

LOUISVILLE METRO POLICE
DEPARTMENT

CITIZENS' ATTITUDE SURVEY

Deborah G. Keeling, Ph.D.
Angie Schwendau, M.S.
Department of Criminal Justice
University of Louisville

September 2015

INTRODUCTION

“It is the mission of the Louisville Metro Police Department to deliver professional, effective services, fairly and ethically, at all times, to all people, in order to prevent crime, control crime, and enhance the overall quality of life for citizens and visitors. We will encourage and promote community involvement on all levels to achieve these ends” – Louisville Metro Police Department Mission Statement (2006, <http://www.louisvilleky.gov/.../0/OurMissionStatement.pdf>).

The Louisville Metro Police Department is committed to fostering and sustaining strong police-community partnerships as a means of more effectively reaching the goals of public order and public safety within Metro Louisville. Strong and sustainable police-community partnerships are those that are built upon trust and promoted by regular, open communication and willingness from each “partner” to be responsive to the needs of the other.

A portion of the means of fostering strong, sustainable police–community partnerships is the ongoing evaluation and assessment of community needs and resources as well as the degree to which current projects and practices are meeting these needs. In an attempt to address the quality of service delivery as well as the needs of the community, the Louisville Metro Police Department contracted for the conduct of a citizens’ attitude survey among residents of Metro Louisville.

METHODS

The purpose of the survey conducted by the Louisville Metro Police Department was to measure citizens' perceptions of neighborhood disorder/ order, fear of crime, and the services provided by the Louisville Metro Police Department. The survey additionally addressed specific concerns about crime and public order problems within neighborhoods. Variations in these perceptions across various demographic categories were also assessed.

Survey Instrument and Data Collection

The Louisville Metro Police Department contracted with the University of Louisville's Department of Justice Administration to develop, administer, and analyze the survey and its results. The university developed the survey instrument and contracted with Personal Opinion, Inc. for the conduct of a telephone survey during fall 2014.

The survey instrument contained open- and closed-ended questions. The questions related to citizen perceptions of: their neighborhoods, primarily in terms of safety; police and police services; fear of crime; and specific neighborhood crime and public order concerns. It additionally contained questions that solicited information on the demographic characteristics of the respondents, i.e., age, ethnicity, education, sex, income, and residence (owner occupied versus rental).

Data were collected via telephone calls to randomly selected landline and cell phone numbers for respondents within each of the eight Louisville Metro Police Divisions. A total of 44 percent of the completed surveys were from cell phones and 56 percent from landlines. When contacted, respondents were

asked if they would be willing to participate in the survey and which local police agency had primary responsibility for public safety within their neighborhoods. If they responded with an agency other than LMPD, the interview was terminated. Anonymity and confidentiality were promised to participants.

Calls were made to random respondents until a total of 2409 completed interviews were conducted with a distribution of approximately 300 respondents per division. Since the divisions included exclusive zip codes, in most instances, cell numbers and landline numbers were randomly selected within zip codes of Metro Louisville. Based on the total households in Metro Louisville, the sample had a margin of error of +/- 2 percent at the traditional 95 percent confidence level. The samples used for the information on each division had a margin of error of +/- 5 percent.

The use of random digit dialing of numbers as a means of selecting a sample of respondents has the potential to eliminate those without telephones from the potential "pool" of respondents and, possibly, result in a "non-representative" sample. However, the benefits and more reasonable costs of conducting survey research using telephone (cell and landline) interviews significantly exceed the limitations. And, there is no doubt that the collection and analysis of empirical data for the purposes of agency planning and decision-making results in more realistic, effective and efficient delivery of agency services.

Survey Sample

The survey sample was composed of 2409 completed telephone surveys. Approximately 12 percent of the sample was drawn from each police division. The racial distribution of those surveyed was 73 percent Caucasian, 22 percent African American, 1.0 percent Hispanic, .4 percent Asian American, and 3.6 percent reporting “other.” The same demographics for greater Louisville are: 70.3 percent Caucasian, 21 percent African American, 4.5 percent Hispanic, 2.3 percent Asian American, 3 percent Native American with 1.6 percent reporting other ethnic origins.

Table 1

Survey Sample and Census Estimate 2011 Comparison

<u>Age</u>	<u>Survey</u>	<u>Census Estimate</u>
18-19	0.4	3.3
20-24	1.8	8.5
25-34	12.7	18.3
35-44	14.4	17.2
45-54	15.4	19.6
55-59	10.6	8.4
60-74	30.1	16.1
75 and Older	13.3	8.5

Females represented 66.8 percent of the survey sample and 51.8 percent of the Metro Louisville population. This could have resulted in more positive ratings of police since women have, historically, tended to have more positive attitudes toward police than men. However, the portion of the analysis which

addressed the relationship between respondent sex and satisfaction with the police found no relationship. As such, any potential bias due to an over-representation among women, was not evident. (See Table 12) Table 1 contains a comparison of the age distribution of the survey sample and Community Survey Estimates for 2011 (U.S. Census).

The median age of respondents surveyed was 57 years with that for Metro Louisville being 37.9 years of age. The older median age of respondents is not an unanticipated consequence of the sampling process which required an individual be 18 years of age or older to respond to the survey. When age information from the American Community Survey (U.S. Census) for individuals 18 years of age and older in Metro Louisville is taken into account, differences still exist but the extent of these age differences in the two groups (sample and Census) is diminished.

As shown in this table, the survey contains an under-representation of individuals under 25 and an over representation of individuals 55 years of age and older. The greater proportions of older individuals in the survey is as expected given that older individuals are more likely to be at home, more likely to answer without screening calls and are additionally more likely to agree to respond to a survey.

A small percentage (7.2%) of respondents reported less than a high school education, 27.8 percent had completed their high school degree, 2.8 percent had vocational training, 25.6 percent of respondents had some college education, 23.7 percent of respondents had obtained a college degree, and 12.9

percent reported post graduate work. As such, 92.8 percent of respondents within the survey had at least a high school degree and 36.6 had at least an undergraduate college degree. Within Metro Louisville, 87.6 percent of residents have completed high school with 29.2 percent having completed a college, graduate or professional degree.

A majority (53.0%) of respondents reported a total household income of no more than \$50,000 in the previous year. Within Metro Louisville, the American Community Survey Estimates (U.S. Census) for 2011 reported that 53 percent of residents reported incomes of less than \$50,000. Similarly, 17.1 percent of the survey respondents reported household incomes of no more than \$15,000 while the American Community Survey estimates (U.S. Census) reported 14.8 percent of residents in Metro Louisville reported household incomes of less than \$15,000 annually. While the categories are not exactly identical, they are similar enough to conclude that the survey sample was generally representative of residents of Metro Louisville in terms of annual household income. With respect to home ownership, the survey sample contained a greater proportion (76.0%) of respondents reporting owner occupied residents than was reported in the 2010 U.S. Census which found 64.3 percent of homes being owner-occupied.

Based on comparisons of the demographic characteristics of the survey sample and those of residents of Metro Louisville, the sample was generally representative. Those differences such as the older age of respondents among the sample were, in part, due to the nature of the sample selection process.

Additionally, women are more likely than men to be at home (days or evenings), to answer the phone and to respond to a survey. Consequently, the method of data collection resulted in an over-representation of women.

FINDINGS

Perceptions of Neighborhood Crime and Neighborhood Quality

The findings from the citizens' attitude survey indicated a high level of satisfaction with services provided by the Louisville Metro Police Department (LMPD). Further, respondents' assessments reflected extensive support for LMPD with respect to the professionalism, fairness, and accessibility of police. Citizens of Metro Louisville reported a relatively low level of fear of crime in neighborhoods, as well as generally positive neighborhood perceptions related to quality of life. Reports of serious neighborhood crime problems were very limited and public order issues were the primary focus rather than concern with serious crime activities.

Survey respondents were asked to rate whether their neighborhood had become a *better, stayed the same, or become a worse* place to live over the past year. Chart 1 contains a summary of the responses to this question. The majority (73.2 percent) of those surveyed responded the quality of their neighborhood had *stayed the same* with, 81.0 percent reporting the quality of their neighborhood had *remained the same or improved*. While the majority clearly believed their neighborhoods had remained the same or improved, when considering only those residents reporting a "change," more reported

neighborhoods had gotten *worse* (19.0%) than reported their neighborhoods had *improved* (7.8%) in terms of the respondents' perceptions of the quality of their neighborhoods. The responses to this question did not reflect a significant change from the 2013 survey.

Chart 1

Perceptions of Change in Neighborhood Quality

Similarly, as noted in Chart 2, the majority (65.2 percent) of respondents stated the amount of crime in their neighborhood had *remained* at the same level over the past year and an additional 8.4 percent reported the crime rate in their neighborhood had *declined*. Those who reported crime in their neighborhoods had increased constituted 26.4 percent of the respondents. While a majority (73.6 percent) reported crime in their neighborhood had remained the *same or decreased*. If a change was reported, respondents were more likely to report crime had increased (26.4 percent) rather than decreased (8.4 percent). Again, the findings for 2014 were comparable to those for 2013.

Chart 2

Perceptions of a Change in Neighborhood Crime

While citizen perception of a change in the rate of crime in their neighborhood during 2014 was generally positive, with the majority responding the crime rate has decreased or remained the same, it is important to note that perception of crime in a neighborhood can be changed, in unintended ways, by those very crime prevention activities that seek to reduce fear and reduce crime. For example, as police proceed to organize neighborhood watch programs in communities, some residents may perceive this as an indication that crime has increased and so, rather than reducing their fear of crime, it is actually increased – at least in the short term. Additionally, as police organizations attempt to be more transparent and to engage in partnerships with community residents, more information about public order and crime activities is made public and shared. Consequently, even though crime has not increased, residents may be alarmed

and perceive their neighborhoods as less safe – at least in the short term. Similarly, repeated media attention on sensational crimes within the community may affect citizen perceptions of crime and produce unsubstantiated concerns.

More detailed analysis suggested that these perceptions of the quality of neighborhoods were related to perceptions of crime trends within these neighborhoods. As shown in Table 2, citizens who believed that crime had *increased* in their neighborhoods were most likely (59.7 percent) to report that their neighborhood had *gotten* worse.

Table 2

Respondent Perception of Neighborhood Quality and Neighborhood Crime Over the Past Year

<u>Respondent Rating of Neighborhood Over Past Year</u>	<u>Respondent Perception of Neighborhood Crime</u>		
	Increased	Stayed the Same	Decreased
Improved	2.9% (18)	4.9% (74)	45.6% (89)
About the Same	37.4 (229)	90.3 (1364)	50.8 (99)
Gotten Worse	59.7 (365)	4.8 (73)	3.6 (7)
Total	100% (612)	100% (1511)	100% (195)

In contrast, those respondents who believed crime had *decreased* were significantly less likely (3.6 percent) to report their neighborhood had *gotten* worse. Among these respondents who reported neighborhood crime had *increased*, only 2.9 percent reported their *neighborhood had improved* while 45.6

percent of those reporting crime had *decreased* reported their *neighborhood had improved*. Similarly, a majority of respondents, who perceived *no change* in the amount of neighborhood crime, also perceived the *quality of their neighborhood remained about the same* compared to the past year (90.3 percent). Clearly, community residents see their perception of the prevalence of crime as contributing to the quality of life in their neighborhoods.

As a means of assessing whether respondents believed a sense of community existed in their neighborhood, residents were asked if people were likely to get involved in certain situations taking place in their neighborhood. The majority of respondents reported that individuals would help or do something to get involved. Specifically, respondents were asked if *individuals would generally try to help out others*.

Approximately 56.3 percent believed people were *likely to help others*, while another 21.9 percent believed that *half the time someone would be willing to help another person*. When asked whether individuals in their neighborhood would get involved if they *witnessed young people involved in minor destruction of property or individuals selling drugs/ aiding a drug deal*, 62.1 percent reported they would *do something to get involved* when they witnessed young people involved in minor destruction of property. Similarly, 64.3 percent reported they would *do something to get involved* when they witnessed individuals selling drugs/aiding in a drug deal. Based on these findings, respondents believed a sense of mutual support and “community” existed within their neighborhood. The 2014 findings do not differ significantly from those found in 2013.

Perceived Fear of Crime

Fear of crime may be real or perceptual. In either case, the consequences of this fear are real and can result in actual behavioral changes such as not going out alone at night, refusing to frequent restaurants and businesses in certain areas of town, purchasing additional crime prevention equipment for homes and businesses and altering driving patterns to and from work. Real or imagined, citizen perceptions of fear of crime may be measured in many ways. The current survey included five questions to assess respondents' fear of neighborhood crime. These questions included *how safe they felt being alone in their neighborhood at night, how worried they were about home break-ins when no one was home, how often they avoided going out at night in their neighborhood because of crime, whether they were worried children would be deliberately harmed by someone while outside in their neighborhood, and whether they were concerned about individuals in their neighborhood trying to sell or give children drugs.*

Overall, fear of crime, as measured by the responses to these questions was relatively minor. As noted in Chart 3, a majority of respondents, 79.1 percent, felt *very safe* or *somewhat safe* in their neighborhoods with a total of 40.9 percent of all respondents reporting they felt *very safe*. While 20.9 percent reported they felt *very unsafe* to *somewhat unsafe* in their neighborhoods, only 8.8 percent reported feeling *very unsafe*.

Chart 3

Do You Feel Safe Being Out at Night Alone In Your Neighborhood?

Chart 4

**Do You Avoid Going Out in Neighborhood at Night
Because of Crime?**

Furthermore, as shown in Chart 4, a majority (72.9 percent) of respondents reported they *never avoided going out alone at night because of crime* with only 5.0 percent *always avoiding going out at night because of crime in their neighborhood*.

Similarly, as identified in Chart 5, a substantial number of respondents (37.1 percent) were *not worried at all* and 39.5 percent were *somewhat worried* about someone breaking into their home while no one was present. Only 6.6 percent of the respondents were *very worried* about their home being broken into while no one was home.

Chart 5

Are You Worried Someone Will Break In To Your Home?

Respondents were asked two additional questions to assess fear of neighborhood crime. These questions pertained specifically to crimes that could potentially influence the welfare of children in the neighborhood. When asked if

the respondents worried about children being deliberately harmed by someone in their neighborhood, 42.3 percent of those responding to this question were *not at all worried* and 38.5 percent were *somewhat worried* that children would be deliberately harmed. Only 11.1 percent were *very worried* that children would be deliberately harmed.

Results were similar when assessing whether respondents were worried that someone would offer/ involve children in selling drugs. There was an increase in the number of respondents that replied they were *not at all worried* (55.5 percent) while there was a decrease of those that were only *somewhat worried* (26.1 percent) about children in their neighborhood being involved with illegal drugs. Only 12.2 percent of the respondents reported they were *very worried* about the illegal drug involvement of children in their neighborhood.

Table 3

Respondent Perception of Harm to Children By Whether or Not Children Under the Age of 19 are Living in the Home

<i>Respondent Perception of Possibility of Harm to Children in Neighborhood</i>	<i>Children Under 19 Living in the Home</i>	
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Not at all Worried	42.3% (314)	55.4% (899)
Somewhat Worried	38.5 (286)	33.3 (541)
Quite Worried	8.0 (59)	4.7 (76)
Very Worried	11.2 (83)	6.7 (108)
Total	100% (742)	100% (1624)

Table 4

Respondent Perception of Concern Over Drug Sales to Children By Whether or Not Children Under the Age of 19 are Living in the Home

<i>Respondent Perception of Possibility of Illegal Drugs Being Sold to Children in Neighborhood</i>	<i>Children Under 19 Living in the Home</i>	
	Yes	No
Not at all Worried	55.5% (412)	45.2% (726)
Somewhat Worried	26.1 (194)	34.7 (556)
Quite Worried	6.2 (46)	5.8 (93)
Very Worried	12.2 (91)	14.3 (230)
Total	100% (743)	100% (1605)

Similar worries were noted between those respondents with and without children under the age of 19 living in the home when asked how concerned they were about someone selling children in the neighborhood drugs. Unexpectedly, those individuals without children under 19 years of age in the home expressed higher levels of concern. Table 4 contains these results.

As previously mentioned, fear of crime may be increased, in the short-term by those very crime prevention initiatives seeking to minimize fear of crime and actual criminal activity. Specifically, as residents become more aware of crime prevention initiatives and ways to decrease their vulnerability to victimization, they may experience a perception of increased fear of crime when, in actuality, the nature and frequency of crimes within their neighborhood has not changed and their vulnerability to victimization has actually decreased. Attempts

to “educate the public” may, at least initially, produce misperceptions about the likelihood of victimization. Additionally, fear of crime may or may not be related to the actual probability of victimization. Table 5 contains a ranking of the police divisions by percentage of respondents who report perceptions of crime as increasing, fear of being alone in their neighborhoods at night, and the UCR crime rates and crime rate change for 2014 within the division.

Table 5

Rank Order By Division: Crime Has Increased in Neighborhood, Fear of Being Out Alone at Night in Neighborhood, UCR Part I Crimes, and 2013-2014 Change in Part 1 Crimes

RANK	Neighborhood Crime Increased	UCR Part 1 Crime Rate Change 2013-2014	Very or Somewhat Unsafe Out Alone at Night in Neighborhood	UCR Part I Crime Rate
1	Division 1 (38.0%)	Division 4	Division 1 (38.4%)	Division 3
2	Division 4 (31.7%)	Division 2	Division 4 (32.7)	Division 4
3	Division 3 (33.3%)	Division 7	Division 2 (27.4%)	Division 7
4	Division 2 (28.5%)	Division 3	Division 3 (25.9%)	Division 1
5	Division 6 (20.3%)	Division 8	Division 6 (13.0%)	Division 6
6	Division 5 (22.0%)	Division 1	Division 7 (10.1%)	Division 2
7	Division 7 (16.0%)	Division 6	Division 5 (10.0%)	Division 8
8	Division 8 (14.0%)	Division 5	Division 8 (7.3%)	Division 5

As noted in this table, perception of crime within a neighborhood does not necessarily match reality. For example, Division 1 had the greatest percentage of respondents who reported that crime in their neighborhood had increased (column 1) over the past year (38.8%) when, in fact, Division 1 had the third largest decrease in UCR Part 1 crime (column 2) among the LMPD divisions. The UCR Part 1 crime in this division decreased by 4.48 percent compared to the 2013 rates. Similarly, Division 8 had the smallest percentage of respondents who reported they believed crime in their neighborhood had increased (14.5%) when, in fact, this division had the fourth largest decrease in crime among the division. Part 1 crimes in this division decreased 3.90 percent from the 2013 rates.

Similarly, while Division 1 is ranked number one among police divisions for proportions of respondents reporting fear of going out alone at night in their neighborhood (column 3), this division is ranked 4th in UCR Part 1 crime rates among the police districts (column 4). Division 2 is ranked 3rd in percentage of respondents reporting they had fear of going out alone at night in their neighborhoods while it is ranked 6th in terms of division Part 1 UCR crime rates. Division 7 and Division 3 are similarly inconsistent in their rankings on these two criteria.

Perceived Neighborhood Crime Problems

Respondents were asked a series of questions related to whether certain problems were present in their neighborhood. The problems identified were

varied and included crimes such as vandalism and assaults as well as public order problems such as loud music from cars and vagrant groups of teenagers in public places. The percentage of respondents who reported activities as *big problems* or *not a problem* are presented in Table 6 for each crime/public order problem.

Table 6

Respondent Identification of Neighborhood Problems

<u>ACTIVITY</u>	<u>BIG PROBLEM</u>	<u>NO PROBLEM</u>
Litter or Garbage	19.8%	45.1%
Rundown Property	17.8	50.1
Loud Music From Cars	15.9	47.3
Sale/Use Illegal Drugs	13.0	52.1
Teens Loitering	12.0	63.6
Vacant Lots/Trash and Junk	11.1	70.4
Thefts/Home Break-Ins	10.7	44.2
Car Theft/Theft From Cars	9.5	52.6
Drinking and Driving	8.9	51.0
Vandalism	7.7	58.6
Public Intoxication/Drinking	5.9	80.2
Robberies	5.8	72.4
Citizen Harassment by Citizens	5.1	75.1
Prostitution	3.7	83.8
Assaults/Beatings	4.1	76.6

As shown in Table 6, the responses of those surveyed indicated neighborhood problems were not perceived to be very prevalent. No activity was identified as a *big problem* by more than 19.8 percent of the respondents. There were only seven neighborhood activities reported as a *big problem* by approximately 10 percent or more of the respondents. In rank order, these *big problems* were: litter or garbage, rundown property, loud music from cars, illegal drugs sale/use, teens loitering in public places, and vacant lots/trash and junk in yards. Among these seven activities noted as *big problems* by respondents, the

majority (71.4 percent or 5 out of 7) were public order rather than crime-related problems.

Similarly, when the percentages of respondents reporting major crimes such as robbery and assault were considered, these major crimes were reported as being *big problems* by less than five percent of the respondents and as *no problem* by a clear majority of the respondents.

Respondents were also asked to assign responsibility for criminal activities that took place within their home or community. Respondents were asked several questions relating to drug use: 92.6 percent of respondents *strongly agreed/ agreed* that a person is responsible if drugs are being used in their home, 95.1 percent *strongly disagreed/ disagreed* that occasional drug use is okay, similarly 99.6 percent of respondents *strongly disagreed/ disagreed* that it is permissible to sell drugs. Clearly there was consensus regarding personal responsibility for and the illegality of drug usage among these respondents. Additionally, a strong sense of communal support was evident when asked about drug activity in their neighborhood. The majority of respondents *strongly agreed or agreed* that community members should work together to prevent drug dealers from selling in their area (97.3 percent) and that people should pass along drug activity information to police officers (97.9 percent).

Respondents were also asked whether it was the responsibility of the police, residents or both to prevent crime in their neighborhood. A majority of individuals (77.3 percent) reported that preventing crime was the *shared*

responsibility of police and residents. This is a small decrease below the 78.3 percent who reported *shared responsibility* in 2013 and is statistically significant.

Citizen Contact with Police

There was limited citizen-police interaction/contact reported by the respondents. Within the past year, 28.9 percent of respondents had contacted the police department to report a crime or a suspicious circumstance in their neighborhood. When respondents were asked whether an incident occurred that could have been reported but was not, 10.6 percent of respondents responded there was an incident that they did not report to the police.

A total of 248 respondents who stated something happened in their neighborhood that they *might have reported to police but did not*, provided an explanation as to *why* they did not respond. The following table contains the results of a content analysis of the individual responses which are reported to provide some additional details into these responses and not as definitive findings because the number of respondents is so small that a shift of less than three individuals results in a 1 percent increase.

The major categories of reasons for not contacting the police that were mentioned by respondents were: *police did not help previously* (23.8 percent), *uncertainty a crime had occurred* (16.9 percent), *minor offense* (14.9 percent), *other resolution* (14.5 percent), and *fear of retaliation* (14.1 percent).

Examples of respondent statements that reflected uncertainty a crime had occurred include: “2 windows broke but couldn’t prove who did it,” “Car broken into from a bar around the corner, did not see anyone,” and “I did not have any

proof.” Individuals who made comments suggesting they did not report because the police would not or could not do anything were representative of the following: “We reported one time and nothing was ever done about it,” or “When you call it takes them so long to respond that the trouble is over by the time they get there.”

Table 7

Reasons for Not Contacting Police

Reason for Not Contacting Police	Percentage
Not My Business	7.7% (19)
Fear of Retaliation	14.1% (35)
Uncertain A Crime Occurred/No Proof	16.9% (42)
Minor Offense	14.9% (37)
Police Did Not Help Previously	23.8% (59)
Other Resolution	14.5% (36)
Other	8.1% (20)
TOTAL	100% (248)

Those who commented that the offense was “too minor” made statements similar to the following: “Because the issues were very minor, a homeless man sleeping in the yard,” or “It was only fireworks.” Those who stated they did not respond because it was “not their business” were generally concerned with issues such as: “Didn’t want to get involved,” “We handled it within the community” or “Felt I should stay out of it.” Lastly, some of the “other resolutions” included: altercations that ended, “strangers” in neighborhoods who disappeared when confronted, problems with children worked out between parents, or

someone else had already called the police. These findings are consistent with prior research: cf. Langton, et al. (2012); Hart and Rennison (2003).

Attitudes Toward Police and Police Services in the Neighborhood

Overall, the police and police services were generally well perceived in the community. As shown in Chart 6, a majority of respondents were either *very satisfied* (50.2 percent) or *somewhat satisfied* (37.2 percent) with police and police services. Only 4.4 percent of respondents reported being *very dissatisfied* with the quality of service provided by police.

Chart 6

Satisfaction with Police Services

Additionally, police were rated as good community partners by a majority of the respondents. A majority of respondents (61.2 percent) believed the police were *very willing to work with local community leaders and community groups* another 33.4 percent believed the police were *somewhat willing* to do so. Only a small percentage of respondents (5.4 percent) believed the police were *not willing to work with community leaders and community groups*.

As indicated in Table 8, citizens rated police very positively on all aspects of police services. The police were perceived as effectively performing their responsibilities (crime prevention and order maintenance) and did so in a manner considerate of the needs of the citizens. As indicated by citizen responses to the quality of service provided, police received very high ratings in terms of the quality (polite, helpful, fair) of their interactions with citizens and were additionally viewed as being helpful to the victims of crime.

Table 8

Respondent Perceptions of Quality of Specific Police Services

	<u>Very Good/Good</u>	<u>Poor/Very Poor</u>
Crime Prevention	87.9	12.2
Helping Victims of Crime	81.8	18.2
Keeping Order on Streets	88.8	11.2
Polite to Citizens	88.7	11.3
Helpful to Citizens	92.1	8.0
Fair to Citizens	91.7	8.2

Correlates of Satisfaction with Police and Police Services

Fear of Crime

Satisfaction with police services may be influenced by certain perceptions and experiences citizens have had with the police. For example, satisfaction with police services may vary with a citizen's fear of crime. Those individuals with high fear of crime may also be dissatisfied with police services and this may, in fact, aggravate the severity of their fear of crime. While most respondents reported low levels of fear of crime (40.9 percent felt very safe and 38.2 percent felt somewhat safe when being out alone at night in their neighborhood),

satisfaction with police services among those with high and low fear of crime were compared to determine the extent of this relationship.

As seen in Table 9, fear of crime as measured by perceived safety in being out alone in their neighborhoods at night was statistically significant in relation to satisfaction with police services. Among those reporting they felt *very safe/safe*, 91.8 percent reported *satisfaction* with the police services. Among those respondents reporting they felt *unsafe/very unsafe*, fewer, 70.9 percent reported being *satisfied* with police services.

Table 9

Satisfaction with Police and Fear of Crime

<u>Satisfaction with Police and Police Services</u>	<u>How Safe Do You Feel or Would You Feel Being Out Alone at Night in Your Neighborhood?</u>	
	<u>Safe</u>	<u>Unsafe</u>
<u>Satisfied</u>	91.8% (1694)	70.9% (346)
<u>Dissatisfied</u>	8.2 (152)	29.1 (142)
<u>Total</u>	100% (1846)	100% (488)

When the other measures of fear of crime were used, a similar relationship between fear of crime and satisfaction with police services was found. For example, as depicted in Table 10, those respondents who reported *high fear their home would be broken into when no one was home* were more likely to report *dissatisfaction* (36.9 percent) with police than those who reported *low fear their home would be broken into* (6.8 percent). While it is not possible

with the current data to determine causation, that is whether it is the fear that causes dissatisfaction or dissatisfaction that causes the fear, the two factors are clearly related.

Table 10

Satisfaction with Police and Fear of Home Being Broken Into

<u>Satisfaction with Police and Police Services</u>	<u>How Worried Are You That Someone Will Break Into Your Home When No One Is There?</u>	
	Very Worried	Not Worried At All
Satisfied	63.1% (113)	93.2% (806)
Dissatisfied	36.9 (66)	6.8 (59)
Total	100% (179)	100% (865)

Citizen Contact with Police

Respondents were asked whether they had contacted the police within the past year to report a crime or suspicious circumstance in their neighborhood. While a majority of respondents (71.1 percent) reported *no contact* with police over the past year, there was enough variation in contact with police to assess the relationship between contact with the police and satisfaction with police. As shown in Table 11, respondents who reported *no contact* with police were more likely to be *satisfied* with police and police services (91.2 percent) compared to those who reported *contact* with police (78.4 percent).

While this might seem to be problematic, when considering the nature of most contact with police, it is very difficult for civilians to be completely “satisfied” with this contact. Citizens generally contact the police in stressful and “challenging” situations. For example, if they call to report a crime, they want an immediate solution; or if they call the police asking for immediate assistance and are made to wait; or if they call the police and don’t understand why an arrest cannot be made on their suspicion only. The nature of police/citizen encounters makes the contact that it is more likely to result in frustration more often than complete satisfaction on the part of the “consumer.” Similarly, it is very difficult for individuals in these instances, to generalize past their own personal experiences and rate the police in an objective manner.

Table 11

Satisfaction with Police and Citizens Had Contacted Police

<i>Satisfaction with Police and Police Services</i>	<i>Citizens Had Contacted Police</i>	
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
<u>Satisfied</u>	78.4% (537)	91.2% (1516)
<u>Dissatisfied</u>	21.6 (148)	8.8 (147)
Total	100% (685)	100% (1663)

Demographic Correlates

Satisfaction with police services may vary with individual demographic characteristics such as age, ethnicity, social class and sex. The relationship between some limited demographic characteristics of the respondents and satisfaction with police services was assessed.

Table 12

Satisfaction with Police by Sex of Respondent

<i>Satisfaction with Police and Police Services</i>	<i>Sex</i>	
	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
<u>Satisfied</u>	86.9% (683)	87.6% (1372)
<u>Dissatisfied</u>	13.1 (103)	12.4 (194)
Total	100% (670)	100% (1566)

Sex: The relationship between sex of the respondent and satisfaction with police services was not statistically significant. As shown in Table 12, males (86.9 percent) and females (87.6 percent) were equally as likely to report satisfaction with police services.

Ethnicity: Table 13 indicates how individuals from various ethnic groups¹ rated police and police services. Overall, within both the Caucasian and African American respondent groups, a majority indicated they were satisfied with police

¹ Due to the fact that Hispanics (1.1 percent) and Asians (.3 percent) each represented no more than 1% of the sample it was not possible to include respondents from these ethnic groups in this comparison.

and police services. The proportion of respondents who reported satisfaction with the police was slightly higher among Caucasian respondents (89.2 percent) than African American respondents (82.2 percent). This relationship was statistically significant.

Table 13

Satisfaction with Police and Police Services by Ethnicity of Respondent

<i>Satisfaction with Police and Police Services</i>	<i>Ethnicity</i>	
	<u>African American</u>	<u>Caucasian</u>
<u>Satisfied</u>	82.3% (417)	89.2% (1519)
<u>Dissatisfied</u>	17.8 (90)	10.8 (184)
Total	100% (507)	100% (1703)

Table 14

Satisfaction with Police Services by Household Income of Respondent

<i>Satisfaction with Police and Police Services</i>	<i>Household Income</i>			
	<u>To \$20000</u>	<u>\$20001 to \$40000</u>	<u>\$40001 to \$60000</u>	<u>\$60001 +</u>
<u>Satisfied</u>	84.7% (416)	86.2% (486)	88.0% (300)	90.2% (488)
<u>Not Satisfied</u>	15.3 (75)	13.8 (78)	12.0 (41)	9.8 (53)
Total	100% (491)	100% (564)	100% (341)	100% (541)

Income: Respondents were asked to respond to whether their 2014 annual household income fell within a series of income categories ranging from “No more than \$5000” to “\$80000 or more”. The median household income reported by respondents to this survey was “\$40001 to \$50000”. Respondent satisfaction with police services for individuals within the various household income categories was assessed. The results of this analysis are contained in Table 14. There were no significant differences between the income categories in terms of the respondents’ satisfaction with police services.

Age: Overall, a majority of individuals within all age categories reported satisfaction with the police. As shown in Table 15, some variation was noted according to age of the individual in that older individuals were generally more likely to report satisfaction with police services than younger respondents. However, this relationship was not statistically significant.

Table 15

Satisfaction with Police and Police Services by Age of Respondent

Respondent’s Age	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Total
18-25	85.1% (57)	14.9% (10)	100 (67)
26-35	83.9 (265)	16.1 (51)	100 (316)
36-45	87.0 (289)	13.0 (43)	100 (332)
46-55	83.6 (317)	16.4 (62)	100 (379)
56-65	88.5 (478)	11.5 (62)	100 (540)
66+	90.6 (615)	9.4 (64)	100 (679)

Education: Table 16 contains the findings related to the relationship between education of the respondent and satisfaction with police and police services. As shown in this table, respondents with higher levels of education had

greater satisfaction with the police. The difference, however, was not statistically significant.

Table 16

Satisfaction with Police and Police Services by Education

Education	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Total
Less Than High School Degree	85.9% (146)	14.1% (24)	100% (170)
High School or GED	87.1 (562)	12.9 (83)	100 (645)
Some College/Vocational	86.1 (570)	13.9 (92)	100 (662)
College Degree	87.8 (489)	12.2 (68)	100 (557)
Post Graduate Work	90.9 (271)	9.1 (27)	100 (298)

Residential Ownership: Respondents were asked whether or not they owned their residence. Ownership included those still paying mortgages and applied to houses as well as condominiums. While both residence owners (88.8 percent) and those who rented their residences (83.0 percent) were, in the majority, satisfied with police services; individuals who reported owning their own residences were more likely to be satisfied than those who rented their residences.

DIVISION FINDINGS

The total number of respondents to this survey was purposely increased in 2014 to provide for findings by division. Each division had approximately 300 respondents. Therefore, the margin of error for these findings is approximately +/- 5 percent.

Perception of Neighborhood

As shown in Table 17, a significant majority of respondents in each division reported that their neighborhoods had improved or were about the same compared to last year. Divisions 1, 4 and 8 had the greatest portion of

respondents who reported their neighborhood had *improved* over the last year.

Divisions 1, 2 and 4 had the greatest portion of respondents reporting their neighborhoods had *gotten worse* over the past year.

Table 17

Perception of Neighborhood by Division

“In the past year has your neighborhood become a better, worse or about the same place to live?”

Perception of Neighborhood	DIVISION							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Improved	11.8%	7.4%	5.9%	8.1%	5.7%	7.8%	7.7%	8.4%
About the Same	62.3	67.0	71.0	58.7	83.9	75.4	80.9	86.1
Gotten Worse	25.9	25.6	23.1	33.2	10.4	16.7	11.4	5.4
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 18

Perception of Neighborhood Crime by Division

“In the past year has the amount of crime in your neighborhood increased, decreased or remained the same?”

Amount of Crime	DIVISION							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Decreased	12.9%	9.6%	7.1%	7.6%	4.8%	9.2%	6.6%	9.3%
About the Same	48.3	57.9	63.3	57.8	74.0	68.3	76.7	76.1
Increased	38.8	32.5	29.6	34.6	21.1	22.5	16.7	14.5
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

As noted in Table 19, in each division, a majority of respondents reported they felt or would feel safe walking alone at night in their neighborhoods.

Divisions 5, 7 and 8 had the greatest percentage of respondents reporting they felt *very safe or safe* walking alone at night in their neighborhoods. While

Divisions 1, 2, 3 and 4 had the greatest percentage of respondents reporting they felt *very unsafe or unsafe* while walking alone at night in their neighborhoods.

Table 19

Perception of Neighborhood Safety by Division

“How safe do you or would you feel being out alone at night in your neighborhood?”

DIVISION

Safe Walking Alone	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Very Safe/Safe	59.6%	72.6%	74.1%	67.2%	90.0%	87.1%	89.9%	92.7%
Unsafe/Very Unsafe	40.4	27.4	25.9	32.8	10.0	12.9	10.1	7.3
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 20

Perception of Neighborhood Safety by Division

“How worried are you that someone will break into your home when no one is there?”

DIVISION

Worried Break-In	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Worried	18.9%	17.9%	18.8%	17.6%	6.5%	12.1%	9.1%	7.5%
Not Worried	81.1	82.1	81.2	82.4	93.5	87.9	90.9	92.5
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 21

Perception of Neighborhood Safety by Division

“How often do you avoid going out alone at night in your neighborhood?”

DIVISION

Avoid Out Alone at Night	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Always/Almost Always	30.4%	23.2%	11.9%	20.0%	4.5%	10.6%	8.5%	4.1%
Never/Almost Never	69.6	76.8	88.1	80.0	95.5	89.4	91.5	95.9
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

As found in the earlier section addressing fear of crime within Metro Louisville, Tables 20 and 21 contain data which shows respondents were less concerned about their home being broken into when no one was present than they were going out alone in their neighborhoods at night alone. A significant majority of respondents in each division are *not worried* or *not worried at all* about a home break-in. Divisions 5, 7, and 8 had the lowest percentage of respondents worried about home break-ins as well as the lowest percentage of respondents afraid to go out alone in their neighborhoods at night.

Table 22

Perception of Responsibility for Neighborhood Crime Prevention by Division

“When it comes to preventing crime in your neighborhood, do you feel that it’s more the responsibility of the residents, or is it more the responsibility of the police?”

Responsible to Prevent Crime	DIVISION							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Residents	14.1%	16.9%	13.1%	18.7%	17.7%	14.4%	11.7%	21.7%
Police	8.0	8.4	5.2	5.7	7.7	8.1	3.0	7.4
Both	77.9	74.7	81.7	75.6	74.7	77.5	85.3	70.9
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 22 contains responses, by division, to whether respondents believed crime prevention in their neighborhood is a “solo” or “partnership” venture. As seen in this table, in each division, a clear majority of respondents believed crime prevention was the joint responsibility of police and residents. Additionally, a clear minority in each division believe crime prevention is solely the purview of police. There were not extensive variations among the divisions

on this question. However, respondents in Divisions 3 and 7 were most likely to report the responsibility as belonging both the police and residents.

Table 23 contains responses, by division, to whether respondents believe police were willing to be community partners. No division-specific responses deviated from the overall finding that the police were perceived to be willing, to some degree, to be community partners.

Table 23

Perception of Police Willingness to be Community Partners by Division

How willing are police to partner with members of the community and community groups?"

	DIVISION							
Community Partners	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Very Willing	48.7%	45.4%	57.8%	51.9%	66.7%	68.4%	69.5%	76.8%
Somewhat Willing	43.4	44.0	36.3	38.4	29.4	28.7	28.7	21.4
Not Willing	7.9	10.6	5.9	9.7	3.9	2.9	1.8	1.8
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

In all divisions, a majority responded the police were *very willing* to be community partners with an even more substantial majority responding the police were willing, to some degree, to be community partners. Divisions 5, 6, 7, and 8 had the greatest percentage of respondents who replied the police were very willing to be community partners as well as the smallest percentage responding the police were not willing to be community partners.

Table 24 contains responses, by division, to the respondents' satisfaction with police services in their neighborhood. As noted in this table, no division-specific responses deviated from the general findings for Metro Louisville. That is, respondents in each division expressed satisfaction with police services.

Within each division, a significant majority of the respondents were *very satisfied/satisfied* with police services in their neighborhood. Division 8 had the smallest percentage of respondents expressing some degree of dissatisfaction. However, in all districts one fifth or fewer respondents reflected some degree of dissatisfaction. Additionally in one-half of the divisions, 10 percent or less expressed some degree of dissatisfaction.

Table 24

Satisfaction with Police Services by Division

“In general, how satisfied are you with the quality of police services in your neighborhood?”

Satisfaction With Police Services	DIVISION							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Very Satisfied/Satisfied	81.0%	79.8%	86.7%	80.5%	92.8%	91.5%	93.2%	93.5%
Unsatisfied/Very Unsatisfied	19.0	20.2	13.3	19.5	7.2	8.5	6.8	6.5
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 25 contains the findings, by division, for the responses to assessments of the quality of police activities such as crime prevention, victim assistance, and maintaining public order as well as citizen assessments of how helpful and fair the police are in their dealings with civilians. As with the other division-specific findings, all division outcomes were consistent with overall general trends in which a majority of respondents reported the police were *very good/good* at crime prevention, helping victims, and maintaining public order. Additionally, a majority of respondents believed the police were polite, helpful and fair in their dealings with the public.

Table 25

Percentage of Respondents Rating Police Activities as Very Good or Good by Division

“How good are police at crime prevention? Helping Victims? Keeping Public Order? Being Helpful? Being Fair?”

Standards	DIVISION							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Preventing Crime	76.2%	80.3%	88.7%	79.3%	94.3%	92.8%	97.2%	94.0%
Helping Victims	71.1	72.5	82.9	74.8	88.0	86.3	92.9	89.8
Keeping Public Order	76.8	82.3	90.8	82.5	95.6	91.9	95.4	95.9
Polite	83.5	81.5	88.2	85.1	91.2	92.7	92.8	94.7
Helpful to Citizens	87.8	85.9	95.0	87.5	94.1	95.3	96.3	94.8
Fair to Citizens	84.1	85.6	93.8	91.0	93.7	92.9	97.6	95.6

DISCUSSION

The findings from the assessment of citizens’ perceptions of the Louisville Metro Police Department (LMPD) showed that citizens of Metro Louisville were satisfied with police and the quality of police services provided by LMPD. The findings in the current 2014 survey did not differ from the findings reported in the 2013 survey. The majority of respondents perceived the police as very willing to work with local community leaders and community groups and positively rated

the quality of police services in crime prevention and order maintenance. When dissatisfaction was noted, it was from a minority of the respondents.

A significant majority of individuals reported that the quality of their neighborhood, as well as neighborhood crime, had remained the same over the past year. Similarly, respondents reported low levels of fear of crime, in that the majority of respondents felt safe when being out alone at night. When asked about neighborhood problems, those reported most often were public order incidents such as loud music from cars rather than serious crime problems such as assault.

A majority of individuals reported that they had no contact with the police during the previous year. Those reporting that they had contacted the police indicated higher levels of dissatisfaction; however given the nature of police contact, it may be difficult to garner positive citizen responses. One must take into account that any number of situations involving police contact may mitigate the overall, positive satisfaction respondents may have for police and police services. Similarly, it may be very difficult for respondents to generalize past their own personal experiences and view police objectively.

Citizens perceived the Louisville Metro Police as doing a good job helping crime victims. Respondents' attitudes toward police officers rated the police as polite, helpful, and fair when interacting with neighborhood residents. Citizens perceived police as helpful in reducing crime and make the neighborhoods safer places in which to live.

While being satisfied with police services, respondents also believed that it was the responsibility of both residents and police to prevent neighborhood crime; and that, within their neighborhoods, a sense of community existed in that neighbors would assist neighbors and neighbors would report public order and crime incidents to police. Respondents additionally viewed the police as willing partners with community leaders and community groups.

The demographic variables of age, income and education were not related to satisfaction with police services. Ethnicity was related to satisfaction with police services but the differences between Caucasians and African Americans were not extreme. Within both ethnic groups a significant majority reported satisfaction with police services.

The review of the findings within each division did not produce division-specific findings that were counter to the trends evidenced in the overall Metro Louisville findings. The divisions did exhibit differences in the percentage distributions for specific findings but this is to be expected and the differences were not extreme. The division findings represent interesting internal comparisons that are of relevance overall and specifically to the division commanders. However, caution must be exercised due to the sample size of 300 in each division which results in a margin of error of +/- 5 percent.