

OPINION SURVEY

Reno Police Department



January 1989

10012

ATTITUDE AND PUBLIC OPINION SURVEY

RENO POLICE DEPARTMENT

JANUARY, 1989

Wayne Lucia
Internal Affairs Unit
and
Loren Ross
Quality Assurance Division



POLICE DEPARTMENT

R V BRADSHAW

City of Reno

POST OFFICE BOX 1900 RENO, NEVADA 89505 (702)785-2100

January, 1989

This is the third in a series of surveys that the Reno Police Department has done. The people of Reno are asked twice yearly to report upon how they think "their" Police Department is doing. It is their Department and this is our report card. The Department uses the results of the survey in a number of ways.

With the reorganization of the Department during the summer of 1987 into what we call Community Oriented Policing (COP+), we pledged at that time to make the views of Reno's citizens prominent in determining how the affairs of the Department would be conducted. This survey is one of several ways in which we maintain that police-citizen contact. The findings stated in this report are used along with other management information sources to decide about training, deployment of personnel, the kinds of programs to start, which ones to halt, and what projects to continue.

This survey represents a major effort by the Department. We think knowing what the people have to say is very important. The many gains made since the reorganization show that we have been listening. We will continue to do so in the future.

R. V. Bradshaw
Chief of Police

INDEX

Executive Summary.....	I
Acknowledgments.....	II
Introduction.....	1
Survey Design.....	2
Implementation.....	3
Results.....	3-11
Conclusion.....	11-12
Charts.....	13
Question Responses.....	13-22
Graphs.....	23-25

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
Attitude and Public opinion Survey
January 1989

SUMMARY

The January 1989 Attitude and Public Opinion Survey is the third in a series of semi-annual telephone surveys conducted by the Quality Assurance Division of the Reno Police Department. This survey yielded a total of 884 completed surveys, compared to 503 in Survey I, and 703 in Survey II. The ratio of public satisfaction with the Department has increased in all areas, and most notably in the areas of the Department's overall performance, the Department's dealing with criminals, and the Department's image within the community.

METHODOLOGY

When asked to rate the Department's performance overall, 7% of the respondents gave the Department a poor or below average rating. A total of 39% of the respondents gave an average rating, and 54% rated the Department as above average or good. In this survey, the results show a favorable ratio of 7.7 : 1 (7.7 times as many people gave a positive rating than did a negative rating). In Survey I the ratio was 3 : 1, in Survey II the ratio was 4.3 : 1, and has now climbed to 7.7 : 1 in Survey III.

When asked to rate the Department in dealing with criminals, 6% of the respondents rated the Department as poor or below average. A total of 48% of the respondents gave an average rating, and 46% rated the Department as above average or good. In this survey, the results show a favorable ratio of 7.6 : 1. In Survey I the ratio was 3.5 : 1, and in Survey II the ratio achieved was 4.5 : 1, and is now at a ratio of 7.6 : 1 in Survey III.

When asked to rate the Department's image within the community, 21% of the respondents rated the Department as poor or below average. A total of 39% of the respondents gave an average rating, and 40% rated the Department as above average or good. In this survey, the results show a favorable ratio of 1.9 : 1. This question may have the most significant impact in showing improvement in the Department. In Survey I, the ratio achieved was 2 : 3, clearly a negative response to the Department's image within the community. In Survey II this increased to a ratio of 1 : 1 (a 50-50 split), and in Survey III has now increased to a favorable ratio of 1.9 : 1. This ratio is a substantial accomplishment for the Department over a period of approximately 18 months.

Respondents to this survey were asked if, within the past two years, they had come into direct contact with any member of the Police Department. Of the 884 respondents, 390 persons (44%) reported individual contact with a Department member. Of these 390 people, 355 (91%) reported that the Department employee was properly businesslike in handling the contact. This is also an improvement over Survey I with a favorable response of 78%, and Survey II with a favorable response of 80%.

These 390 people were also asked if the Department employee gave them the feeling that there was concern about them in handling their problem. A total of 80% of the respondents indicated this to be the case. Again, this is an improvement over Survey I with a response of 66% positive, and in Survey II with a response of 69% positive.

Survey III contained a new question concerning the COP+ Program, and asked the respondents to note whether police service has improved, stayed the same, or deteriorated since the Department reorganization to the COP+ Program. A total of 69% of the respondents indicated that police services have stayed the same. 29% indicated they believed police services have improved, and 2% thought police services have deteriorated.

CONCLUSION

The changes that the Department has gone through and is going through have been and are significant. The improving standings as portrayed in the survey series demonstrate that the COP+ change in the summer of 1987 has been appropriate and successful from the perspective of the citizens of Reno. In sum, it would be fair to say that Survey III is a validation of what the Department is doing. The challenge presented is to continue future improvement and to devise new and creative ways of doing police work, all within the framework of the COP+ philosophy.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A survey which represents all of Reno's people, as this one does, reflects the effort and cooperation of many people. Without their help this project could not have been brought to completion. We wish to thank everyone involved for their selfless assistance.

No survey can be completed without the many people who are willing to take time out of their busy days to answer the questions put to them. Those answers were almost always thoughtful and considered and were given with the intent of aiding the Reno Police Department. There were 884 respondents who took their time to help out the Department. The Department owes them its sincerest thanks.

Mr. Bob Chez of the Nevada Bell Telephone Co. opened several doors within his company which yielded important information about the ways telephone numbers are assigned in the Reno area. This information was crucial in the final design of the survey.

The success of a survey revolves around the people who talk to the respondents and record their answers. Our survey takers were recruited from the University of Nevada and the Reno Police Department's auxiliary officer program. Dr. Ken Peek, Chairman of the University of Nevada's Criminal Justice Department, is owed special thanks for his help with the recruitment of the survey takers used.

The survey takers deserve individual thanks. Each of them was a volunteer, was faithful in meeting commitments, and diligently did the work without complaint. Approximately 250 hours were donated by this group. The Department wishes to personally thank each of these young people: Joseph Barainca, Christine Benson, Shelley Bessey, Jay Brown, Darren Burgess, Missy Chinnock, Holly Coffill, Shawnette Etcheberry, Stephanie Foss, Tiffany Fuller, Randi Fultz, Mike Furlong, Laurena Griffiths, Gary Hanneman, Steve Hay-Chapman, Ann Hedwall, Ray Hurst, Kevin Kish, Mike Laffins, Mike MaGee, Mike Maschino, Christie McCune, Joseph Mullen, Toni Neilsen, Kevin O'Donnell, Lisa Oakden, Daniel Parker, Carrie Shields, Sandy Tedsen, Kristi Walters, and Steve Wilson.

Several employees of the Reno Police Department made important contributions to this project. Particular thanks to Joanne Case, Barbara Eckroat, Kevin Foley, and Stacey Upson.

INTRODUCTION

During May, 1987 the Reno Police Department started a movement away from the traditional format for the delivery of police services and adopted a different approach called Community Oriented Policing (COP+). One tenet of COP+ is that the people served by a police department have the ability to make direct input into the organization. This input is then considered and combined with professional police judgement, all of which results in a somewhat different way of doing business. Hopefully, that difference will find satisfaction with the citizens and the police professionals. Accordingly, the Department's constituents need to be systematically sampled at periodic intervals to find out what people's feelings are toward their police department.

The Department's first survey, conducted during June, 1987, called upon 503 of Reno's citizens for their opinions about how the Reno Police Department was doing its job. The results were mixed and clearly pointed out some areas in need of improvement. The next mass sampling queried 703 people in March, 1988, and they characterized this agency as an improving department that was actively working on the shortcomings previously pointed out. This most current effort, conducted in November, 1988, and using 884 respondents, shows the continuing trend of Departmental improvement. (Throughout this report there will be reference made to each of the three surveys. This is for comparison purposes. For the sake of simplicity those surveys will be referred to as Survey I, June, 1987; Survey II, March, 1988; and Survey III, November, 1988.)

These surveys can be regarded as the report card from the people on the Department in one sense. They let police administration know how it is doing. Perhaps more importantly, the information is used to identify problems and acts as a guidepost for devising future training and policy for this agency. As in the past, the Reno Police Department plans to use this survey information as constructively as possible. This sometimes means substantial retraining of personnel and different ways of doing police work. This is the essence of COP+, The improving picture illustrated by the series of surveys portrays a Department that is serious about doing the best job it can for the people it serves.

SURVEY DESIGN

The survey was designed to be conducted over the telephone which offers the best in economy and efficiency. Reno is divided into prefix areas by the Nevada Bell Telephone Company. There are 16 different prefix designators serving residential customers within the City. Each such prefix had its ratio of residential users compared to all of the others so a mathematical quota of randomly chosen telephone numbers could be made. This resulted in each prefix being represented according to its size compared to the others, what is referred to as probability proportional to size selection. Selection tables were used for each number called so that the respondents would be balanced by sex and age. Respondents were limited to people living in Reno who are 18 years of age or older. By using a ratio system with the prefix designators combined with selection tables for the numbers actually called, a group of respondents is created which represent the whole of Reno, geographically, by sex, and by age.

As previously stated, there were 503 respondents in Survey I, 703 in II, and 884 during this latest one, Survey III. The size of the survey was originally expanded in the interests of greater accuracy. It was enlarged once again for the same reason and because it was possible to do so without extra cost. Each replication has brought with it new efficiencies which enable more to be done at the same cost or effort. Little, if any, expansion is anticipated beyond present levels.

The objectives of this survey, and previous ones, are to find out how Reno's citizens felt about:

1. The kind of job that the Reno Police Department is doing;
2. What the Department seems to do best;
3. What the Department does poorly;
4. How the Department can improve; and
5. What should receive greater emphasis.

A survey questionnaire was developed, pre-tested within the community, revised, and finally produced for use in this project.

IMPLEMENTATION

Thirty-one volunteers were recruited and trained to be survey takers. Most of these young men and women were criminal justice students from the University of Nevada, Reno. Several other volunteers were members of the Reno Police Department's auxiliary officer program. Civilian volunteers were exclusively used to lessen the connection between the Police Department and the survey in the hope of having all questions asked and recorded in as neutral a manner as possible. This was intended to lessen bias.

The survey itself was conducted at the City of Reno Training Center at Mill and Wells Avenue. This site away from the Police Department was selected so as to reduce distractions and to eliminate interference from such events as overheard police radio calls, etc.

Actual calls to the respondents began on November 14, 1988 and were concluded December 1, 1988. All calls were made between the hours of 5:00 PM and 9:00 PM, Mondays through Thursdays, Thanksgiving excepted.

RESULTS

Some questions were more difficult for the respondents than others, resulting in some answers which were not meaningfully related to the question. The information received from some inquiries is broken down to reflect the attitudes and views within each of the districts that the Department has divided its service delivery system into. Other questions, especially those producing a significant number of unclear or ambiguous answers, were not so subdivided, but were taken as a whole to represent the views of Reno at large.

A total of 884 completed questionnaires were obtained during the survey period. Male respondents numbered 425, females 456, and the sex of 4 respondents is not known. The age group distribution by sex and percentile share is believed to correspond fairly closely to that found within the City of Reno. (See Chart A)

Under the COP+ reorganization, Reno has been divided into three divisions for the purpose of delivering police services. Each geographical area produces a roughly equivalent demand for services, although they vary widely in terms of the number of people actually residing within each division. The divisions are North which contains the northwest, northeast, and north suburban areas of the City, Central which is the downtown core with its surrounding

residential belt, and South containing the southwest and southeast portions of Reno. South Division is the most populous, North is the second most populated division, and Central has the least number of people residing within it. The questionnaires obtained from each division and sub-area tend to reflect the share or proportional representation within the whole. (See Chart B)

What follows is a listing of each question asked along with the results obtained. When applicable, explanations, interpretations, and comparisons with Surveys I and II will be included. It should be noted that some questions were easy for the respondents to answer while others were more difficult. This difficulty factor accounts for some of the variations in answers. Not all answers given were included in the interpretations which follow, however, each answer is reported in the concluding section entitled Question Responses.

Some questions are narrowly related to the kind of answer a respondent gave to a preceding one. For example, question 1 asked about the Department's overall performance and question 2 is asked only of those persons who gave a below average or poor rating as their answer to question 1. This distinction is important when interpreting the percentage results stated in this report. Not every question involved an answer from our entire group of 884 respondents.

The questions and answers are:

1. How would you rate the Reno Police Department's **performance** overall? The respondent was given five choices: **poor**, below average, average, above average, and good.

This question was evaluated by combining the poor and below average scores and contrasting that total with the sum of the above average and good scores. The size of the middle average rating was also considered. The objective of this manipulation was to obtain a pro v. con perspective from this question.

Overall, 7% of the respondents gave the Department a poor or below average rating on this question, 39% said average, and 54% reported the Department as being above average or good. One way to evaluate the answers is to look at the ratio between above average scores and those receiving a below average answer. Fifty-four percent divided by 7% produces a favorable ratio of 7.7 : 1 (7.7 times as many people gave a positive rating than did a negative rating). Survey I had a 3 : 1 favorable ratio; this improved to 4.3 : 1 with Survey II and has climbed to 7.7 : 1 for survey III.

A clear and positive progression can be seen from the improving ratios between the three surveys. The most apparent conclusion that can be drawn is that the people of Reno think that the Department performs very well overall. This view has been consistent throughout all surveys, however, the margin of support has been steadily increasing. The perception of Reno's people is that the Department is doing better over time.

2. What is it that you dislike that caused you to give an unfavorable evaluation of the Department? This is a new survey question and was only asked of those respondents who gave either a poor or below average rating to question 1. The top five answers were:

Slow response times, 30%
Poorly managed Department, 11%;
Bad officer attitudes, 11%;
Don't come when called, 8%; and
Don't patrol neighborhoods, 8%

These top five answers accounted for 68% of the 60 responses made. The remaining answers were highly varied.

It is clear that the ability of the Department to rapidly arrive at the scenes of calls for service is still a significant irritant as far as some are concerned. Although only a small minority believes that response times, overall management, and poor officer attitudes is a serious problem, those areas should still be addressed. It is through that sort of attention that the Department has improved in the past and will continue to increase its share of public confidence.

3. What is it that you like that caused you to give a favorable evaluation of the Department? This also is a new question to the survey and was only asked of those persons who gave either an above average or good rating to question one. The top four answers were:

Good response time, 17%;
Effective, 14%;
No opinion, 12%; and
Professionalism of officers, 8%.

These answers accounted for 51% of the 477 responses. The remainder were highly varied.

4. How would you rate the Police Department in dealing with those who break the law? The respondent was given five choices: poor, below average, average, above average, and good.

As with question 1, poor and below average scores were combined and were compared with the sum of the above average and good ratings.

Overall, 6% of the respondents gave the Department a poor or below average rating on this question, 48% said average, and 46% reported the Department as being above average or good. One way to evaluate the answers is to look at the ratio between above average scores and those receiving a below average answer. Forty-six percent divided by 6% produces a favorable ratio of 7.6 : 1. Survey I had a 3.3 : 1 favorable ratio; this improved to 4.5 : 1 with Survey II; and has climbed to 7.6 : 1 for this current survey, III. (The ratio changes over the surveys are mainly attributed to the decline in negative ratings while the positive share has remained more or less constant. See attached graph.)

The progressive improvement in this category is significant, especially when the results of question 7 are examined. The Department is characterized by its citizens as being more efficient and/or effective in dealing with the criminal element while, at the same time, positively changing its public image for the better. That outcome is welcome as the Department has been working very hard to accomplish just that sort of public perception change.

5. What is it about how the Police Department deals with those who break the law that caused you to give an unfavorable rating? This is a new question and was only asked of those respondents who gave either a poor or below average rating to question 4. No comparisons with Surveys I or II can be made. The top four answers were:

Soft on crime and violators, 37%;
Unprofessional, 12%;
Ineffective, 11%; and
Don't know, 11%.

These responses accounted for 71% of the 57 negative answers given to question 4. The remaining answers were too varied to be categorized.

6. What is it about how the Police Department deals with those who break the law that caused you to give a favorable rating? This also is a new question and was asked of those persons who gave an above average or good rating to question four. Again, no comparisons with previous surveys are possible. The top five answers were:

Effective, 23%;
Don't know, 14%;
Professional, 14%;
Firm but fair, 11%; and
Always there, 8%.

These answers represented 70% of the 403 positive responses given to question 4. The remaining responses were highly varied.

7. How would you rate the Reno Police Department's image within the community? The choices were poor, below average, average, above average, and good.

The negative scores were added together and were contrasted with the sum of the positive ratings for this question to yield an index or scale from which to make an evaluation. Twenty-one percent of the respondents gave a poor or below average rating, 39% gave an average response, and 40% reported that the Department has a good or above average public image. When looking at the results from a pro v. con perspective, the Department was perceived as having a poor image in Survey I, a ratio of 1 : 1.6 for approval v. disapproval. This improved to a 1 : 1.03 ratio in Survey II where those believing the Department had a good or above average image were equal to those believing that a poor or below average image existed. The ratio has been further improved to approximately 2 : 1 (actually 1.934 : 1). This change over the three surveys is highly significant. One sees a police department which had a clear negative public image transformed into one which has a clear positive one; this all within a period of about 18 months. This is no small accomplishment.

8. What is it about the Department's image that has caused you to give an unfavorable rating? This is a new question and no comparisons with prior surveys have been made. The top four answers were:

Poor media treatment, 32%;
Poor attitude, 13%;
Don't know, 10%; and
Slow response time, 9%.

The remaining 36% of the answers were highly varied and not easily subject to categorization.

In Surveys I and II, the two main reasons given for the Department's image problems were poor treatment by the media and poor attitudes on the part of police employees. The current results show no difference in this regard. This consistency across surveys sends an important message to the

Department. Even though a dramatic turn-around of public image has been achieved, careful attention still needs to be devoted to both media and public relations. This is not only the job of police management, but is a task requiring the diligent attention of each and every Departmental employee.

9. What is it about the Department's image that has caused you to give a favorable rating? This is a new question as well with no comparisons being made. The top five answers were:

Officer attitudes, 28%;
Improved media relations, 23%;
Don't know, 17%;
COP+, 7%; and
High visibility, 5%.

The remaining 20% of the answers were highly varied.

10-11. Within the past two years, have you come into direct, individual contact with any member of the Reno Police Department? A total of 390 persons out of the 884 surveyed (44%) reported that they had such a contact within the specified period of time. Survey I reported 31% contacts and increased to 50% in II. In III, the causes of those contacts were having been given assistance - 36%, being a complainant - 19%, a victim - 18%, and given citation - 14%. A variety of reasons accounted for the remaining 13% of the contacts. A conclusion that can be drawn from these reports is that the Reno Police Department has a very high level of interaction with the city's citizens, the bulk of which were of a helping nature.

12-13. How would you evaluate the quality of that last contact? Most respondents having contact reported that it was a positive experience; 75% fell into this category. Fourteen percent characterized the contact as neutral and 11% thought it was negative. A large majority, 355/390 or 91%, felt that the Department employee was properly businesslike in the way the individual contact was handled while the remaining 9%, 35 respondents, felt otherwise.

The most recent scores show gains. Regarding whether or not the contact was a positive one, Survey II produced a positive rating of 70% which was increased in III to 75%. That question was not asked in Survey I. With respect to the businesslike approach of the police employee, 78% felt the employee was appropriately so in I, 80% in II; , and 91% was reported for Survey III.

14. Did the Department employee give you the feeling that he or she was concerned about you in his or her handling of your case or incident? Eighty percent believed that to be the case while 20% did not. Improvement again is indicated: Survey I showed 66% concern and Survey II gave a 69% concerned response.

It is interesting to note that Reno's police officers are being viewed as increasingly more professional over the course of these surveys. At the same time, the Department's public image has gone from poor to good. Add to all of this the public perception that the officers are showing more concern for their clients and we arrive at a conclusion that is hard to avoid. A concerned, businesslike demeanor carries a great deal of weight with the public. It's what the public expects and wants from the Department. That expectation and desire should always be kept in mind as the Department conducts training or embarks on new projects. These seem to be essential requirements for success in public service. It is difficult to overstate the importance of this.

15. What, if anything, would you change about the way in which your case or incident was handled? The top five answers were:

Nothing, 63%;
Do a better job, 9%;
Don't know, 8%;
Show more interest, 7%; and
Be more polite, 6%.

The remaining 7% of the answers were varied. In Survey I, 36% said they wouldn't change anything. This increased to 59% in II, and is now at 63% in III. Although this is a measure of improvement over time, the validity of this statistic is questionable. One perspective is that the words "if anything" in the question generate a demand characteristic and thereby creates a high level of "nothing" responses. There are plans to change the question in future surveys to eliminate this source of bias.

16. Do you feel that Reno is a safe place to live? Eighty percent, 709 of 884 respondents, believed that Reno is safe. In Survey I 81% felt safe, 77% in II, with a rebound in III. This fluctuation may be attributed to the publicity surrounding the Safety 88 tax override campaign in May, 1988. The public statements about the chronic shortage of officers could have been responsible for the reduction in safety perceptions in II while the passage of the tax question may have brought about the rebound as that passage assured the hiring of a large number of police officers for the Reno Police Department.

17. What would you like to see the Department do differently to make Reno a better place to live? This is a new question to this survey, however, it is similar to what was asked in Surveys I and II in several respects. The top seven answers were:

Don't know, 24%;
Hire more officers, 19%;
Do more patrolling, 16%;
Nothing, 10%;
Do more public relations work, 5%;
Get rid of gangs, 4%; and
Make more arrests, 4%.

The remaining answers were too varied to be subject to categorization.

In terms of similarity with Surveys I and II, the top two answers in those prior inquiries were to hire more officers and to do more patrolling. That viewpoint was prominently expressed in the answers to this question in this survey.

18. About 15 months ago the Reno Police Department underwent a major reorganization and started what's known locally as Community Oriented Policing. Since that reorganization, has the police service given to the community improved, stayed about the same, or become worse? Most respondents, 69%, felt that things have remained about the same, 29% believed that conditions had improved, and only 2% thought that the police service had deteriorated. This is a new question, so no comparisons with previous questions can be made.

The high level of neutral answers, 606/884 or 69%, strongly suggests that the question is valid and does not contain a load or bias. If that assumption is correct, then the difference between the positive and negative answers, 29% v. 2%, can be correctly viewed as an encouraging signal that the people of Reno think that COP+ is making a difference and a welcome contribution. The high levels of approving responses throughout this survey, not just with this question, add credence to this viewpoint.

19. What do you think is the reason for the improvement in service? This is a new question to the survey. The top four answers were:

More officers hired, 29%;
More neighborhood patrols, 15%;
Don't know, 11%; and
More responsive to complaints, 8%.

The remaining 37% of the answers were varied.

Although this question is a new one, the central theme of hiring more officers and doing more neighborhood patrols is still clearly evident. These two issues appear to have had a very significant impact upon the thinking of respondents in each of the three surveys conducted. This is clearly what the people of Reno want, as a minimum, from their police department.

20. What do you think is the reason for the service becoming worse? Again, this is a new question. The top two answers were:

Don't know, 30%; and
Fewer neighborhood patrols, 15%.

The other answers were highly varied.

The several remaining questions which were asked are primarily of a demographic nature and describe the characteristics of the group of respondents. Each question asked and the number and kind of response given are listed for the entire questionnaire in the concluding section entitled Question Responses. The reader is encouraged to read that section.

CONCLUSION

In evaluating the meanings of the various responses to the different questions, it is important to remember the overall context that the Department was in during the periods before and during Survey III. Before Survey I the Department had suffered two consecutive losses at the polls in efforts to secure more funding for additional officers from the voters. At about that same period of time, the police were the subject of several uncomplimentary editorials and articles in the local press. There were several newsworthy and unfortunate on and off duty incidents, all of which, in one way or another, managed to detract from the positive image of the Reno Police Department. One inescapable consequence of these combined factors was a low state of general morale for the officers of this agency. This sort of adverse circumstance tends to feed upon itself, creating ever worsening conditions. Cycles of that nature tend to continue until some intervention is made.

The reorganization of the Department into the Community Oriented Policing (COP+) style of police management and service occurred for very good reasons. The COP+ intervention was needed to halt the pattern described above, the timing was right, and it was a mechanism that enabled

the Department to meet increasing demands during a period of chronic understaffing. There would naturally go with the intervention an expectation of improving change. The series of surveys shows that the expectations have been met.

Throughout this survey report mention is made of the perceptions held about some aspect of the Reno Police Department. This is certainly a legitimate perspective since this is an attitude survey and must therefore deal with perceptions. It is important that one particular concept be kept in mind: perceptions are always, in some way, founded upon real world events. Those events in Reno are that the Police Department is improving and is doing a better job. COP+ is a management system for delivering police services. Although there is an identifiable public relations component to Community Oriented Policing, most of what goes on has to do with the daily, concrete world of law enforcement in Reno, Nevada. The Reno Police Department is a successful law enforcement agency that is, for the most part, doing the job that the people want it to do.

The changes that the Department has gone through, and is going through, have been and are significant. The improving standings, as portrayed in the survey series, demonstrate that the COP+ change during the summer of 1987 has been appropriate and successful from the perspective of the citizen. In sum, it would be fair to say that Survey III is a validation of what the Department is doing. The challenge presented is to continue future improvement and to devise new and creative ways of doing police work, all within the framework of the COP+ philosophy.

CHART A

Age	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
#M	39	116	98	57	45	66
%M	4%	13%	11%	7%	5%	8%
#F	56	107	111	53	59	64
%F	6%	12%	13%	6%	7%	7%

CHART B

<u>North Division</u>	- 390 questionnaires = 44%
Northwest	- 237 questionnaires = 27%
Northeast	- 81 questionnaires = 9%
North	- 72 questionnaires = 8%
<u>Central Division</u>	- 62 questionnaires = 7%
<u>South Division</u>	- 432 questionnaires = 49%
Southwest	- 241 questionnaires = 27%
Southeast	- 191 questionnaires = 22%
<u>Total</u>	- 884 questionnaires = 100%

QUESTION RESPONSES

Each question asked during Survey III is repeated along with the numbers and kinds of answers given in total. Percentages will not be listed and the reader is directed to the text of this report for those figures.

1. How would you rate the Reno Police Department's performance overall?

Poor	24
Below average	37
Average	346
Above Average	145
Good	332
T =	884

2. What is it that you dislike that caused you to give an unfavorable evaluation of the Department?

Slow response times 18
Bad attitudes 7
Poorly managed department 7
Don't come when called 5
Don't patrol neighborhoods 5
Don't have any effect 3
Unprofessional officers 3
Officers not friendly 2
Not there when needed 2
Not hard working 1
Officers not helpful 1
Don't like Bradshaw 1
Works downtown 1
Soft on traffic violators 1
No action on gangs 1
Hands are tied too much 1
No opinion 1

T=60

3. What is it that you like that caused you to give a favorable evaluation of the Department?

Good response times 81
Effective 68
No opinion 55
Professionalism of officers 37
Officers are friendly 33
Officers are helpful 32
Patrol neighborhoods 32
Hard working 27
Tough on crime 25
Come when called 24
There when needed 19
Good attitudes 15
Well managed department 15
Media 5
Knows them personally 2
Getting gangs out 1
Opinions of others 1
They are fair 1
Lots of police visibility 1
I never see them 1
Listen to scanner 1
No problems 1
T=477

4. How would you rate the Police Department in dealing with those who break the law?

Poor	16
Below average	41
Average	424
Above average	160
Good	243
T=	884

5. What is it about how the Police Department deals with those who break the law that caused you to give an unfavorable rating?

Soft on crime/violators	21
Unprofessional	7
Ineffective	6
Don't Know	6
Uncaring	3
Unfair	3
Don't solve crime	3
Not there when needed	3
Don't reduce crime	2
Everything	1
Discrimination	1
Not enough officers	1
T=	57

6. What is it about how the Police Department deals with those who break the law that caused you to give a favorable rating?

Effective	93
Don't know	56
Professional	55
Firm but fair	43
Always there	31
Fair	24
Solves crimes	20
Media	20
Lots of arrests	18
Firm	16
Nothing	10
Reduces crime	7
Lots of tickets	3
Opinions of others	2
Quick response time	1
Knows them personally	1
Takes care of gangs	1
Hard working	1
They leave me alone	1
T=	403

7. How would you rate the Reno Police Department's image within the community?

Poor	68
Below average	114
Average	350
Above average	123
Good	229
T=	884

8. What is it about the Department's image that has caused you to give an unfavorable rating?

Poor media treatment	58
Poor attitude	23
Don't know	18
Slow response time	16
Other people's opinion	11
On duty behavior	8
Poor supervision	7
Not enough officers	6
Not enough patrol	5
Poor management	5
Off duty incidents	4
Police chief	4
Brutality towards others	3
Ineffective	2
Personal experience	2
Poor public relations	2
Transients	1
Ask for more money	1
Quick release of offenders	1
Personal appearance	1
Police are ignorant	1
Teens need more leeway	1
Haven't seen any more cops since override	1
Gangs	1
T=	182

9. What is it about the Department's image that has caused you to give a favorable rating?

Officer attitudes	97
Improved media relations	80
Don't know	61
COP+	23
Visibility	18
Nothing	14
Training	9
There when needed	9
Doing good job	6
Feel safe	6

Comments from people 5
More officers 3
Bond issue 3
Good response time 3
Personal contact 3
Cracking down on gangs 3
Firm but fair 2
Helpful 1
Quality of officers 1
Professional appearance 1
Come when called 1
Crackdown on drugs 1
Neighborhood watch 1
Four or five cars for routine calls 1
T=352

10. Within the past two years, have you come into direct, individual contact with any member of the Reno Police Department?

Yes 390
No 494
T= 884

11. How did your last contact occur?

Given assistance 12 3
Complainant 74
Victim of a crime 71
Given a citation 55
On the job 16
Personal contact 10
Arrested 9
Business 7
Accident 6
Witness 5
Questioned 4
Kids arrested 2
Neighborhood watch 2
School 1
Seminar 1
Recruits 1
Friend arrested 1
City Council 1
Refused 1
T=390

12. How would you evaluate the quality of that last contact?

Positive 294
Negative 53
Neutral 43
T= 390

13. Was the Department employee properly businesslike in his or her handling of your case or incident?

Yes 355
No 35
T= 390

14. Did the Department employee give you the feeling that he or she was concerned about you in his or her handling of your case or incident?

Yes 311
No 79
T= 390

15. What, if anything, would you change about the way in which your case or incident was handled?

Nothing 246
Do a better job 34
Don't know 30
Show more interest 28
Be more polite 24
Better response times 16
Take more time 8
Better supervision 1
Better equipment 1
Give more information 1
Better communication between other agencies 1
T=390

16. Do you feel that Reno is a safe place to live?

Yes 709
No 175
T= 884

17. What would you like to see the Department do differently to make Reno a better place to live?

Don't know 212
Hire more officers 176
Do more patrolling 141
Nothing 92
More public relations work 40
Get rid of gangs 36
More arrests 32
Get rid of drugs and dealers 25
Work harder 17
Clean up downtown 13
Help the homeless 12
Be more caring/helpful 12
Faster response times 9
Do better investigations 8
Better arrests 8
More professional 6
More supervision 6
Have better attitudes 5
Better supervision 5
Better administration 5
Do more training 4
Raises for officers 4
Less arrests 2
Stop brutality 2
Get rid of Chief Bradshaw 2
More foot patrols 2
Use emergency lights 1
Enforce alcohol laws with minors 1
Keep cruising down 1
Get a helicopter 1
Run two man cars 1
Win approval of community 1
Work on bigger crime 1
Neighborhood Watch 1
T=884

18. About 15 months ago the Reno Police Department underwent a major reorganization and started what's known locally as Community Oriented Policing. Since that reorganization, has the police service given to the community improved, stayed about the same, or become worse?

Improved 258
Stayed the same 606
Become worse 20
T= 884

19. What do you think is the reason for the improvement in service?

More officers hired 76
More neighborhood patrols 39
Don't know 28
More responsive to complaints 20
Officers more helpful 12
Innovative methods 12
More arrests being made 9
Better response time 9
Better management 8
Officers more courteous 6
Officers more friendly 5
Better public relations 4
More involved in the community 4
COP+ 3
Better investigations 3
Better/more supervision 3
Other people's opinions 3
Better/more training 2
More awareness 2
Build better image 2
Foot patrol 2
Officers should show more concern 1
Renewed dedication 1
Better morale 1
Crime rate went down 1
Good DUI program 1
T=257

20. What do you think is the reason for the service becoming worse?

Don't know 6
Fewer neighborhood patrols 3
Worse investigations 2
Less responsive to complaints 2
Worse/less supervision 1
Still have police brutality 1
Get rid of Chief Bradshaw 1
Lazy officers 1
Bad communication with public 1
Too many promotions 1
Use of uniform as a weapon 1
T=20

21. Do you live in a house, apartment, mobile home, or condominium?

House	492
Apartment	258
Condominium	70
Mobile home	54
Other	10
T=	884

22. Do you rent or own?

Own	468
Rent	416
T=	884

23. Have you been employed during the past 12 months?

Yes	681
No	203
T=	884

24. Are you currently employed?

Yes	638
No	246
T=	884

25. What is your total family income per year?

Refused	183
Under \$20,000	164
\$20,000 - \$29,999	152
\$30,000 - \$39,999	116
\$40,000 - \$49,999	95
\$50,000 - \$59,999	76
\$60,000 - \$69,999	38
\$70,000 and above	60
T=	884

26. What is the highest level of formal education that you have received?

Less than high school graduation	62
High school graduate	248
Some college	299
College graduate	201
Post-graduate college	74
T=	884

27. What is your race?

White	815
Hispanic	23
Black	19
Asian	15
Indian(American)	10
Other	2
T=	884

NOTICE

EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1990, A COUPLE CHANGES TO THE PUBLIC OPINION SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE WILL BE IMPLEMENTED. MOST SIGNIFICANTLY, THE RATINGS IN THE LIKERT SCALE WERE CHANGED FOR A MORE COMPREHENSIVE INTERPRETATION AND FOLLOWUP QUESTIONS WERE RESTRUCTURED TO REQUEST BOTH POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE RESPONSE.

COPIES OF THE NEW SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE **WILL** BE AVAILABLE AFTER JANUARY OF 1990.