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Profile of respondents (n=766 usable from 945 completed)

- After considerable piloting of this, admittedly short and preliminary q-form, we had 8 demographic questions (e.g., age, gender, race) and 17 relating to content issues.

- The content items included:
  - Estimates of Officers’ higher educational levels
  - Rated performance and satisfaction with SBPD
  - Reported amount of contact with SBPD Officers
  - Perceived communicative accommodativeness of Officers
  - Images of Officers on TV (positive-negative)
  - Concerns, approvals, and meanings attributed to “community-oriented policing”

- Survey was administered personally, in English-only, door-to-door in SB City (every 3rd door approached) from April to October 2002.

- Response rate estimated at 20% of those invited.
Overview

- Results presented as follows:
  - Demographics of the sample
    - Aim was to obtain gender, ethnicity & (adult) age balances, & beat distribution
    - Main patterns presented, others available
  - Content issues including
    - What predicts satisfaction with SBPD
    - Open-ended data
    - Concerns, approvals, & citizens’ understandings of “community-oriented policing”
Respondent demographic profile

- 52% female
- Range in age from 18 to 91 yrs
- 71% Caucasian (29% “other”)
- Average length of residence in SB City is 13 years
- 75% rent their homes
- 48% have a BA or better
- 47% yearly income $50,000 or more
- 46% have previous traffic violations
Respondent-profile of beats by gender and ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beat</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Caucasia</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>33 (36%)</td>
<td>47 (48%)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>55 (53%)</td>
<td>76 (75%)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>110 (61%)</td>
<td>150 (80%)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>47 (46%)</td>
<td>72 (67%)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>64 (54%)</td>
<td>91 (77%)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>61 (53%)</td>
<td>83 (73%)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>370 (52%)</td>
<td>519 (71%)</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Education level of respondent by ethnicity

*range 1-7 (1=<elementary school; 7=graduate degree)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education of Respondent</th>
<th>Caucasian</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.47&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.66&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 = completed AA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 = completed high</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Superscripts indicate significant differences: alpha = .05
Much fine detail exists on what our sample looks like... and many statistically different patterns emerged demographically...

- Respondent ages by gender
- Beat by age
- Length of residence in Santa Barbara: age by gender
- Length of time in Santa Barbara: Age by ethnicity
- Education of respondent: Beat by age
Findings
7-pt. Scales (1=least; 7 = most)

- Amount of contact with SBPD
- Expressed willingness to report crimes
- Expressed positive media representations of police
- Communicative accommodation of SBPD
- Satisfaction with, & ratings of, SBPD
- Concerns, approvals, and understandings of “community-oriented policing”
## Amount of contact with SBPD by beat

7-pt. Scales (1=None; 7 = more than 11)

Overall mean: 2.82 (1-2 occasions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beat 1</th>
<th>Beat 2</th>
<th>Beat 3</th>
<th>Beat 4</th>
<th>Beat 5</th>
<th>Beat 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>3.22&lt;sup&gt;bc&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.69&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.84&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.36&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.36&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.71&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Different superscripts indicate significant differences: Alpha = .05
# Reported contact with SBPD by ethnicity

7-pt. Scales (1=none; 7 = more than 11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Caucasian</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>2.92\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>2.62\textsuperscript{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3 = 3-4 times)</td>
<td>(2 = 1-2 times)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Superscripts indicate significant differences Alpha = .05
Expressed willingness to report crime to SBPD by age

7-pt. Scales (1=never; 7 = always)

Overall mean: 5.88

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report crime</th>
<th>18-25 yrs</th>
<th>26-35 yrs</th>
<th>36-50 yrs</th>
<th>51+ yrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.37\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>5.89\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>6.14\textsuperscript{bc}</td>
<td>6.48\textsuperscript{c}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 = frequently</td>
<td>6 = most of the time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Different superscripts indicate significant differences: Alpha = .05
# Willingness to report crime to SBPD by gender

7-pt. Scales (1=never; 7 = always)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Report crime to SBPD</td>
<td>5.53(^a)</td>
<td>6.20(^b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Different superscripts indicate significant differences Alpha = .05
## Perceived positive media portrayals of police by age of respondent

7-pt. Scales (1=very negative; 7 = very positive)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Media Portrayal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>3.77&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>3.96&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-50</td>
<td>4.22&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51+</td>
<td>4.24&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Different superscripts indicate significant differences Alpha = .05

Overall Mean: 4.01 (4=neutral)
Perceived positive media portrayals of police: Beat by ethnicity

![Graph showing perceived positive media portrayals of police by beat and ethnicity. The x-axis represents different beats (1 to 6), and the y-axis represents the scale of perceived portrayals ranging from somewhat positive to somewhat negative. The graph shows data for Caucasian and Other ethnicities.](image-url)
Respondents’ estimated % of Officers with B.A.s

7-pt. Scales (1 = 0 – 9%; 7 = 100%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%PD with B.A.s</th>
<th>Beat 1</th>
<th>Beat 2</th>
<th>Beat 3</th>
<th>Beat 4</th>
<th>Beat 5</th>
<th>Beat 6</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50-69%</td>
<td>4.05&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.78&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.68&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.38&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.86&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.73&lt;sup&gt;a,b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – 49%</td>
<td>30 – 49%</td>
<td>30 – 49%</td>
<td>30 – 49%</td>
<td>30 – 49%</td>
<td>30 – 49%</td>
<td>30 – 49%</td>
<td>30 – 49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Different superscripts indicate significant differences: Alpha = .05
Respondents’ estimated % of Officers with M.A.s by ethnicity

7-pt. Scales (1= 0 –9%; 2= 10-29%; 7 = 100%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Caucasian</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PD with M.A.s</td>
<td>2.16\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>2.35\textsuperscript{b}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Different superscripts indicate significant differences Alpha = .05
Respondents’ estimated % of Officers with M.A.s by gender and beat

(30 - 49%) 3
(10 - 29%) 2
(0 - 9%) 1

Beat 1 Beat 2 Beat 3 Beat 4 Beat 5 Beat 6

male
female
## Overall performance ratings

*(1=very poor; 4=average; 5=above average; 6=good; 7=excellent)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beat</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>1 (101)</th>
<th>2 (109)</th>
<th>3 (201)</th>
<th>4 (113)</th>
<th>5 (124)</th>
<th>6 (118)</th>
<th>Total (766)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rating</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No statistical differences across Beats
Structural Equation Model of City-Wide Responses to Local Police

Age of Respondent

Perceptions of Police Officers' Accommodation

Caucasian (1) vs. Latino (2)

Police Department Performance Rating

Willingness to Call Police Department

Level of Satisfaction with Police

.28

.34

.09

.62

.52

.39

.05

-.08
Concerns or complaints about SBPD

(Open-ended items coded 99% reliably by two independent coders)

1. Attitudes/communication of Officers (n=75)
2. None (57)
3. Minority discriminationprofiling (52)
   - “they assume you’re in a gang because of hairstyle or tattoos”
   - “Women need to be higher positions than in charge of those parking ticket folks!”
   - “Harrassment of Latino youth, impoliteness”
4. Miscellaneous (42)
   - E.g., “Overwhelming presence”
   - “Take the gum out, Officers!”
   - “Don’t need helicopters – especially TWO!”
5. Slow response to calls (29)
6. Abuse of executive privilege (27)
7. Minor infractions (e.g., jaywalking/skateboarding) (24)
   - Of minor concern:
     - Inappropriate use of force (8)
     - Law suits (3)
Matters approved of
(99% reliably coded)

1. Good attitude and communication
   \((n=137)\)

2. Timely response to calls for service
   \((44)\)

3. Good presence \((36)\)

4. Increased safety (e.g., drunk driving)
   \((24)\)

5. Doing a good job \((24)\)

   Of minor concern:
   - Community programs \((4)\)
Changes ideally
*(coded reliably 99%)*

1. Attitude communication issues (*n*=50)
2. Employ more minority/female officers (45)
3. Need more Officers (43)
4. None (42)
5. Deal with social discrimination (28)
   - “More sensitive to the Hispanic community, more women on the force”
   - “Treat female employess better”
   - “Stop harrassing kids just because they are young”
   - “Less stereotyping (profiling); from what I’ve seen on fiesta, weekends, a lot of people are wrongly profiled and accused without anything except looking at them”
6. Too much emphasis on petty offences (12)
Meanings attributed to “community-oriented policing” (reliably coded 99%)

- Respondents asked if they had heard of the term (ie., “c.o.p.”). Those affirming were invited to indicate its meaning for them.
- Only 25% claimed they had heard the term (n=195)
  - Of those, only half (49.74%) were correct!
- There were 4 kinds of meaning attributed to “c.o.p.”
- Police-community partnership (97)
  - 12.66% of the entire sample actually!
- Community alone (47)
- Police alone (39)
- Miscellaneous (12)
  - “Spy on your neighbor”
  - “It sounds like a horrible idea to give anyone in the community police authority.”
**Conclusions**

- Images of SBPD, in general, on the **positive** side
  - Better than average, better than media portrayals
  - Very willing to report crime
  - Not concerned with “excessive force” issues
- Some, perhaps, “surprises”…
  - Different Beats/areas of the City seem not as potent as anticipated
  - Amount of contact with PD, length of residency in City, or even being recipient of a traffic ticket is not predictive
  - The community is not cognizant of agency differences
    - Put another way, one agency’s perceived dysfunction will spill over onto others
Conclusions contd....

- Less surprising perhaps, yet in need of underscoring, is that Officer *communication* skills are the *key* to good relations with the community
  - In particular, an Officer’s ability to *accommodate* different factions of the community is critical
- Community expresses a desire to see more ethnic minority and, perhaps especially, *female* Officers
- Irrespective of the #/quality of extant programs, the *message* of community-oriented policing is *not* getting out there, as yet...
  - Most malcontent resides in *young* people, especially male, non-Caucasians
Citizens’ Survey of Santa Barbara Police Department
March 25, 2003

A COPPAC PRODUCT

Thanks, Chief and Staff, for your longstanding support, interest, and commitment to engaging research!
~ extra data not presented given time constraints ~
### Profile of respondent ages by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-50</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-65</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-80</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81+</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>336</strong></td>
<td><strong>368</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-50</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Education of respondent: Beat by age

- BA degree
  - 18-25
  - 26-35
  - 36-50
  - 51+

- AA degree
  - 18-25
  - 26-35
  - 36-50
  - 51+

- High school
  - 18-25
  - 26-35
  - 36-50
  - 51+
Length of time in residence: Beat by age
Length of residence in Santa Barbara: Age by gender

[Graph showing the length of residence in Santa Barbara by age and gender. The x-axis represents age groups (18-25, 26-35, 36-50, 51+), and the y-axis represents length of residence (in years). The graph includes lines for male and female, with different colors for each gender.]
Length of time in Santa Barbara: Age by ethnicity

Length in Santa Barbara (in years)

Age

0 5 10 15 20 25 30

18-25 26-35 36-50 51+

caucasian
other