive a survey. Taking the list of homes in each beat, a randomly selected starting point was made and every 42nd home was selected for survey distribution. A list of selected addresses were compiled and this gave CSU a population to survey.

Mailing

In order for CSU to be involved in any project dealing with humans, there has to be approval by the University's Institutional Review Board (IRB). IRB is concerned with anonymity (how it is assured) and safety of the research subjects. For mailings, these assurances are very straightforward. Researchers keep all data received in a database that is password protected. No one personally comes in contact with the subjects and safety is rarely viewed as an issue. IRB approval was sought and granted.

In November 2017, a postcard was sent to each of the selected homes notifying them that a survey was being sent and asking them to take 10 minutes, complete the survey, and mail it back in a return envelope. The initial mailing took place just before Thanksgiving 2017. The mailing included a survey and a return envelope.

The police department began to receive competed surveys in December 2017. Much as Summer is an issue for faculty collaboration, so too is Winter. In the middle of December the Fall semester ends and faculty begin to, once again, disperse for holidays with family and friends or vacation getaways. They regroup in late January and CSU is no different. In January 2018, we found that approximately 200 surveys had been completed and returned. This led to a second major decision.

Mailings are expensive. There is a cost of copying the materials, mailing the surveys and including a stamped return envelope. A second mailing would significantly impact the cost of the project with no real assurance of increasing response rates. After several meetings, all involved agreed that a canvass of the selected residences would be more efficient and effective. By using the initial list of homes and removing the homes that had returned the surveys, a list of the remaining homes gave us approximately 1,300 homes to canvass.

Canvassing

Canvassing presents several problems. The mailing was simple and straight forward. We know the address but not the people at the address and anonymity is easy to assure. However, IRB approval becomes more complex when researchers are face-to-face with a subject. Also, CSU's risk management department became involved. As noted by several CSU faculty, this type of survey technique had not been done before by any department at CSU-Stanislaus and concern for the students became an issue.

A lengthy form was submitted to IRB that assured the committee of our intent to do no harm and assure anonymity. Each resident that agreed to complete a survey would also complete an informed consent letter and the data collected would be kept in a password protected computer. Also, once the data was collected and put into a database, all identifiers would be scrubbed from the data. These assurances led IRB and risk management to give us approval to conduct the canvass.

While the approval process was occurring, the criminal justice department asked any students if they would be interested in being part of the survey. A group of 22 students eventually agreed to be part of the canvassing team. To buttress the number of canvassers, MPD requested assistance from the department's cadets, explorers, and volunteers. This provided an additional 17 people to canvass.

The criminal justice department has an adjunct faculty member who was a team leader in the 2010 national census. He volunteered to conduct a series of training sessions on administering a survey and all people who were going to go into the field were required to take one of the three-hour training sessions. With the 39 canvassers trained and ready, we put together a plan that led to the entire 1,300 remaining

residences being contacted during the month of March. From that 1,300 we got an additional 100 completed surveys.

Data Analysis

CSU was asked to evaluate the surveys and determine what the citizens think of the job being done by the police department. The survey begins with a Likert Scale. It is a qualitative evaluation of a person's opinion. In general, it ranges from "not at all" to "to a great extent" or "very dissatisfied" to "very satisfied." The qualitative measure is then given a number to allow quantitative evaluation (from 1 to 5). All numbers were assigned to assure that low numbers (1, 2) would indicate dissatisfaction and high numbers (4, 5) would indicate satisfaction in whichever attribute was being measured. The lower the number, the less satisfaction and the higher the number the more satisfied the resident is with the police department. This type of scale results in ordinal data and best lends itself to descriptive analysis. Therefore, Spearman's Rho and percentages and averages are used for analysis.

Demographics

The survey also asked for demographic information. There were 307 surveys returned. That represents 20.4% of the total surveys either mailed or delivered by hand. Of the 307 people who responded to the survey, 46.6% were male, 46.6% were female, and 1.3% identified as other, 3.6% preferred not to answer, with 2% of respondents leaving the question of gender blank. The median age of respondents to the survey was 56, with the age group aimed for in this study being citizens over the age of 18. The racial composition of respondents was 1% American Indian, 4.6% Asian, 1.3% African American, 16.6% Hispanic, 63.5% White (non-Hispanic), and 13% of the data was omitted after mode imputation for missing data. The educational level breakdown of the sample was 5.5% had Less than 12 years of schooling, 16.6% had a High school degree (no college), 28% had Some college hours (no degree), 14.7% had an Associate's Degree, 18.9% had a Bachelor's Degree, 12.4% had a Graduate Degree, and 3.9% of the sample was omitted after mode imputation. Household income composition of the survey was 9.8% for Less than $20,000, 9.8% for $20,000 to $34,999, 11.7% for $35,000 to $49,999, 30.9% for $50,000 to $74,999, 15% for $75,000 to $99,999, and 22.8% for $100,000 or more. In terms of employment, 52.4% of the sample was employed, while 40.7% of the sample was unemployed, with 6.8%

Table 1:   Spearman Rho Analysis

			10. To what extent do officers in the Modesto Police Department treat people fairly?	12. To what extent are officers in the Modesto Police Department respectful?	13. To what extent is the Modesto Police Department responsive to the concerns of community members?	14. To what extent do you trust the Modesto Police Department?	26. What is your race?	28. What is the educational level of person completing survey?	29. What is your current household income?	31. What is your current employment status?	@32. Crimerateper beat
Spearman's rho	10. To what extent do officers in the Modesto Police Department treat people fairly?	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.646**	.545**	.601**	.163**	-.035	.047	.064	-.015
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000	.000	.008	.550	.413	.280	.791
		N	307	307	307	307	267	295	307	286	302
	12. To what extent are officers in the Modesto Police Department respectful?	Correlation Coefficient	.646**	1.000	.592**	.669**	.090	.017	-.021	.028	-.032
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.	.000	.000	.143	.770	.720	.635	.581
		N	307	307	307	307	267	295	307	286	302
	13. To what extent is the Modesto Police Department responsive to the concerns of community members?	Correlation Coefficient	.545**	.592**	1.000	.654**	.078	.000	-.015	.053	-.064
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.	.000	.204	.999	.790	.375	.269
		N	307	307	307	307	267	295	307	286	302
	14. To what extent do you trust the Modesto Police Department?	Correlation Coefficient	.601**	.669**	.654**	1.000	.080	-.030	-.003	.120*	-.046
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.	.191	.610	.961	.042	.424
		N	307	307	307	307	267	295	307	286	302
	26. What is your race?	Correlation Coefficient	.163**	.090	.078	.080	1.000	.193**	.177**	.164**	.122*
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.008	.143	.204	.191	.	.002	.004	.009	.049
		N	267	267	267	267	267	263	267	254	262
	28. What is the educational level of person completing survey?	Correlation Coefficient	-.035	.017	.000	-.030	.193**	1.000	.408**	-.005	.011
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.550	.770	.999	.610	.002	.	.000	.928	.851
		N	295	295	295	295	263	295	295	279	290
	29. What is your current household income?	Correlation Coefficient	.047	-.021	-.015	-.003	.177**	.408**	1.000	-.217**	-.030
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.413	.720	.790	.961	.004	.000	.	.000	.598
		N	307	307	307	307	267	295	307	286	302
	31. What is your current employment status?	Correlation Coefficient	.064	.028	.053	.120*	.164**	-.005	-.217**	1.000	-.049
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.280	.635	.375	.042	.009	.928	.000	.	.417
		N	286	286	286	286	254	279	286	286	281
	@32.Crimerateperbeat	Correlation Coefficient	-.015	-.032	-.064	-.046	.122*	.011	-.030	-.049	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.791	.581	.269	.424	.049	.851	.598	.417	.
		N	302	302	302	302	262	290	302	281	302

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. 0.007679

of the sample omitted after mode imputation of the initial missing data.

Statistical Analysis of Data

Using SPSS, a Spearman Rho analysis of the dataset was conducted to determine if demographic variables influenced perception of police. Race, education, income level, and employment status were the independent variables. Trust in police, fairness of police, responsiveness to community issues, and respectfulness of police officers were the dependent variables.

Analysis (Table **1**) revealed two significant relationships. Race played a part in the perception of fairness of police. Whites were most likely to perceive the police as fair followed in order by Asians, Latinos, Native Americans, and African Americans. The other significant relationship was between employment status and trust in police. Unemployed respondents had more trust in the police than employed respondents.

Descriptive Statistics of Survey Data

Because the range of responses was assigned a number from 1 to 5, the average score for each question is 3. Basically, a survey is a form of evaluation and a common error made by evaluators is a regression to the mean. Responses tend to cluster around a middle response and, in this case, it is 3. In general, we can look at numbers that fall between 2.5 and 3.5 and determine that, as a group, respondents were not dissatisfied nor were they satisfied with any issue the question addresses. When questions elicit enough interest on the part of the respondent that they are willing to move out of that middle ground, then we begin to see what the respondents think of the police department.

Although there were 307 surveys returned, it is important to note that no question has 307 responses. Something in the response made data input impossible. Also, not all questions ask for an opinion of police officers. Question 6 askes the respondent to pick the three issues they believe are the greatest problems in the community and will be addressed later. Of the

remaining 23 questions, 16 have a mean rating within the previously mentioned range of medium opinion.

The remaining seven questions: 7, 10, 12, 14, 20c, 21c, and 22b are all outside the middle range. All of them are greater than 3.5. In the city wide analysis, there are no questions that had a mean

score under 2.5. This indicates general approval of the police department as it relates to the issue imbedded in the question.

First, studying non-police officer questions. Questions 20c and 21c ask about citizen satisfaction with dispatch. Question 20c asks for approval of dispatch interaction on a 911 emergency call and it is high at 3.73. Question 21c asks about interaction on non-emergency calls and is also high at 3.67. These responses indicate a good opinion of police department dispatchers.

Second, citizens feel safe walking alone in their neighborhood during the day (question 7). The mean rating is 3.53 and is high (meaning they feel safe) compared to how they feel about walking alone at night (question 8, 2.59-not as safe).

Third, citizens have been satisfied with the interactions they have had with their police officers (question 22b). This question had the highest mean score of any question on the survey (3.77). It may have been with officers, dispatch, records, detectives, or administrators but they give a high satisfaction rating to those interactions.

Fourth, questions 10, 12, and 14 reveal what people think about police officers employed by their police department. Respondents feel that they are treated fairly (question 10, 3.59) and with respect (question 12, 3.72). The respondents also indicated that they trust the police department (question 14, 3.59).

Fifth, question 6 asks residents what are the major issues within their community. Of the 305 surveys that had respondents answer this question the top six issues were: 6b—burglary/theft residential (141), 6o—homeless/transient related problems (123), 6a—burglary/theft auto (111), 6i—drug abuse (98), 6k—gang activity (91), and 6v—traffic/residential speeding (83)

In general, the people of the community have respect for their officers and trust in them to do the right thing. They also feel as though they are treated fairly. Basically, they are satisfied with the police department.

CONCLUSIONS

The survey has some weaknesses. The most prominent weakness is the return rate. Approximately 20% of surveys were returned. Researchers are aware that attitudes of citizens who do not return surveys is often different that attitudes of citizens who do return surveys. The issue is: what is the perception of citizens who did not respond and how does it differ from those who did return the survey?

Another weakness is the inexperience of the canvassers. No canvass of a community had been done by this particular CSU. There was some resistance to allowing students to canvass a community and this delayed the data collection. Eventually, students and police cadets were used to conduct the canvass. They were given a three-hour training seminar but that does not substitute for in-the-field experience. They, no doubt did an admirable job of canvassing but there were not enough faculty to go into the field with them and assist in the process. This may have impacted the response rate.

That said; a survey was taken. In this community, the citizens indicate approval of their police officers. This does not mean that there are no areas in which improvement can occur. In fact, the use of over 3.5 as a standard for approval is a low criterion to meet. Despite the media blitz of publicity regarding a police shooting of an unarmed black man in Sacramento during the time the survey was conducted, the citizens still indicated a positive attitude toward their police department. However, as noted above, the news may have impacted racial perception of the trust of police found in the data.

Citizens indicate a high level of satisfaction their interactions with the police. That issue had the highest mean score of any question and speaks well for the police officer's ability to interact with the community they serve. Respondents felt that they were treated fairly and with respect. In any community police effort, these are important perceptions.

What may be perceived as a counter-intuitive response was the finding that unemployed respondents indicated more trust in the police than employed respondents. This may be explained by the decision to simply condense the responses to a binary result

(employed/unemployed). Because of this decision, those who responded as students, retired, military, unable to work, and homemakers were included in the unemployed category. This may explain the unexpected result and is an interesting subject for further research.

There is still work that needs to be done. Every respondent had issues that they wanted the police to work toward fixing. The police department can still improve on most areas of the survey but it seems that in this particular central valley community the people of the community trust and respect their officers.

APPENDIX A

PD Survey

1. To what extent does the Police Department develop relationships with community members (e.g., residents, organizations, and groups)?

Not at all (1) A little (2) Somewhat (3) A lot (4) To a great extent (5)

2. To what extent does the Police Department regularly communicate with community members (e.g., websites, social media, e-mails, or public meetings)?

Not at all (1) A little (2) Somewhat (3) A lot (4) To a great extent (5)

3. To what extent does the Police Department make it easy for community members to provide input (e.g., comments, suggestions, and concerns)?

Not at all (1) A little (2) Somewhat (3) A lot (4) To a great extent (5)

4. To what extent does the Police Department work together with community members to solve local problems?

Not at all (1) A little (2) Somewhat (3) A lot (4) To a great extent (5)

5. Community policing involves officers in the Police Department working with the community to address the causes of crime in an effort to reduce the problems themselves through a wide range of activities. Based on this definition, to what extent do you think the Police Department practices community policing?

Not at all (1) A little (2) Somewhat (3) A lot (4) To a great extent (5)

6. Please select the three (3) issues you think are the greatest problems within your community.

BINARY CODE for each option below: 0 = NO / 1 = YES

o6a. Burglaries/thefts (auto)

o6b. Burglaries/thefts (residential)

o6c. Child Abuse

o6d. Child Sexual predators/Internet safety

o6e. Disorderly conduct/public intoxication/noise violation

o6f. Disorderly youth (e.g., cruising or gathering)

o6g. Domestic violence (adult)

o6h. Driving under the influence (i.e., alcohol or drugs)

o6i. Drug abuse (e.g., manufacture, sale, or use of illegal/prescription drugs)

o6j. Fraud/identity theft

o6k. Gang activity

o6l. Gun violence

o6m. Hate crimes

o6n. Homeland security problems

o6o. Homeless- or transient-related problems (panhandling)

o6p. Homicide

o6q. Mugging

o6r. Physical assault

o6s. Prostitution

o6t. School safety (e.g., bullying, fighting, or weapons)

o6u. Sexual assault/rape (adult)

o6v. Traffic issues/residential speeding

o6w. Underage drinking

o6x. Vandalism/graffiti

7. To what extent do you feel safe in your community when you are outside alone during the day?

Not at all (1) A little (2) Somewhat (3) A lot (4) To a great extent (5)

8. To what extent do you feel safe in your community when you are outside alone at night?

Not at all (1) A little (2) Somewhat (3) A lot (4) To a great extent (5)

9. Over the last 12 months, to what extent have your feelings of safety in your community increased, decreased, or stayed the same?

Decreases a lot (1) Decreased some (2) Stayed the same (3) Increased some (4) Increased a lot (5)

10. To what extent do officers in the Police Department treat people fairly?

Not at all (1) A little (2) Somewhat (3) A lot (4) To a great extent (5)

11. To what extent do officers in the Police Department show concern for community members?

Not at all (1) A little (2) Somewhat (3) A lot (4) To a great extent (5)

12. To what extent are officers in the Police Department respectful?

Not at all (1) A little (2) Somewhat (3) A lot (4) To a great extent (5)

13. To what extent is the Police Department responsive to the concerns of community members?

Not at all (1) A little (2) Somewhat (3) A lot (4) To a great extent (5)

14. To what extent do you trust the Police Department?

Not at all (1) A little (2) Somewhat (3) A lot (4) To a great extent (5)

15. If you had contact with an officer in the Police Department during the past 12 months, to what extent did the officer sufficiently explain his or her actions and procedures?

Not at all (1) A little (2) Somewhat (3) A lot (4) To a great extent (5)

16. To what extent is the Police Department effective at proactively preventing crime?

Not at all (1) A little (2) Somewhat (3) A lot (4) To a great extent (5)

17. To what extent is the Police Department addressing the problems that really concern you?

Not at all (1) A little (2) Somewhat (3) A lot (4) To a great extent (5)

18. To what extent are you satisfied with the overall performance of the Police Department?

Not at all (1) A little (2) Somewhat (3) A lot (4) To a great extent (5)

19a.How many times in the past 12 months have you had contact with the Police Department for traffic issues (e.g., citation, warning, or vehicle crash)?

0 times (go to 20a) **(1)** 1-2 times **(2)** 3-4 times **(3)** 5-6 times **(4)** 7 or more times **(5)**

19b. To what extent are you satisfied with your interaction(s) with the Police Department for traffic issues?

If 19a is (1), code (0) here

Very dissatisfied **(1)** dissatisfied **(2)** neither satisfied nor dissatisfied **(3)** satisfied **(4)** very satisfied **(5)**

20a. How many times in the past 12 months have you had contact with the Police Department for *911 emergency calls*?

0 times (go to 21a) **(1)** 1-2 times **(2)** 3-4 times **(3)** 5-6 times **(4)** 7 or more times **(5)**

20b. To what extent are you satisfied with your interaction(s) with the Police Department for *911 emergency calls*?

If 20a is (1), code (0) here

Very dissatisfied **(1)** dissatisfied **(2)** neither satisfied nor dissatisfied **(3)** satisfied **(4)** very satisfied **(5)**

20c. To what extent are you satisfied with your interaction(s) with the dispatcher for *911 emergency calls*?

If 20a is (1), code (0) here

Very dissatisfied **(1)** dissatisfied **(2)** neither satisfied nor dissatisfied **(3)** satisfied **(4)** very satisfied **(5)**

21a. How many times in the past 12 months have you had contact with the Police Department for *non-emergency calls* (e.g., to report a crime or suspicious activity)?

0 times (go to 22a) **(1)** 1-2 times **(2)** 3-4 times **(3)** 5-6 times **(4)** 7 or more times **(5)**

21b. To what extent are you satisfied with your interaction(s) with the Police Department for *non-emergency calls*?

If 21a is (1), code (0) here

Very dissatisfied **(1)** dissatisfied **(2)** neither satisfied nor dissatisfied **(3)** satisfied **(4)** very satisfied **(5)**

21c. To what extent are you satisfied with your interaction(s) with the dispatcher for *non-emergency calls*?

If 21a is (1), code (0) here

Very dissatisfied **(1)** dissatisfied **(2)** neither satisfied nor dissatisfied **(3)** satisfied **(4)** very satisfied **(5)**

22a. How many times in the past 12 months have you had contact with the Police Department for *other contacts or interactions* (e.g., attend a community meeting or talk to an officer on patrol)?

0 times (go to 23) **(1)** 1-2 times **(2)** 3-4 times **(3)** 5-6 times **(4)** 7 or more times **(5)**

22b. To what extent are you satisfied with your interaction(s) with the Police Department for *other contacts or interactions*?

If 22a is (1), code (0) here

Very dissatisfied **(1)** dissatisfied **(2)** neither satisfied nor dissatisfied **(3)** satisfied **(4)** very satisfied **(5)**

23. To what extent are you satisfied with police response time to emergency calls?

Very dissatisfied **(1)** dissatisfied **(2)** neither satisfied nor dissatisfied **(3)** satisfied **(4)** very satisfied **(5)**

24. To what extent are you satisfied with police response time to non-emergency calls?

Very dissatisfied **(1)** dissatisfied **(2)** neither satisfied nor dissatisfied **(3)** satisfied **(4)** very satisfied **(5)**

25. What is your gender?

Male (1) Female (2) Transgender (3) Other (specify) (4) Code (4) if there is text here

Prefer not to answer **(5)**

26. What is your race?

(1) American Indian

(2) Asian

(3) Black or African American

(4) Hispanic

(5) White (non Hispanic)

(6) Other (please specify) Code 6 if there is text here

(7) Prefer not to answer

27. What is the age of the person completing the survey?

Input raw number

Prefer not to answer ___

28. What is the educational level of person completing survey?

(1) Less than 12 years of schooling

(2) GED (no college)

(3) High school degree (no college)

(4) Trade Certification

(5) Some college hours (no degree)

Specify number of hours do not input raw # Code (5) if selected

(6) Associate Degree

(7) Bachelor's Degree

(8) Master's Degree

(9) Ph.D.

(10) Prefer not to answer

29. What is your current household income?

(1) Less than $20,000

(2) $20,000 to $34,999

(3) $35,000 to $49,999

(4) $50,000 to $74,999

(5) $75,000 to $99,999

(6) $100,000 to $149,999

(7) $150,000 to $199,999

(8) $200,000 or more

30. Do you have a relative or close friend in law enforcement?

(1) Yes _____

(2) No _____

31. What is your current employment status?

(1) full-time (> 35 hours a week)

(2) part-time (< 35 hours a week)

(3) Self-employed

(4) Out of work and looking for work

(5) Out of work but not currently looking for work

(6) A homemaker

(7) A student

(8) Military

(9) Retired

(10) Unable to work

(11) Other (specify): Code (11) if there is text here

(12) Prefer not to answer

Comments:

REFERENCES

Chu, Doris, John Huey-Long Song, and John Dombrink (2005).Chinese immigrants' perceptions of the police in New York City. International Criminal Justice Review*, 15*(2):101-114.
http://doi.org/10.1177/1057567705283894

Frank, James., Brad. W. Smith, and Kenneth. J. Novak (2005). Exploring the basis of citizens' attitudes toward the police. Police Quarterly, *8*(2):206-228.
http://doi.org10.1177/1098611103258955

Goldsmith, Andrea. (2005). Police reform and the problem of trust. Theoretical Criminology, *9*(4):443-470.
http://doi.org/10.1177/1362480605057727

Hinds, Lyn. (2009). Public satisfaction with police: The influence of general attitudes and police–citizen encounters. International Journal of Police Science & Management, *11*(1):54-66.
http://doi.org/10.1350/ijps.2009.11.1.109

Hennigan, Karen, Cheryl. Maxson, David Sloane, and Molly Ranney (2002). Community Views on Crime and Policing: Survey Mode Effects on Bias in Community Surveys. Justice Quarterly19 (3):565–587.

Lai, Yung-Lien, and Jihong S. Zhao (2010). The impact of race/ethnicity, neighborhood context, and police/citizen interaction on residents' attitudes toward the police. Journal of Criminal Justice, *38*(4):685-692.
http://doi.org10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2010.04.042

MacDonald, John, and Robert J. Stokes (2006). Race, social capital, and trust in the police. Urban Affairs Review, *41*(3):358-375.
http://doi.org/10.1177/1078087405281707

Reisig, Michael D., and Roger B. Parks (2000). Experience, quality of life, and neighborhood experience: A hierarchical analysis of satisfaction with police. Justice Quarterly*, 17*(3):607-630.
http://doi.org/10.1080/07418820000094681

Schafer, Joseph A., Beth. M. Huebner, and Timothy. S. Bynum (2003). Citizen Perceptions of police services: Race, neighborhood context, and community policing. Police Quarterly, *6*(4):440-468.
http://doi.org/10.1177/1098611102250459

Sunshine, Jason, and Tom. R. Tyler (2003). The role of procedural justice and legitimacy in shaping public support for policing. Law & Society Review, *37*(3):513-548.
http://doi.org/10.1111/1540-5893.3703002

Thompson, Brian. L., and James Daniel Lee (2004). Who cares if police become violent? Explaining approval of police use of force using a national sample. *Sociological Inquiry*, *74*(3):381-410.
http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-682X.2004.00097.x

Tyler, Tom. R. (2005). Policing in black and white: Ethnic group differences in trust and confidence in the police. Police Quarterly, *8*(3):322-342.
http://doi.org/10.1177/1098611104271105

Tyler, Tom. R., and Cheryl. J. Wakslak (2004). Profiling and police legitimacy: Procedural justice, attributions of motive, and acceptance of police authority. Criminology, *42*(2):253-281.
http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.2004.tb00520.x

Weitzer, Ron, and Steven. A. Tuch (2002). Perceptions of racial profiling: Race, class, and personal experience. Criminology, *40*(2): 435-456.
http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.2002.tb00962.x

Weitzer, Ron, and Steven. A. Tuch (2005). "Determinants of public satisfaction with the police." Police Quarterly, *8*(3):279-297.
http://doi.org/10.1177/1098611104271106

Wentz, Erica A., and Kristyn. A. Schlimgen (2012). "Citizens' perceptions of police service and police response to community concerns." Journal of Crime and Justice*, 35*(1):114-133.
http://doi.org/10.1080/0735648X.2011.631412

Wu, Yuning. (2014). "Race/ethnicity and perceptions of the police: A comparison of White, Black, Asian and Hispanic Americans." Policing & Society, *24*(2):135-157.
http://doi.org/10.1080/10439463.2013.784288