

# **CRIME, POLICE, AND THE COMMUNITY**

A report by the  
Citizens Crime Commission  
of New York City

(212) 733-8300

July, 2001

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Part I of this survey presents the findings of a public opinion survey, conducted by an independent research team at the Fordham Institute. It measured citizens' attitudes toward police and crime. Among the basic findings were:

### Safety

91% of respondents felt safe in their neighborhoods during the daytime, 77% at night. 84% thought their neighborhood was equally or more safe than 12 months ago.

### Local Police

67% of respondents were satisfied with police protection. 31% thought it had improved over the last 12 months, 59% thought it had stayed the same.

### Enforcement of Quality of Life Laws

66% of New Yorkers favored enforcement of Quality of Life laws against small time drug dealing, public drinking, disorderly conduct, etc... However, the way in which it is carried out is important. New Yorkers preferred 63% to 37% that enforcement be done in a respectful rather than an aggressive manner. The survey found that New Yorkers' support for QOL enforcement was high across all demographic subgroups (ethnicity, borough, gender, age), and had surprisingly little or no relation to feelings about personal safety or the police.

### Police Community Relations

67% of respondents felt that police are tougher on Blacks than Whites. 59% of respondents said that brutality was a serious problem in the NYPD.

### Differences by Ethnicity

When broken down by group (Hispanics, Blacks, non-Hispanic Whites, and Asians) the responses remained approximately the same, though Black and Hispanics had less favorable views of police than any other groups.

From an analysis of New Yorkers' comments, the researchers also noted that, it was striking how just one direct interaction with a police officer could leave a lasting impression across several years and could generalize to police as a group.

• • • •

In Part II, noting the findings of the survey that New Yorkers want an improvement in police conduct and a continuation of crime reductions, the Crime Commission

analyzed recent studies of police operations and suggested some programs that should be instituted by the NYPD. The recommendations were:

- Introduce Procedural Justice Methods into Police Operations

Studies of police enforcement activities in other cities have determined that there is a close connection between police attitudes and perceived unfairness, especially among minority group members, and the process by which policing is carried out is as important as the outcome. When police treat people with courtesy and openness, taking time to explain their actions and to listen to people's views, even if they arrest or ticket citizens they get high ratings on fairness- -not only from the individuals involved, but from those observing the incident, as well. This type of policing has been labeled "Procedural Justice." When police do not appear to show respect or to listen to citizens, even if they decide not to arrest or ticket them, they get low ratings for fairness. The commission recommends that the NYPD build into its training, and especially into its daily operations, the concepts of procedural justice so that each officer understands that just enforcing the law and reducing crime is not sufficient to ensure positive ratings from the public. The way in which policing is conducted is equally important.

- Enhance the Role of the Neighborhood Beat Officer

Precinct patrol duty has less status and compensation than other police tasks. In the NYPD, as in most police departments, it has been the pattern that the route of advancement has been to move away from patrol to specialized or supervisory duties. Yet officers who acquire knowledge of local conditions and subcultures and who display good interpersonal skills are especially important in a city as diverse as New York. Various researchers and study commissions have urged that the NYPD recognize and reward experience and make patrolling a career rather than encouraging officers to transfer to other assignments. In 1998, a mayoral task force recommended that experienced officers who have demonstrated their expertise in combating crime and in working closely with community residents should receive extra pay. A modified version of this proposal was instituted, but it has been blocked by litigation amidst contractual negotiations between the City and the PBA.

- Utilize Information Age Technology to Improve Neighborhood Policing

Recently the NYPD has begun listing crime figures on its website, and precinct commanders have been directed to engage in the community in problem solving. Shared information could be used to enlist the help of neighborhood residents in planning crime fighting strategies. Neighborhood people are well positioned to suggest strategies that would be both effective and not offensive to the community. Enlisting the community to fight crime would also give the public a much better understanding of police operations and increase support for them.

## INTRODUCTION

In the last decade, no problems have been of more concern to New Yorkers than those involving crime and police. In 1990, when the city logged a record 2,245 murders and 710,000 total serious crimes, there was a general perception that crime was out of control. As late as 1993, the number of murders was 1,946 and total crimes 600,000. Then the city witnessed unprecedented reductions in the crime rate. By 1996 the number of murders had dropped below 1,000 and total crimes below 400,000. This achievement was hailed locally and around the world as “The New York Miracle.” By 2000 the number of murders had fallen to the 600 range and serious crimes to 288,000. Despite these reductions, however, the assault of Abner Louima and the killings of Amadou Diallo and Patrick Dorismond by police officers, brought widespread criticism of the NYPD in the late nineties.

How then do New Yorkers feel about police and crime? Recent surveys have found the situation complex. For example, polls conducted by the New York Urban League, The Hispanic Federation and Quinnipiac College have reported that the majority of Black and Hispanic residents, and a significant number of Whites, feel police discourtesy and use of excessive force are serious problems. Yet the same respondents report that their neighborhoods have become safer and approve of police performance in terms of crime prevention and response to calls.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> See Urban League, State of Black New York, Poll, June 2000, Hispanic Federation, Eighth Annual Survey Report, Police and Quality of Life, June 2000, Quinnipiac University Polls, February 3 & May 3, 2001.

In an effort to determine what policies the city should pursue to continue the crime reductions, and improve police – community relations, the Citizens Crime Commission of New York City, an independent criminal justice research organization, engaged researchers from the Fordham institute to conduct an in - depth assessment of citizen attitudes toward police and crime. The results of that survey are contained in Part I of this report. Part II is an analysis by the Crime Commission of some recent studies of police operations and recommendations on some promising programs that should be instituted by the NYPD.

**PART I**

**CITIZEN ATTITUDES TOWARD  
POLICE AND CRIME, 2001**

A report prepared for  
The Citizens Crime Commission  
of New York City

By

Harold Takooshian and Richard H. Tashjian

July, 2001

## 1. THE SURVEY FINDINGS

### Nature of the Survey

How do New Yorkers today regard their public safety, police operations, enforcement of quality of life laws, and police-community relations? Does this vary much among New York's large ethnic groups, over recent years, or across the City's boroughs?

The groundwork for our 2001 survey of citizen attitudes began in 1998, when the Citizens Crime Commission of New York enlisted outside researchers to develop a prototype bilingual, psychometric-quality survey instrument to assess public attitudes toward four issues: (a) safety and crime, (b) neighborhood policing, (c) quality of life (QOL) enforcement<sup>2</sup>, and (d) police-community relations.

To develop the most effective survey, researchers conducted three focus groups -- with college students, minority professionals, and minority nonprofessionals. Their verbatims were used to construct a 30 item survey which, in 1999, was completed by a random sample of 203 New Yorkers from two specific areas -- a primarily white neighborhood on the upper West Side of Manhattan (37% minority), and the primarily minority neighborhood of Jamaica, Queens (77% minority).

While the sampling was not designed to represent the entire City, the survey and focus group results proved revealing. The overall findings of the 1999 Community Safety Survey (CSS) can be briefly summarized: (a) New Yorkers across ethnic groups generally felt safe in their homes and on the streets, and believed that street crime had decreased during the past five years. (b) Blacks had more critical views of the police than did other groups. (c) New Yorkers across ethnic groups, however, clearly supported the NYPD's QOL enforcement, and the "broken windows" theory underlying it. In fact, Blacks were actually a bit more supportive of QOL enforcement than other groups. This was somewhat surprising since it is frequently argued that the vigorous enforcement of QOL laws alienates minority citizens.

Based on this preliminary study, it was decided to conduct a full City-wide survey, with a sufficient number of respondents to permit confidence in the results. The 2000-2001 Community Survey was conducted by a team of interviewers headed by three

---

<sup>2</sup> Quality of life (QOL) enforcement is a police strategy based on James Q. Wilson and George Kelling's "broken windows" theory. In a 1982 *Atlantic Monthly* article they argued that, just as leaving a broken window unfixed seems to encourage vandalism, inattention to minor crimes such as small-time drug dealing, public drinking and disorderly conduct creates an environment which contributes to the growth of major crimes. Thus, beginning in 1994, the NYPD began to vigorously enforce laws against these minor offenses.

specialists with some 50 years of survey research experience among them--Professors Harold Takooshian of Fordham University, Richard H. Tashjian of New York University, and Richard S. Velayo of Pace University. Methods and procedures utilized in the survey are found in Appendix A.

Because the Citizens Crime Commission routinely expresses views on public issues involving crime and police, in order to insulate the survey, the CCC maintained a hands-off policy, giving the researchers complete control of data collection, analysis, and interpretation for Part I of this report. In Part II, the analysis and recommendations are entirely those of the Commission.

**Participants.** The participants seemed to be a representative cross-section of New Yorkers, diverse in age, ethnicity, and other features. A demographic analysis of the 834 respondents yields this biodata profile. Their ages varied from 18 to 70+, with a mean of 37 years. They lived in their current neighborhood from a few weeks up to 68 years, with a mean of 16.8 years. Ethnically, the 834 included 190 Hispanics (23%), 250 non-Hispanic Blacks (30%), 328 non-Hispanic whites (39%), 57 Asians (7%) and 9 "other" ethnicities. Some 61% of respondents were females. Some 24% report living in a minority area, 59% in a mixed area, and 17% in a nonminority area. Almost half (44%) reported involvement in their neighborhood -- school, precinct council, church or some community group. Some 37 of 834 respondents opted for the Spanish-language version.



## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

(The survey questionnaire and the tables are contained in Appendix B)

**Overall views.** In the 2001, as in the 1999 survey, the overall results confirm some well-accepted facts about New Yorkers' views. They also reveal a number of findings that go against the popular wisdom, yet which our data affirm to be stable, statistically significant findings.

As seen in Table 1, New Yorkers today continue to feel quite safe in their neighborhoods: 91% reported feeling moderately to very safe during daylight hours, and 77% at night. 84% feel their neighborhood is equally or more safe than 12 months ago, and 82% that the city is equally or more safe than 12 months ago. When asked about 8 neighborhood problems using a 0=no to 2=yes scale (item #6a-h), New Yorkers' ratings were consistently below 1 point across the 8 problems, indicating no current problems are viewed as serious. Respondents voiced most concern about drugs (.77), theft (.72), and burglary (.70).

Neighborhood police also continue to elicit favorable responses. Some 67% were satisfied, very satisfied, or extremely satisfied with their local police, while only 12% were not at all satisfied. 59% of respondents felt protection had stayed the same over the past 12 months, 31% thought it had gotten better. 73% of respondents would like to see more police patrolling on foot in their neighborhoods.

When asked if they approve of QOL enforcement in general, 15% said slightly, 12% maybe, 27% probably, and 39% definitely. However, the way in which it is carried out is important. When asked to choose whether police should be respectful or aggressive with suspects in high-crime areas, more New Yorkers chose respectful (63%) over aggressive (37%). Only 8% of New Yorkers flatly reject the "broken windows" notion of inner-city decay, while 73% support the theory, 50% of these "definitely." (See also Table 4.)

In almost all surveys, including ours, citizens prefer more foot patrol, but the use of plainclothes or undercover officers is more controversial, particularly after the killings of Mr. Diallo and Mr. Dorismond by plainclothes officers. Yet 65% of New Yorkers definitely supported plainclothes police in high-crime areas, 17% said they probably supported it, and another 10% said maybe.

New Yorkers generally felt NYPD officers are tougher on blacks (67%) than whites (1%), with 32% feeling police are even-handed. Some 45% said minority officers are more effective in patrolling minority neighborhoods, 47% said maybe. Some 61% felt police are more effective if they live in the neighborhood they patrol. 54% of New Yorkers said that police brutality is probably or definitely common, 20% were unsure,

and 26% thought it was rare. Similarly, 59% felt brutality is a serious problem in the NYPD, including 30% who thought it is very serious. 34% thought it was a slight or moderate problem.

At first these findings seem to conflict. That is, most people are satisfied with the police protection they receive, and strongly support vigorous law enforcement. Yet a large number of people feel police mistreatment of citizens is common. This suggests that New Yorkers support police enforcement when it is carried out in a respectful manner, but reject it when it is conducted aggressively.

In general, the respondents' personal experiences with law enforcement have not been unfavorable. Fewer than one in six (15%) reported being stopped unfairly by police in the past five years, and one in 20 (4.6%) have received a QOL summons. About one in six (16.5%) knew someone who had brought a complaint to the Civilian Complaint Review Board (CCRB); of these, three-quarters (12.8%) were resolved to the complainant's satisfaction, one-quarter (3.7%) were not. (See Table 2.)

**Ethnicity.** There were differences between respondents by ethnic group. As noted in Table 2, they varied demographically. The mean age of whites (44 years) was far higher than Asians (29), with Hispanics (32) and Blacks (36) in between. Whites have lived in their current neighborhood an average of 19 years, Blacks 14, Hispanics 12, and Asians 8. Whites were far less likely than Blacks or Hispanics to have been stopped unfairly, or to know someone who filed a complaint with the CCRB. All groups reported favorable outcomes for complaints with the CCRB by a ratio of 3:1, which for Blacks rose to 7:1. Asians were far less likely to report neighborhood involvement (6%) than whites (39%), Hispanics (53%), or Blacks (67%).

Do ethnic groups vary much in their views? As Table 3 indicates about their feelings of safety, all four ethnic groups had means above 3 on the 1-5 scales of feeling safe during daylight and night hours. All four groups felt equally or more safe than 12 months earlier, both in their neighborhoods and the City generally. For 8 neighborhood problems, all four groups' ratings on a 0-2 scale fell at 1.0 or less, indicating no current problems were viewed as serious. Still, on the 0-16 scale, Whites reported significantly fewer neighborhood problems (3.4) than Asian (4.2) Black (5.3) and Hispanic New Yorkers (5.3).

In commenting on the police, Blacks and Hispanics rated NYPD officers slightly, yet significantly, lower than Whites and Asians, but all four ethnic groups agreed police protection over the past 12 months has stayed the same or improved slightly.

On QOL enforcement, all four groups equally approved of the "broken windows" notion of urban decay (4.0 on a 1-5 scale), and continued to score above 3 on a 1-5 scale endorsing NYPD QOL enforcement.

Table 4 lists 10 specific QOL enforcement, and indicates two clear points: (a) New Yorkers clearly support 8 of the 10 QOL measures. The two with less support are jaywalking and street vendors, particularly the latter. When analyzed by ethnic group, all four groups strongly supported QOL enforcement. On the 0-20 scale, Whites' level of support (14.6) for QOL enforcement was actually exceeded by people of color--Hispanics (15.2), Blacks (15.3) and Asians (15.5). The likely reason for this is that as their response to local problems (Table 3, question #6) indicated, QOL problems are more troublesome in non-White neighborhoods.

On police and community relations (Table 3), all four groups clearly support use of NYPD plainclothes police in high-crime areas. Blacks were slightly, yet not significantly, more likely than the other three groups to feel police are tougher on Blacks. All ethnic groups felt brutality was more common than rare in the NYPD (3.5 on a 1-5 scale), but this view was significantly higher among Blacks (4.0) and Hispanics (3.7) than among Asians (3.3) and Whites (3.0). Similarly, the brutality problem was rated as more serious by Blacks (4.2) and Hispanics (3.9) than Asians (3.3) and Whites (3.1).

**Comments of New Yorkers.** At the end of this anonymous survey, item #31 asked respondents if they had any further comments to add on the topic. Approximately 100 people offered a quick one-sentence comment, either in passing or while critiquing public safety or the police. A smaller number made more detailed comments about their personal experiences or views.

Upon analysis, a few patterns are clear in these comments. (a) Many people voice strong feelings in both directions – positive and negative—indicating New Yorkers' ambivalence about police. (b) There is no clear trend among the three larger ethnic groups, all three reporting mixed experiences or sentiments, ranging from strongly positive to strongly negative. (c) More than anything, it is impressive how strongly and memorably citizens were impacted by their interactions with the City's men and women in blue. Though this survey's explicit focus was the past 12 months, respondents readily and vividly described incidents as far back as 20 years, and many could hardly wait during the survey to give their personal experiences or views at the end. Clearly, such positive and negative experiences deeply affected their responses on the topic, reminding us of the importance of police interaction with citizens. Though a minority of citizens had direct interaction with police in a single year, it is striking how just one direct interaction with one officer can leave a lasting impression across several years that can generalize to police as a group.

**3. Geography.** Do views vary by boroughs in New York City? Table 5 reports the findings broken down by four boroughs.<sup>3</sup> Few systematic patterns emerge here, with two exceptions. (a) On a 0-16 scale, local problems were rated significantly higher in the Bronx (5.8) and Brooklyn (4.8) than Queens (3.7) and Manhattan (3.5). (b) On a 0-20 scale measuring support for QOL enforcement, Manhattanites scored significantly lower (14.0) especially, on three of the 10 items--pot-smoking, loitering, graffiti--than those in the other three boroughs (15.3).

**4. Intercorrelations.** How do New Yorkers' attitudes across the four areas correlate with each other--safety, police, QOL, community relations? Two trends are worthy of note here. (a) One's rating of local problems is significantly related to less safety ( $r = -.38$ ), less confidence in police ( $r = -.36$ ), and being stopped unfairly ( $r = .22$ ). (b) In contrast, one's support of QOL enforcement is quite independent of other factors, including the respondents views on neighborhood safety ( $r = -.11$ ) or problems ( $r = .05$ ), satisfaction with police ( $r = .06$ ), or rating of NYPD brutality ( $r = -.14$ ). These findings confirm that there is indeed no simple connection between feelings of safety and support for QOL enforcement; instead these must be recognized as two quite separate dimensions ( $r = .05$ ) of New Yorkers' psyche. (See Table 6)

---

<sup>3</sup> No survey calls were made to residents of Staten Island.

**PART II**

**FIGHTING CRIME – IMPROVING POLICE – COMMUNITY  
RELATIONS**

By

The Citizens Crime Commission  
of New York City

## Introduction

As the 2001 community survey indicates, New Yorkers clearly want to continue the successful anti-crime programs of the past eight years. But they also want to improve the way the police deal with the community. The findings also refute the argument that if citizens were fully aware of how the crime reductions of recent years had increased their safety, they would not be so critical of police. The survey documents that they are aware and appreciative of the safer streets, but they are still critical of police. Simply put, they want to be protected and respected. There is no reason that the kind of good policing that is effective against crime should lead to conflict with citizens. In fact, the reverse is true.

While many police officers are courteous and helpful in their dealings with citizens, some assume a detached or authoritarian attitude that may be perceived by citizens as unfriendly, or even hostile. Police Commissioner Bernard Kerik has noted that in some instances, when he has approached field officers who did not recognize him, they responded with “inexcusable rudeness.” According to the Commissioner, this behavior, arose from “a warped idea of what it means to be a public servant.”<sup>4</sup>

In the past an impersonal or authoritarian style was not resented as much by citizens. Many people took it for granted that police officers, like supervisors in offices and factories, would act in a brusque manner. Citizens, today, however, are not willing to submit to authority simply because it is authority. People want to be listened to and treated with respect. Thus, police behavior that was once tolerated is now deemed unacceptable. In successful businesses, line personnel have been afforded more discretion, and greater emphasis has been placed on achieving customer satisfaction. Policing has yet to follow the private sector’s example.

---

<sup>4</sup> Bernard Kerik, “Its Rudeness not Racism” City Journal. Spring, 2001, p.120

In the last few years the NYPD has done an outstanding job in reducing crime. The Department has also begun a number of programs to improve police community relations. Still, as our survey reports, many citizens have criticisms of the way police treat people. Commissioner Kerik has expressed great concern over this and has emphasized the need for the Department to improve in this area.

Listed below are 3 promising programs for both improving community relations and crime fighting.

#### Introduce Procedural Justice Methods into Police Operations

It is sometimes argued that police become unpopular when they do their job, such as enforcing the law, particularly for low level offenses. According to this notion, citizens who are stopped or arrested will naturally have negative feelings toward the police. If this were true, then it would suggest that in the interest of improving police community relations, the NYPD should cut back on enforcement, particularly for minor offenses. This would be a mistake. Our respondents wanted quality of life problems addressed.

The original Wilson-Kelling “Broken Windows” formulation never posited that arrests would be automatic for all public order offenses. In early policing experiments around the country, police exercised discretion, and education and counseling were frequently employed.<sup>5</sup> Even when enforcement is necessary, research has shown that police can make arrests and still receive positive ratings from citizens.

---

<sup>5</sup> See, George L. Kelling & Catherine M. Coles, Fixing Broken Windows: Restoring Order & Reducing Crime in Our Community, N.Y. The Free Press, 1996, pp. 22, 23



In studies of police enforcement activity in cities such as Oakland, Los Angeles and Chicago, Psychologist Tom Tyler determined that there is a close connection between police attitudes and perceived unfairness, especially among minority group members, and the process by which policing is carried out is as important as the outcome. Tyler's studies found that when police treat people with courtesy and openness, taking time to explain their actions and listen to people's views on the matter, even if they arrest or ticket citizens they gain high ratings on fairness –not only from the individuals involved, but from those observing the incident, as well. Tyler calls this type of policing “procedural justice.” But when police do not appear to show respect or listen to citizens, even if the police decide not to arrest or ticket them, they get low ratings for fairness.<sup>6</sup> This finding is reflected in our survey, which documents that citizens support quality of life law enforcement if it is carried out in a respectful manner.

Even in instances when police do not intend to be offensive, they may be perceived as such. Professor Lawrence Sherman has noted that, in 1999, when one State Police force first installed cameras on patrol cars and its officers wore microphones to record what they said to drivers they stopped, the first 40 complaints of racist police language were disproved. Sherman posited that the complaints may have arisen because drivers reacted not to racist language but to an authoritarian attitude that police assumed was appropriate to the circumstances, but which citizens took as hostility. According to Sherman, while authoritarian attitudes may break no law or regulation, a more egalitarian and explanatory style is less likely to fuel anger and allegations of police

---

<sup>6</sup> Tom R. Tyler “Trust and Democratic Governance” In V. Braithwrite & M. Levi, eds., Trust & Governance. New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1998; Tyler, Testimony Before New York City Council, Public Safety Committee, 3-22-99 & Tyler “Trust and Law Abidingness: A Proactive Model of Social Regulation,” Boston University Law Review, April 2001.



unfairness.<sup>7</sup> Commissioner Kerik, in describing his unsatisfactory encounters with field officers, pointed out that not only does such behavior leave a negative impression among citizens, “it’s easily mistaken for racism or sexism, and so it can offend entire communities.”<sup>8</sup> Our own survey commented that “it is striking how just one direct interaction with one officer can leave a lasting impression across several years that can generalize to police as a group.”

The extent to which police engage in procedural justice may also affect the crime rate. One study found that when police arrested domestic violence offenders more politely, it reduced the rate at which they subsequently engaged in such conduct. Offenders interviewed within an hour of being arrested for misdemeanor violence who said that police treated them well by listening to their side of the story, were 40% less likely to reoffend in six months than those who said police refused to listen to them.<sup>9</sup>

The NYPD has begun to build into its training the same regard for tact and courtesy as is now expected for crime fighting and adherence to legal requirements. It is important that this training carry over to the field and that procedural justice becomes standard operating procedure in day -to -day police work. Each officer must understand that just enforcing the law and reducing crime is not sufficient to ensure positive ratings from the public. The way in which policing is conducted is equally important.

#### Enhance the Role of the Neighborhood Beat Officer

Within the police organization, the mechanization of patrol has led to a deemphasis of what was once the backbone of the force, the neighborhood beat cop. These were the officers who dealt directly with low level crime and public disorder on a

---

<sup>7</sup> Lawrence Sherman, “Fair and Effective Policing,” in J.Q. Wilson, and J. Petersilia, eds. Crime 2001

<sup>8</sup> Op-Cit, Kerik, City Journal

<sup>9</sup> Raymond Paternoster, Et. Al. “Do Fair Procedures Matter? The Effect of Procedural Justice on Spouse Assault.” Law and Society Review. 31: 163-204, 1997

daily basis. For most citizens they were the public face of policing. In 1997-98, a mayoral task force, formed in the aftermath of the Abner Louima case to investigate police/community relations, spent many hours listening to citizens' complaints about the police. Even people who were very critical, though, did not hesitate to acknowledge that many police officers do a good job. In some instances, local residents identified particular officers who worked well with the community and whose presence at incidents provided a calming influence. Yet, many people complained that such officers were frequently rotated to other assignments. They wondered why an officer who was doing a good job was not allowed to remain in his post for a long period of time. Similar complaints were voiced by police officers themselves. An echo of this sentiment is found in our survey where respondents expressed a strong sentiment for more foot patrol, which they commonly see as a return to the old time neighborhood beat cop.

A study of New York City policing by researchers Bayley and Garofalo found that the behavior of officers judged by colleagues to be skilled in handling citizen encounters, was measurably different from the behavior of average patrol officers. In general, those identified as possessing this trait were the more experienced officers.<sup>10</sup>

Precinct patrol duty in general has less status and compensation than other police tasks. In the NYPD, as in most police departments, it has been the pattern that the route of advancement is to move away from patrol into specialized or supervisory duties. Yet officers who acquire knowledge of local conditions and subcultures and display good interpersonal skills are especially important in a city as diverse as New York.

---

<sup>10</sup> David H. Bayley & James Garofalo, "Patrol Officer Effectiveness in Managing Conflict During Police Citizen Encounters," in Report of the New York State Commission on Criminal Justice and Use of Force, 1987.

Bayley and Garofalo recommended that police departments should learn to recognize and reward hard - won experience and make patrolling a career rather than encouraging officers to transfer to other assignments. <sup>11</sup>

In this vein, the Mayor's task force proposed a program whereby a certain number of officers in each precinct, housing service area and transit district would be awarded a new title called "community patrol specialist." Those selected would receive an increase in pay to a level equivalent to that of a third grade detective and the award of a gold shield. Community patrol specialists would be chosen from experienced officers who have demonstrated their expertise in combating crime and working closely with community residents. The task force believed that allowing such officers to remain on their beats and still advance in the Department would constitute a major step in improving police – community relations. In addition, it would establish in each command a permanent cadre of outstanding officers who, by their leadership and example, would teach other officers how to reduce crime and disorder while enjoying the full support and cooperation of the local community. This is especially important because it is in the precincts that new officers learn the patterns of behavior that they carry with them throughout their careers.<sup>12</sup> In 1999 the NYPD attempted to institute a modified version of this proposal that provided for selected patrol officers to receive approximately one-half of a detective's pay. At present, even this limited measure has been blocked by litigation amidst contractual negotiations between the Patrolmen's Benevolent Association (PBA) and the City.

---

<sup>11</sup> Bayley and Garofalo, "The Management of Violence By Police Patrol Officers," Criminology, Volume 27. No. 1, 1989

<sup>12</sup> Task Force on New York City Police/Community Relations - Report to the Mayor, March 1998, pp. 69-71

### Utilize Information Age Technology to Improve Neighborhood Policing

An example of informational age policing is the “Compstat” (computer generated comparative statistics) system that was installed in the NYPD in 1994. Prior to that time compilations of crime statistics often ran weeks or months behind. Under “Compstat” they were made available on a weekly basis, and commanders of subordinate units such as boroughs, precincts, and detective squads were regularly assembled at police headquarters to discuss how to more effectively combat crime. Such meetings were a first in the NYPD and contributed significantly to the crime reductions that occurred.<sup>13</sup>

The new technology can also be helpful in breaking down divisions between police and citizens. Recently the NYPD has begun listing crime figures on its website and precinct commanders have been directed to engage the community in problem solving. These measure should be the start of an expanded information sharing effort between the NYPD and the community. Shared information should also be used routinely to enlist the help of neighborhood residents in planning crime fighting strategies. For example, community beat officers and supervisors could meet with local residents to review crime patterns and to discuss means of combating them, in a sort of mini police/citizen Compstat. As our survey suggests, local people who know their neighborhoods intimately are well positioned to suggest crime fighting strategies that will be both effective and not offensive to the community. When these are instituted, police could carry them out in with the assistance of neighborhood anti-crime groups. Not only would this help fight crime, it would give the public a much better understanding of police operations and increase support for them.

---

<sup>13</sup> *Eli Silverman, NYPD Battles Crime: Innovative Strategies in Policing. Boston, Northeastern University Press, 1999.*

Professor Sherman has observed that “the American police institution now stands between its industrial - age past and its information – age future.”<sup>14</sup> The NYPD, which so successfully implemented Compstat, should lead American policing into the information age.

---

<sup>14</sup> Op – Cit, Sherman, Crime 2001

APPENDIX A

**METHODS & RESEARCH TEAM**

## Method

(For further information see Fordham Institute website: [www.opinions-us.com](http://www.opinions-us.com))

**Materials.** The 2001 survey was an anonymous 30-item questionnaire, divided into four major areas -- Neighborhood safety and problems (5 items), Neighborhood police (3 items), QOL enforcement (5 items), Police-community relations (8 items), plus 9 biodata items. It was largely based on the first (1999) CSS, and was accompanied by a Spanish version as well. Compared with other public opinion surveys, the CSS-2001 was designed by a psychologist and statistician to achieve three specific goals: (a) Its questions were kept entirely free of the high-profile personalities and headlines of the day, so they could be repeated as-is across different times and places. Respondents occasionally volunteered timely names or events, but only in "item 31" at the very end of the survey. (b) The 30 items were not independent "one-item scales" common in public opinion polling, but were designed to be combined into larger, scorable attitude scales (on QOL, problems, safety, police) which can analyze and track public opinion. These multi-item scales could be assessed for their psychometric qualities -- internal homogeneity ( $\alpha$ ), and stability over time. (c) Not least of all, the items were based in part on issues and verbatim comments that arose during four lively focus group sessions with minority/nonminority and professional/nonprofessional New Yorkers.

**Procedure.** Random Digit Dialing (RDD) phone numbers were purchased, to represent a representative sample of 200+ New York households in four boroughs (excluding Richmond). A team of university researchers phoned each number in turn, and invited all respondents, age 18+, to voice their opinions in an anonymous 10-minute interview. Numbers were dialed in replicates of 40, with a number retired only after 5 unsuccessful attempts or some other disqualifier (fax, nonworking, nonresidential, refusal). Nonresponse rates in this survey continued to increase from past years;<sup>1</sup> an estimated average of 16 numbers had to be dialed to obtain one completed survey, though once a respondent answered, the completion rate was a more acceptable 40 percent. Most households were contacted on weekdays after 6 PM or weekends after noon; about one-fifth of calls were made during weekdays before 6 PM (and a subsequent analysis found no systematic differences in response associated with day v. evening calls).<sup>2</sup> Calls were

---

<sup>1</sup> To augment CSS-2001, webmaster George Stokes established a new website at [www.opinions-ny.com](http://www.opinions-ny.com) during the course of this research. Researchers are now examining the feasibility of using the website for two-fold communication with community members -- to receive their responses and send messages.

<sup>2</sup> With a City-wide random sample of 800, and a normal distribution on a 1-5 scale, the statistical power of the test around the midpoint of the scale is calculated at 0.1. So a difference of greater than 0.1 on the 1-5 scale is significant. The power based on 200 responses per borough is closer to 0.2.

made continuously over a five-month period from October 2000 through February 2001, to assess views over a period of time, while also being able to monitor sudden shifts in attitude following any dramatic events during that period.



### **About the research team**

The Community Safety Survey 2001 was jointly conducted by a consortium of three research groups -- Fordham University (Fordham Institute), Pace University (Psychology Department), and Richard Tashjian Associates (an applied research firm founded in 1970). The team of researchers came from several local universities. The two Directors of the survey were: **Harold Takooshian, PhD**, a psychologist on the faculty of Fordham University since 1975, and the Director of FIRST--Fordham Institute for Research, Service, Teaching. **Richard H. Tashjian, PhD**, Adjunct Professor at NYU Stern Graduate School of Business, and Director of Richard Tashjian Associates. **Richard S. Velayo, PhD**, on the psychology faculty of Pace University, where he also chairs the Communications Department. **George D. Stokes** is a web consultant at New York University. **Princess Dumas** is a 2001 graduate of Fordham University, where she served as President of Fordham's Psychology Society at Rose Hill. **Yelena Khmel'nitskaya** is an experienced behavioral researcher and 2001 graduate in psychology from Fordham University. **Bindu Methikalam** is an honors student in psychology, who graduated Pace University in 2000. **Elyes Perez** is an honors student in psychology at Hunter College CUNY where she graduated in 2001. **Patricia Zahregian** is an honors student in psychology who graduated from Pace University in 2000, where she is entering Pace's doctoral program in applied psychology in Fall 2001.

APPENDIX B

**SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE AND TABLES**

Phone: Boro \_\_\_\_\_ #: \_\_\_\_\_ - \_\_\_\_\_ date: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/00  
a answ. mach. f fax r refusal e call back at...  
? not home n not a residence

-----  
**COMMUNITY SAFETY SURVEY - 2001**

1 \_\_\_\_\_ How many years has your family lived in its current neighborhood? \_\_\_\_ years.

**A: NEIGHBORHOOD SAFETY**

2. 1 2 3 4 5 In your neighborhood today, how safe do you feel on the streets during daylight?

1- very unsafe 2- unsafe 3- slightly safe 4- safe 5- very safe

3. 1 2 3 4 5 .... during nighttime?

1- very unsafe 2- unsafe 3- slightly safe 4- safe 5- very safe

4. 1 2 3 4 5 Compared with 12 months ago, would you say your neighborhood today is

1- much less safe 2- less safe 3- about the same 4- safer 5- much safer.

5. 1 2 3 4 5 Compared with 12 months ago, would you say New York City streets in general are

1- much less safe 2- less safe 3- about the same 4- safer 5- much safer.

6 In the past 12 months, which would you say has been a serious problem on or around your block? (n= No, ?= maybe, y= yes)

a. n ? y Drugs

e. n ? y Assaults on the street

b. n ? y Guns

f. n ? y Muggings

c. n ? y Street gangs

g. n ? y Theft of property

d. n ? y Abandoned buildings

h. n ? y Burglary of homes/businesses

**B: NEIGHBORHOOD POLICE**

7. 1 2 3 4 5 In general, how satisfied are you with the police who serve your neighborhood?

1- not at all 2- slightly 3- satisfied 4- very satisfied 5- extremely satisfied

8. 1 2 3 4 5 In the past 12 months, would you say police protection in your neighborhood has become

1- much worse 2- worse 3- stayed the same 4- better 5- much better

9. 1 2 3 4 5 Would you like to see more police patrolling *on foot* in your neighborhood?

1- not at all 2- slightly 3- maybe 4- probably 5- definitely

**C: QUALITY OF LIFE ENFORCEMENT**

10 a r On streets high in crime and drugs, would you say it is more important for police to be aggressive, or respectful of people they suspect of wrong-doing? \_\_aggressive \_\_respectful

11 1 2 3 4 5 Some people feel that if fairly minor street problems are tolerated -- such as disorderly teens, boom box radios, small-time drug dealing, buildings not kept fixed and clean -- that this leads to more breakdowns since it looks like no one cares. Would you say such minor breakdowns in the neighborhood contribute to more crime:

1-not at all 2-slightly 3-maybe 4-probably 5-definitely

12 In recent months, NYPD police have increased enforcement of Quality-of-life, to improve things that bother most new Yorkers -- like loud noise, dangerous driving, jaywalking. For each of these topics, tell me if you disagree, have no opinion, or agree with police enforcement of it.

a. d ? a jaywalking

e. d ? a squeegee

i. d ? a bad taxi driving

b. d ? a littering

l. d ? a speeding

j. d ? a graffiti

c. d ? a street vendors

g. d ? a loitering

d. d ? a pot-smoking

h. d ? a loud radios

13. 1 2 3 4 5 Overall, do you approve of the City's Quality-of-life enforcement:

1- not at all 2- slightly 3- maybe 4- probably 5- definitely

14 n y Have you received a quality-of-life summons?  No  Yes \*\*(If Yes, see item 30 below.)

**D: POLICE AND MINORITY COMMUNITIES**

15. 1 2 3 4 5 To get more drugs and guns off the street, or protect taxi drivers, some cities like New York have put more *plainclothes* police in high-crime areas. Would you say such undercover policing is a good idea?  
1- definitely not 2 probably not 3 maybe 4 probably 5 definitely
16. b = w Do you think the police in New York City are tougher on blacks than whites, or tougher on whites than blacks, or do the police treat them both the same?  
b- tougher on blacks =- about the same w- tougher on whites ? Have no idea
17. 1 2 3 4 5 Compared with white officers, would you say minority officers policing a minority neighborhood are \_\_\_\_\_ effective?  
1- much less 2- slightly less 3- equally 4- slightly more 5- much more
18. 1 2 3 4 5 Are police more effective if they live in the neighborhood they patrol?  
1- not at all 2- slightly 3- maybe 4- probably 5- definitely
19. n y In the past 5 years, have you personally been stopped by police unfairly?  
 No  Yes \*\* (If Yes, see item 30 below.)
20. 1 2 3 4 5 In some recent cases, NYC police officers were charged with police brutality. Would you say such incidents are rare exceptions, or common?  
1- definitely rare 2 probably rare 3- unsure 4- probably common 5- definitely common
21. 1 2 3 4 5 How serious a problem do you think police brutality is in New York City?  
1- not at all 2- slight 3- moderate 4- serious 5- very serious
22. n y Do you personally know anyone who brought a formal complaint against police to the Civilian Complaint Review Board?  No  Yes  
If "Yes," was it resolved to their satisfaction?  No  Yes  Don't know

Now please tell me:

23. Are you involved in your neighborhood:  church  school board  preenet council  community group(s)
24. Your age? -19 20s 30s 40s 50s 60s 70s+
25. Would you describe your neighborhood as a primarily Black or Hispanic one?  No  Mixed  Yes.
26. Zip code: \_\_\_\_\_
27. Gender: M F
28. Ethnicity:  Hispanic  Non-Hispanic Black  Non-Hispanic white  Asian Other: \_\_\_\_\_
29. Language: Eng Span

\*\* 30. Have you had any personal experiences you can tell me about, involving the police or Quality-of-Life?  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

31. Thank you for your time. Anything else to add -- about safety, or policing, or quality of life...?

Interviewer's initials: \_\_\_\_\_

Table 1. Responses of 834 New Yorkers in 2001

	Percentage agreement					Mean (s.d.)	
	1	2	3	4	5	2001	1999
<b>LOCAL SAFETY? (1=low to 5=high)</b>							
2. In your neighborhood, how safe do you feel on the streets during daylight?	3	6	13	44	35	4.0 (1.0)	4.1 (1.0)
3. during nighttime?	9	14	22	39	17	3.4 (1.1)	3.5 (1.1)
4. Compared with 12 months ago, would you say your neighborhood today is [less/more safe]?	3	14	65	12	7	3.0 (1.0)	3.2 (1.0)
5. New York City streets in general are [less/more safe]?	5	13	49	22	11	3.2 (1.1)	3.3 (1.1)
<b>TOTAL safety [4-20]</b>	-	-	-	-	-	<b>13.6 (3.6)</b>	<b>14.1 (3.5)</b>
<b>LOCAL PROBLEMS?</b>							
6. In the past 12 months, which would you say has been a serious problem on or around your block? [0= No, 1= Maybe, 2= Yes]							
a. Drugs		57	10	34		.77	-
b. Guns		69	8	22		.53	-
c. Street gangs		72	9	19		.47	-
d. Abandoned buildings		84	4	12		.27	-
e. Assaults on the street		73	9	17		.44	-
f. Muggings		69	10	21		.52	-
g. Theft of property		59	10	31		.72	-
h. Burglary of homes/businesses		60	10	30		.70	-
<b>TOTAL problems [0-16]</b>						<b>4.4 (4.1)</b>	
<b>LOCAL POLICE?</b>							
7. In general, how satisfied are you with the police who serve your neighborhood? [1= not at all, 5=extremely]	12	20	38	22	7	2.9 (0.9)	-
8. In the past 12 months, has police protection in your neighborhood become [1= much worse, 5= much better]	2	8	59	23	8	3.3 (0.9)	3.2 (0.9)
9. Would you like to see more police patrolling <i>on foot</i> in your neighborhood?	12	5	10	17	56	3.9 (1.3)	3.9 (1.3)
<b>QUALITY OF LIFE ENFORCEMENT?</b>							
10. On streets high in crime and drugs, would you say it is more important for police to be aggressive [=1] or respectful [=2] of people they suspect of wrong-doing?						37% Aggressive	63% respectful
						1.6 (0.5)	1.5 (0.5)
11. Some people feel that if fairly minor street problems are tolerated--such as disorderly teens, boom box radios, small-time drug dealing, buildings not kept fixed and clean--that this leads to more breakdowns since it looks like no one cares. Would you say such minor breakdowns in the neighborhood contribute to more crime? [1= not at all, 5=definitely]	8	7	13	23	50	4.0 (1.3)	4.0 (1.3)
13. Overall, do you approve of the City's Quality-of-life enforcement? [1=not at all, 5=definitely]	7	15	12	27	39	3.8 (1.3)	3.8 (1.3)

**Table 1. Responses of 834 New Yorkers in 2001 (continued)**

	Percentage agreement					Mean (s.d.)	
	1	2	3	4	5	2001	1999
<b>POLICE AND MINORITY COMMUNITIES?</b>							
15. To get more drugs and guns off the street, or protect taxi drivers, some cities like New York have put more plainclothes police in high-crime areas. Would you say such undercover policing is a good idea? [1= No, 5= Yes]	5	4	10	17	65	4.3 (1.1)	-
16. Are police in New York City tougher on [0= blacks, 1= equal, 2= whites]		67	32	1		.4 (2.1)	-
17. Compared with white officers, minority officers policing a minority neighborhood are [less/more effective]?	3	5	47	23	22	3.6 (1.0)	3.5 (1.0)
18. Are police more effective if they live in the neighborhood they patrol? [1= No, 5= Definitely]	16	5	18	25	36	3.6 (1.4)	3.5 (1.4)
20. In some recent cases, NYC police officers were charged with police brutality. Are such incidents rare exceptions [=1], or common [=5]?	8	18	20	27	27	3.5 (1.3)	3.5 (1.2)
21. How serious a problem do you think police brutality is in New York City? [1= Not at all, 5= very serious]	6	11	23	29	30	3.7 (1.2)	-

**Table 2. Respondents' biodata, broken down by ethnicity (Hispanics, Blacks, non-Hispanic Whites, Asians)<sup>1</sup>**

	190 Hispanics	250 Blacks	328 Whites	57 Asians	p =	834 Total (s.d.)
1. How many years has your family lived in its current neighborhood?	12.3	14.3	19.3	8.1	* .001	<b>16.8 (14.9)</b>
14. Have you received a quality-of-life summons?	6.2%	3.7%	4.2%	4.4%	.66	<b>4.6%</b>
19. In the past 5 years, have you been stopped by police unfairly?	16.3%	24.8%	9.8%	11.0%	* .001	<b>15.1%</b>
22. Do you personally know anyone who brought a formal complaint against police to the Civilian Complaint Review Board?	16.3%	24.8%	10.9%	8.9%	.08	<b>16.5%</b>
If "Yes," was it resolved to their satisfaction? [Yes]	12.4%	21.6%	7.0%	4.5%		<b>12.8%</b>
[No]	3.9%	3.2%	3.9%	4.4%		<b>3.7%</b>
23. Are you involved with your neighborhood: church, school board, precinct council, community group(s)?	53.3%	67.2%	39.0%	* 6.3%	* .02	<b>44.4%</b>
24. Your age? [mean, in years]	31.9	36.3	43.6	28.7	* .001	<b>37.0 (16.8)</b>
25. Is your current neighborhood black/Hispanic? No:	12.4%	3.2%	30.8%	13.0%	* .001	<b>16.9%</b>
Mixed:	54.5	58.1	62.2	63.0		<b>59.3</b>
Yes:	33.2	38.7	7.0	23.9		<b>23.8</b>
26. Gender? [percent female]	62.7%	67.0%	56.0%	52.1%	.07	<b>60.8%</b>

<sup>1</sup> About ethnic labels, the survey used the current nomenclature -- Hispanic, non-Hispanic Black, non-Hispanic white, Asian, other. It was striking how many New Yorkers had difficulties with this labeling. Close to 100 respondents independently chose "other" rather than non-Hispanic white, to describe themselves as Greek (20), Italian (40), Jewish (40), Russian (15). Some 50 declined non-Hispanic Black to specify "other" African-American (35), Haitian (5), Jamaican (5), West-Indian (5). With Asians too, some 15 respondents preferred to specify "other" Chinese, East Indian, Japanese, Korean.

**Table 3. New Yorkers' responses in 2001, by ethnicity  
(Hispanics, Blacks, non-Hispanic Whites, Asians)**

	190 Hispan	250 Blacks	328 Whites	57 Asians	p =	<u>Total (s.d.)</u> 2001 1999	
<b>LOCAL SAFETY? (1=low to 5=high)</b>							
2. In your neighborhood, how safe do you feel on the streets during daylight?	3.8	3.9	4.3	3.9	*.001	4.0 (1.0)	4.1 (1.0)
3. during nighttime?	3.2	3.3	3.6	3.4	*.01	3.4 (1.1)	3.5 (1.1)
4. Compared with 12 months ago, would you say your neighborhood today is [less/more safe]?	3.1	3.0	3.1	3.2	.70	3.0 (1.0)	3.2 (1.1)
5. New York City streets in general are [less/more safe]?	3.3	3.2	3.2	3.2	.50	3.2 (1.1)	3.3 (1.1)
<b>TOTAL safety [4-20]</b>	<b>13.3</b>	<b>13.4</b>	<b>14.3</b>	<b>13.5</b>	<b>.06</b>	<b>13.6 (3.6)</b>	<b>14.1 (3.5)</b>
<b>LOCAL PROBLEMS?</b>							
6. In the past 12 months, which would you say has been a serious problem on or around your block? (0=No, 1=maybe, 2=Yes)							
a. Drugs	1.0	1.0	.5	.4	*.001	.77	-
b. Guns	.7	.9	.2	.3	*.0001	.53	-
c. Street gangs	.6	.6	.3	.4	*.0001	.47	-
d. Abandoned buildings	.3	.4	.1	.2	*.0001	.27	-
e. Assaults on the street	.6	.4	.4	.4	.10	.44	-
f. Muggings	.6	.5	.5	.6	.06	.52	-
g. Theft of property	.8	.8	.6	.6	.08	.72	-
h. Burglary of homes/businesses	.7	.6	.7	1.0	.06	.70	-
<b>TOTAL problems [0-16]</b>	<b>5.3</b>	<b>5.3</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>*.0001</b>	<b>4.4 (4.1)</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>LOCAL POLICE?</b>							
7. In general, how satisfied are you with the police who serve your neighborhood? [1= not at all, 5=extremely]	2.8	2.6	3.2	3.1	*.0001	2.9 (0.9)	3.2 (1.1)
8. In the past 12 months, has police protection in your neighborhood become [1= much worse, 5= much better]	3.4	3.2	3.2	3.5	*.04	3.3 (0.9)	3.2 (1.1)
9. Would you like to see more police patrolling <i>on foot</i> in your neighborhood?	4.2	4.0	3.9	4.0	*.03	3.9 (1.3)	3.9 (1.1)
<b>QUALITY OF LIFE ENFORCEMENT?</b>							
10. On streets high in crime and drugs, would you say it is more important for police to be aggressive [=1] or respectful [=2] of people they suspect of wrong-doing? % Aggressive =	28.%	32.%	45.%	31.%	*.01		
11. Some people feel that if fairly minor street problems are tolerated -- such as disorderly teens, boom box radios, small-time drug dealing, buildings not kept fixed and clean -- that this leads to more breakdowns since it looks like no one cares. Would you say such minor breakdowns in the neighborhood contribute to more crime? [1= not at all, 5=definitely]	4.1	4.0	4.0	3.9	.36	4.0 (1.3)	4.0 (1.3)
13. Overall, do you approve of the City's Quality-of-life enforcement? [1=not at all, 5=definitely]	3.9	3.5	3.9	3.8	*.01	3.8 (1.3)	3.8 (1.3)



**Table 3. New Yorkers' responses in 2001, by ethnicity (continued)**

	190 Hispan	250 Blacks	328 Whites	57 Asians	<u>Total</u> 2001	p =
<b>POLICE AND MINORITY COMMUNITIES?</b>						
15. To get more drugs and guns off the street, or protect taxi drivers, some cities like New York have put more plainclothes police in high-crime areas. Would you say such undercover policing is a good idea? [1= No, 5= Yes]	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.2	<b>4.3</b> (1.1)	* .02
16. Are police in New York City tougher on [0= blacks, 1= equal, 2= whites]	.7	.2	.4	.6	.4 (2.1)	.22
17. Compared with white officers, minority officers policing a minority neighborhood are [less/more effective]?	3.7	3.4	3.6	3.3	<b>3.6</b> (1.0)	* .02
18. Are police more effective if they live in the neighborhood they patrol? [1= No, 5= Definitely]	3.4	3.6	3.6	4.0	<b>3.6</b> (1.4)	.23
20. In some recent cases, NYC police officers were charged with police brutality. Are such incidents rare exceptions [=1], or common [=5]?	3.7	4.0	3.0	3.3	<b>3.5</b> (1.3)	* .0001
21. How serious a problem do you think police brutality is in New York City? [1= Not at all, 5= very serious]	3.9	4.2	3.1	3.3	<b>3.7</b> (1.2)	* .0001

**Table 4. Mean scores on quality of life enforcement, by ethnicity and by year  
(2001 in bold, 1999 in plain)**

12. In recent months, NYPD police have increased enforcement of Quality-of-life, to improve things that bother most New Yorkers -- like loud noise, dangerous driving, jaywalking. For each of these topics, tell me if you disagree [=0], have no opinion [=1], or agree with police enforcement of it [=2]?

	190 Hispanics	250 Blacks	328 Whites	57 Asians	834 † Total (s.d.)	p =
a. jaywalking	<b>1.0</b> .8	<b>0.9</b> .9	<b>0.9</b> .6	<b>1.2</b> -	<b>0.93 (.92)</b> .8	<b>.08</b> .13
b. littering	<b>1.7</b> 1.7	<b>1.7</b> 1.9	<b>1.6</b> 1.7	<b>1.7</b> -	<b>1.69 (.68)</b> 1.8	<b>.54</b> .19
c. street vendors	<b>.6</b> 1.0	<b>.6</b> .8	<b>.5</b> .6	<b>*.9</b> -	<b>.60 (.86)</b> .80	<b>.18</b> *.03
d. pot-smoking	<b>1.7</b> 1.6	<b>1.7</b> 1.6	<b>*1.5</b> 1.4	<b>1.7</b> -	<b>1.64 (.70)</b> 1.6	<b>*.02</b> .19
e. squeegees	<b>1.3</b> 1.2	<b>1.2</b> 1.2	<b>1.5</b> 1.4	<b>1.6</b> -	<b>1.36 (.87)</b> 1.3	<b>*.02</b> .52
f. speeding	<b>1.9</b> 1.8	<b>1.9</b> 1.9	<b>1.9</b> 1.8	<b>1.9</b> -	<b>1.90 (.41)</b> 1.8	<b>.54</b> .17
g. loitering	<b>1.6</b> 1.5	<b>*1.8</b> 1.4	<b>1.5</b> 1.3	<b>1.5</b> -	<b>1.61 (.73)</b> 1.4	<b>*.001</b> .23
h. loud radios	<b>1.6</b> 1.5	<b>1.7</b> 1.6	<b>1.6</b> 1.8	<b>1.5</b> -	<b>1.65 (.71)</b> 1.6	<b>.25</b> .09
i. bad taxi driving	<b>1.8</b> 1.7	<b>1.9</b> 1.8	<b>1.8</b> 1.9	<b>1.8</b> -	<b>1.83 (.69)</b> 1.8	<b>.50</b> .30
j. graffiti	<b>1.8</b> 1.7	<b>1.9</b> 1.8	<b>1.8</b> 1.8	<b>1.8</b> -	<b>1.81 (.54)</b> 1.8	<b>.35</b> .30
<b>TOTAL [0 - 20]</b>	<b>15.2</b> 14.5	<b>15.3</b> 14.9	<b>14.6</b> 14.2	<b>15.5</b> --	<b>15.01 (3.48)</b> 14.6	<b>.09</b> .42

Notes: † Includes 9 "other" ethnicities.  
\* Significant difference, p<.05

Table 5. Responses of 834 New Yorkers in 2001, by 4 boroughs

	Percentage agreement					Mean (s.d.)
	1	2	3	4	5	
<b>LOCAL SAFETY? (1=low to 5=high)</b>						
2. In your neighborhood, how safe do you feel on the streets during daylight?						
Bkl:	1	8	16	49	25	3.9 (.9)
Brx:	5	7	15	41	33	3.9 (1.1)
Man:	3	2	8	35	51	4.3 (.9)
Qns:	3	5	11	50	31	4.0 (.9)
3. during nighttime?						
Bkl:	11	18	24	37	10	3.2 (1.2)
Brx:	14	18	22	28	19	3.2 (1.3)
Man:	5	9	15	46	26	3.8 (1.1)
Qns:	6	10	24	46	14	3.5 (1.1)
4. Compared with 12 months ago, would you say your neighborhood today is [less/more safe]?						
Bkl:	4	10	65	10	10	3.1 (.9)
Brx:	5	19	51	18	7	3.0 (.9)
Man:	0	8	81	8	3	3.1 (.5)
Qns:	1	18	65	10	5	3.0 (.7)
5. New York City streets in general are [less/more safe]?						
Bkl:	4	13	47	22	14	3.3 (1.0)
Brx:	7	14	42	24	12	3.2 (1.1)
Man:	3	7	63	20	7	3.2 (.8)
Qns:	3	8	45	23	10	3.2 (1.0)
<b>LOCAL PROBLEMS?</b>						
6. In the past 12 months, which would you say has been a serious problem on or around your block? [0= No, 1= Maybe, 2= Yes]						
a. Drugs						
Bkl:		58	9	33		.8 (.9)
Brx:		37	10	53		1.2 (.9)
Man:		62	11	27		.6 (.9)
Qns:		70	9	21		.5 (.9)
b. Guns						
Bkl:		62	11	27		.6 (.9)
Brx:		50	10	40		.9 (.9)
Man:		80	8	12		.3 (.7)
Qns:		84	5	11		.3 (.7)
c. Street gangs						
Bkl:		68	9	23		.6 (.8)
Brx:		59	12	29		.7 (.9)
Man:		82	8	11		.3 (.6)
Qns:		81	6	13		.3 (.7)
d. Abandoned buildings						
Bkl:		83	2	15		.3 (.7)
Brx:		80	5	15		.4 (.7)
Man:		82	5	13		.3 (.7)
Qns:		92	2	6		.1 (.5)
e. Assaults on the street						
Bkl:		70	14	16		.5 (.8)
Brx:		70	7	23		.5 (.8)
Man:		77	8	15		.4 (.7)
Qns:		76	8	15		.4 (.7)
f. Muggings						
Bkl:		68	16	16		.5 (.8)
Brx:		65	9	26		.6 (.9)
Man:		72	8	20		.5 (.8)
Qns:		70	9	21		.5 (.8)

Table 5. Responses of 834 New Yorkers in 2001, by 4 boroughs (continued)

	Percentage agreement					Mean (s.d.)	
	1	2	3	4	5		
g. Theft of property	Bkl:	53	10	36		8	(.9)
	Brx:	55	8	36		.8	(.9)
	Man:	70	12	18		5	(.8)
	Qns:	59	8	33		.7	(.9)
h. Burglary of homes/businesses	Bkl:	56	13	31		.8	(.9)
	Brx:	59	9	33		.7	(.9)
	Man:	69	12	19		.5	(.8)
	Qns:	58	6	36		.8	(.9)
TOTAL PROBLEMS (0-16):	Bkl:					4.8	(4.3)
	Brx:					5.8	(4.5)
	Man:					3.5	(4.0)
	Qns:					3.7	(3.5)
<b>LOCAL POLICE?</b>							
7. In general, how satisfied are you with the police who serve your neighborhood? [1= not at all, 5=extremely]	Bkl:	14	30	33	17	6	2.7 (1.0)
	Brx:	17	20	38	16	9	2.8 (1.2)
	Man:	8	15	38	30	9	3.2 (1.1)
	Qns:	8	17	43	26	5	3.0 (1.0)
8. In the past 12 months, has police protection in your neighborhood become [1= much worse, 5= much better]	Bkl:	2	8	60	22	8	3.3 (.8)
	Brx:	3	10	48	29	11	3.4 (.9)
	Man:	1	5	71	18	5	3.2 (.6)
	Qns:	1	8	60	23	7	3.3 (.8)
9. Would you like to see more police patrolling <i>on foot</i> in your neighborhood?	Bkl:	12	5	7	16	60	4.1 (1.4)
	Brx:	7	6	10	11	66	4.2 (1.3)
	Man:	20	4	12	21	43	3.6 (1.5)
	Qns:	9	6	12	20	52	4.0 (1.3)
<b>QUALITY OF LIFE ENFORCEMENT?</b>							
10. On streets high in crime and drugs, would you say it is more important for police to be aggressive [=1] or respectful [=2] of people they suspect of wrong-doing?	Bkl:	38% Aggressive		62% respectful		1.6	(.5)
	Brx:	35%		65%		1.7	(.5)
	Man:	29%		71%		1.7	(.5)
	Qns:	43%		57%		1.6	(.5)
11. Some people feel that if fairly minor street problems are tolerated--such as disorderly teens, boom box radios, small-time drug dealing, buildings not kept fixed and clean--that this leads to more breakdowns since it looks like no one cares. Would you say such minor breakdowns in the neighborhood contribute to more crime? [1= not at all, 5=definitely]	Bkl:	6	11	15	17	51	4.0 (1.3)
	Brx:	7	4	9	20	60	4.2 (1.2)
	Man:	13	4	15	33	35	3.7 (1.3)
	Qns:	7	8	13	21	51	4.0 (1.3)
13. Overall, do you approve of the City's Quality-of-life enforcement? [1=not at all, 5=definitely]	Bkl:	5	20	12	23	41	3.8 (1.3)
	Brx:	6	16	14	24	40	3.8 (1.3)
	Man:	8	12	11	33	36	3.8 (1.3)
	Qns:	8	12	10	29	40	3.8 (1.3)

Table 5. Responses of 834 New Yorkers in 2001, by 4 boroughs (continued)

		Percentage agreement					Mean (s.d.)	
		1	2	3	4	5		
<b>POLICE AND MINORITY COMMUNITIES?</b>								
15. To get more drugs and guns off the street, or protect taxi drivers, some cities like New York have put more plainclothes police in high-crime areas. Would you say such undercover policing is a good idea? [1= No, 5= Yes]	Bkl: 6	4	8	12	70	4.4	(1.1)	
	Brx: 5	3	9	13	69	4.4	(1.1)	
	Man: 4	5	12	25	54	4.2	(1.1)	
	Qns: 5	3	9	18	65	4.3	(1.1)	
16. Are police in New York City tougher on [0= blacks, 1= equal, 2= whites]	Bkl:	65	34	0		.3	(.5)	
	Brx:	68	32	1		.3	(.5)	
	Man:	76	22	2		.3	(.5)	
	Qns:	60	40	1		.4	(.6)	
17. Compared with white officers, minority officers policing a minority neighborhood are [less/more effective]?	Bkl: 2	6	46	22	25	3.6	(1.0)	
	Brx: 2	6	52	21	20	3.5	(.9)	
	Man: 5	2	46	22	24	3.6	(1.0)	
	Qns: 5	6	44	27	20	3.5	(1.0)	
18. Are police more effective if they live in the neighborhood they patrol? [1= No, 5= Definitely]	Bkl: 17	6	18	25	35	3.6	(1.4)	
	Brx: 22	6	13	19	39	3.5	(1.6)	
	Man: 13	3	22	32	30	3.6	(1.3)	
	Qns: 14	4	19	25	39	3.7	(1.4)	
20. In some recent cases, NYC police officers were charged with police brutality. Are such incidents rare exceptions [=1], or common [=5]?	Bkl: 8	17	24	26	24	3.4	(1.3)	
	Brx: 6	16	15	26	38	3.8	(1.3)	
	Man: 8	18	19	31	24	3.4	(1.3)	
	Qns: 9	21	24	26	19	3.2	(1.3)	
21. How serious a problem do you think police brutality is in New York City? [1= Not at all, 5= very serious]	Bkl: 8	13	20	29	30	3.6	(1.3)	
	Brx: 4	8	18	30	40	3.9	(1.1)	
	Man: 8	8	26	28	31	3.6	(1.2)	
	Qns: 7	15	27	31	21	3.4	(1.2)	

12. In recent months, NYPD police have increased enforcement of Quality-of-life, to improve things that bother most New Yorkers -- like loud noise, dangerous driving, jaywalking. For each of these topics, tell me if you disagree [=0], have no opinion [=1], or agree with police enforcement of it [=2]?

	208 Brooklyn	200 Bronx	200 Manhattan	226 Queens	834 Total (s.d.)	p =
a. jaywalking	0.9	1.0	0.8	1.0	<b>0.93</b> (.92)	.31
b. littering	1.7	1.7	1.6	1.7	<b>1.69</b> (.68)	.24
c. street vendors	.6	.7	.5	.7	<b>.60</b> (.86)	.17
d. pot-smoking	1.7	1.7	* 1.4	1.7	<b>1.64</b> (.70)	* .0001
e. squeegees	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.4	<b>1.36</b> (.87)	.99
f. speeding	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	<b>1.90</b> (.41)	.30
g. loitering	1.7	1.7	* 1.4	1.6	<b>1.61</b> (.73)	* .0001
h. loud radios	1.7	1.7	1.5	1.7	<b>1.65</b> (.71)	.15
i. bad taxi driving	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.9	<b>1.83</b> (.69)	.93
j. graffiti	1.9	1.8	* 1.7	1.9	<b>1.81</b> (.54)	* .01
TOTAL [0 - 20]	15.3	15.3	* 14.0	15.4	15.01 (3.48)	* .0003

Note: \* Significant difference, p<.05, two-tail test

Table 6

Correlation Matrix for Variables: X1 ... X10

	tm	yr	sam	stop	inv	age	gen	sp	qual
tm	1								
yr	.039	1							
sam	.014	-.039	1						
stop	.009	-.073	.25	1					
inv	.052	.152	.021	.08	1				
age	.015	.574	-.103	-.198	.13	1			
gen	.056	.037	-.145	-.177	.053	.065	1		
sp	.036	-.076	.027	.007	-.021	-.052	.067	1	
qual	-.04	-.006	-.051	-.068	.064	.107	.087	.019	1
prob	-.031	-.016	.052	.217	.05	-.13	.084	.035	.049

Note: 29 cases deleted with missing values.

Correlation Matrix for Variables: X1 ... X11

	day	net	pol	AgRe	brok	gol	pln	com	brut	qual
day	1									
net	.153	1								
pol	.291	.189	1							
AgRe	.021	-.001	-.163	1						
brok	.024	-.017	2.112E-4	-.118	1					
gol	.067	.113	.28	-.195	.081	1				
pln	-.026	.051	.069	-.119	.086	.19	1			
com	-.047	-.026	-.246	.175	.064	-.22	-.116	1		
brut	-.013	-.019	-.213	.207	-.009	-.199	-.089	.533	1	
qual	-.114	-.001	.055	-.117	.123	.27	.092	-.136	-.131	1
prob	-.38	-.108	-.357	.059	.082	-.124	.01	.153	.164	.051

Note: 26 cases deleted with missing values.