

**Reporting of Drug-Related Crimes:
Resident and Police Perspectives in the
United States, 1988-1990**

Part 2: Drug-Related Crimes Data

**Robert C. Davis, Barbara E. Smith,
and Susan W. Hillenbrand**

ICPSR 9925

This document was previously available in ASCII format only. It was converted to Portable Document Format (PDF) on the date below as part of ICPSR's CD-ROM project CD0024, supported by the National Institute of Justice. The document is completely searchable. No additional updating of this collection has been performed.

December 1998

REPORTING OF DRUG-RELATED CRIMES: RESIDENT AND POLICE PERSPECTIVES
IN THE UNITED STATES, 1988-1990

(ICPSR 9925)

Principal Investigators

Robert C. Davis, Barbara E. Smith, and Susan W. Hillenbrand
American Bar Association, Criminal Justice Section

First ICPSR Edition
December 1993

Inter-university Consortium for
Political and Social Research
P.O. Box 1248
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

BIBLIOGRAPHIC CITATION

Publications based on ICPSR data collections should acknowledge those sources by means of bibliographic citations. To ensure that such source attributions are captured for social science bibliographic utilities, citations must appear in footnotes or in the reference section of publications. The bibliographic citation for this data collection is:

Davis, Robert C., Barbara E. Smith, and Susan W. Hillenbrand. REPORTING OF DRUG-RELATED CRIMES: RESIDENT AND POLICE PERSPECTIVES IN THE UNITED STATES, 1988-1990 [Computer file]. Conducted by Schulman, Ronca, and Bucuvalas, Inc. ICPSR ed. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [producer and distributor], 1993.

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION ON USE OF ICPSR RESOURCES

To provide funding agencies with essential information about use of archival resources and to facilitate the exchange of information about ICPSR participants' research activities, users of ICPSR data are requested to send to ICPSR bibliographic citations for each completed manuscript or thesis abstract. Please indicate in a cover letter which data were used.

DATA DISCLAIMER

The original collector of the data, ICPSR, and the relevant funding agency bear no responsibility for uses of this collection or for interpretations or inferences based upon such uses.

DATA COLLECTION DESCRIPTION

Robert C. Davis, Barbara E. Smith, and Susan W. Hillenbrand
REPORTING OF DRUG-RELATED CRIMES: RESIDENT AND POLICE
PERSPECTIVES IN THE UNITED STATES, 1988-1990 (ICPSR 9925)

SUMMARY: This data collection investigates the ways in which police use reports of drug-related crimes provided by residents of high drug-crime areas and how willing residents of these areas are to report such crimes to the police. Structured interviews were conducted by telephone with police representatives in most of the nation's 50 largest cities and in person with residents and police officers in high drug-crime districts in each of four major cities: Newark, Chicago, El Paso, and Philadelphia. Police department representatives were queried about the usefulness of citizen reports, reasons for citizens' reluctance to make reports, how the rate of citizen reports could be improved, and how citizen reports worked with other community crime prevention strategies. Residents were asked about their tenure in the neighborhood, attitudes toward the quality of life in the neighborhood, major social problems facing the neighborhood, and quality of city services such as police and fire protection, garbage collection, and public health services. Additional questions were asked about the amount of crime in the neighborhood, the amount of drug use and drug-related crime, and the fear of crime. Basic demographic information such as sex, race, and language in which interview was conducted is also provided. CLASS III

UNIVERSE: Police departments and neighborhoods across the United States.

SAMPLING: Telephone interviews with police representatives in the 50 largest cities of the United States were conducted. Based on 46 of these interviews, four cities (Newark, Chicago, El Paso, and Philadelphia) were chosen for more intensive investigation. Site visits were made to all four cities, and in addition to interviews with local officials, 50 residents in each of two neighborhoods in all four cities were interviewed. The neighborhoods chosen were in precincts recommended by the police.

EXTENT OF COLLECTION: 2 data files + SAS Control Cards + SPSS Control Cards + machine-readable documentation (text) + data collection instrument

EXTENT OF PROCESSING: BLANKS/ NONNUM/ UNDOCCHK.ICPSR/ MDATA

DATA FORMAT: Card Image with SAS and SPSS Control Cards

Part 1: Citizen Survey Data
File Structure: rectangular
Cases: 402
Variables: 168
Record Length: 272
Records Per Case: 1

Part 2: Drug-Related Crimes Data
File Structure: rectangular
Cases: 46
Variables: 62
Record Length: 63
Records Per Case: 1

Part 3: SAS Control Cards
for Citizen Survey Data
Record Length: 78

Part 4: SAS Control Cards
for Drug-Related Crimes Data
Record Length: 78

RELATED PUBLICATIONS:

Davis, Robert C., Barbara E. Smith, and Susan W. Hillenbrand.
"Reporting of Drug-Related Crimes: Resident and Police
Perspectives." 1990.

Schulman, Ronca, & Bucuvalas, Inc. "A National Survey on
Neighborhood Reporting of Drug Crimes: Methodology Report." New
York, NY: Schulman, Ronca, and Bucuvalas, Inc., 1990.

GENERAL STUDY OVERVIEW

STUDY IDENTIFICATION

REPORTING OF DRUG-RELATED CRIMES: RESIDENT AND POLICE PERSPECTIVES IN THE UNITED STATES, 1988-1990

Davis, Robert C., Barbara E. Smith, and Susan W. Hillenbrand

American Bar Association, Criminal Justice Section

Award No. 88-IJ-CX-0032

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The American Bar Association Criminal Justice Section conducted this study to determine how police use reports of drug-related crimes provided by residents of high-drug crime areas, and how willing residents of these areas are to make such reports. The project was designed to take a careful look at citizen reporting of drug activity. The study attempts to answer three key questions. First, how important to the police are citizen reports of drug activity, which types of reports are most useful, and what can be done on the basis of citizen reports? Second, what is the extent to which residents of high drug-crime neighborhoods are reluctant to make reports to the police, and are they more willing to report other types of crime? Third, what reasons do they give for their reluctance? The study finds its theoretical basis in the literature available on bystander intervention in crime, crime reporting by victims, and community crime prevention. In order to gather the information, interviews were conducted with the supervisors of police narcotics units in 46 cities. Interviews were also conducted with 100 residents of high drug-activity neighborhoods in each of the four cities chosen for in-depth investigation. Site visits and interviews with other officials in these cities were also undertaken. Answers to the questions were expected to help the authors in recommending steps to the police.

METHODS

STUDY DESIGN

The four cities were chosen on the basis of geographic diversity, level of cooperation of the police departments, and travel costs. The police officials in each city then selected two precincts with high incidences of drug-related crime. Schulman, Ronca, and Bucuvalas, Inc. then used a selection grid to randomly choose five neighborhood blocks and two alternate blocks from each precinct as sampling units. Using a

calculated interval based on the total number of housing units, specific definitions of what a housing unit consists of, and specific boundaries for each block, housing units in each block were then systematically listed. Following similar guidelines, a listing was made for each building and then for each household interviewed. The interviews were then conducted from scripted questionnaires by trained personnel.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

A telephone survey was conducted with police representatives of the 50 largest cities in the United States. These interviews were designed to obtain information on whether citizen reports of drug activity are useful to police, what kinds of reports police find most useful, and what actions police take based on such reports. Four cities, Newark, Chicago, El Paso, and Philadelphia, were chosen for intensive study. The various systems used for citizen reporting were examined. These included "911", drug hotlines, and direct calls to police departments. Residents in two neighborhoods with serious drug problems were administered in-depth personal interviews.

SAMPLE

Interviews were sought with police departments in the nation's 50 largest cities. Letters and questionnaires were sent to the chief of police in these cities with instructions for the most appropriate respondent to be named. In most instances, the heads of narcotics units or the chief and another designee were the respondents. Interviews were conducted via telephone and lasted from 30 to 45 minutes. Interviews in 46 of the 50 cities were completed. Four cities were chosen for intensive study. The study staff observed citizen reporting procedures in each city, and spent four days in each of the designated high drug-crime neighborhoods. Structured and unstructured interviews were held with police officers assigned to the high drug-crime neighborhoods. A door-to-door sampling plan was used for the resident surveys conducted in the neighborhoods. The sampling method employed was random area sampling. Five neighborhood blocks and two alternate blocks were chosen on a random basis in the high drug-crime areas of the four cities. Area probability sampling was then used to select households. Each housing unit in the area had a chance of being selected for interview. Listings of all housing units were made by the interviewers. The Bureau of the Census standard definition of a housing unit was used. Businesses and other nonresidential buildings, such as churches and schools, were excluded from the sample. Using a sampling point map and specially designed listing sheets, the interviewer began at a designated point in the area and listed the housing units. Two residential blocks contained approximately 60

housing units. The interviewers counted the total number of housing units on the blocks and divided the total by 30. The resulting number was used as the listing interval. Every second or third house was chosen from this list for interviews.

RESPONSE RATES

Newark residents: 60.2 percent, El Paso residents: 80.0 percent, Chicago residents: 73.8 percent, Philadelphia residents: 51.8 percent. For telephone interviews with the police in the 50 largest cities: 46 out of 50 cities responded.

DATES OF DATA COLLECTION

1988-1990

SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

DESCRIPTION OF VARIABLES

Interviews covered topics including the perceived effectiveness of the police department, the quality of police-community interaction, the conditions of the neighborhoods visited, the nature of drug activity in the neighborhoods, reporting options for citizens, and police response to reports, as well as reasons governing reporting or reluctance to report.

PRESENCE OF COMMON SCALES

None

UNIT OF OBSERVATION

Individuals.

RELATED PUBLICATIONS

Davis, Robert C., Barbara E. Smith, and Susan W. Hillenbrand. "Reporting of Drug-Related Crimes: Resident and Police Perspectives." 1990.

Schulman, Ronca, & Bucuvalas, Inc. "A National Survey on Neighborhood Reporting of Drug Crimes: Methodology Report." New York, NY: Schulman, Ronca, and Bucuvalas, Inc., 1990.

PART NUMBER: 1
PART NAME: Citizen Survey Data
FILE STRUCTURE: rectangular
CASE COUNT: 402
VARIABLE COUNT: 168
RECORD LENGTH: 272
RECORDS PER CASE: 1

PART NUMBER: 2
PART NAME: Drug-Related Crimes Data
FILE STRUCTURE: rectangular
CASE COUNT: 46
VARIABLE COUNT: 62
RECORD LENGTH: 63
RECORDS PER CASE: 1

PART NUMBER: 3
PART NAME: SAS Control Cards for Citizen Survey Data
RECORD LENGTH: 78

PART NUMBER: 4
PART NAME: SAS Control Cards for Drug-Related Crimes Data
RECORD LENGTH: 78

DATA COMPLETENESS REPORT

This report corresponds to the data file: DA9925.P1

Table 1: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values*

=====

Variable Name and Label (Total cases=402)	Percent of Cases with Missing Values
--	---

6.0% (10 of 168 variables) have 0% Missing Values

11.3% (19 of 168 variables) have > 0% - 1% Missing Values

6.0% (10 of 168 variables) have > 1% - 3% Missing Values

4.2% (7 of 168 variables) have > 3% - 5% Missing Values

10.7% (18 of 168 variables) have > 5% - 10% Missing Values

V36	DRUGS MORE WORRY KILLED	5.2%
V19	QUAL SCHOOLS	5.5%
V48	GRPS TRY FIGHT DRUGS	5.7%
V60	POLICE DOING BEST FIGHT CRIME	6.2%
V42	DRUGS KEEP TO SELF	6.5%
V29	MORE SERIOUS PROB THAN DRUGS	6.7%
V40	DRUGS WILLING WATCH OUT	6.7%
V87	DONT RPT FEAR REVENGE	6.7%
V89	DONT RPT DONT WANT TESTIFY	6.7%
V94	DONT RPT MISTRUST POLICE	7.5%
V86	USUALLY RPT OTHER CRIMES POLICE	8.0%
V20	QUAL HEALTH SERVICE	8.2%
V90	DONT RPT GET TROUBLE POLICE	8.2%
V88	DONT RPT WASTE OF TIME	8.5%
V37	DRUGS MORE WORRY GO PARK	9.5%
V95	DONT RPT DRUGS NONE OF BUSINESS	9.5%
V98	ANY THREATS DUE TO RPTS	9.7%
V61	POLICE DOING BEST FIGHT DRUGS	10.0%

10.1% (17 of 168 variables) have > 10% - 20% Missing Values

V91	DONT RPT DRUGS NOT PROBLEM	10.2%
V92	DONT RPT DRUGS GOOD ECONOMY	10.2%
V93	DONT RPT POLICE KNOW	10.2%
V39	DRUGS WORRY KIDS OUT	10.4%
V56	VISIBILITY DRUG SALES	10.4%
V41	DRUGS BROUGHT PEOPLE TOGETHER	10.7%
V58	POLICE TREAT RESPECT	10.7%
V160	CITY WINNING WAR ON DRUGS	10.7%
V23	COMPARED WITH 2 YRS AGO	11.2%

=====

Table 1 (continued)

```

=====
Variable Name and Label                                     Percent of Cases with
                                                           Missing Values
-----
V59      POLICE WORK WITH RESIDENTS                            11.7%
V57      VISIBILITY DRUG USE                                       12.2%
V27      PROB DRUG USE                                           13.7%
V44      DRUGS INCREASE GANGS                                    15.4%
V28      PROB DRUG SALES                                         16.4%
V43      DRUGS IMPROVE ECONOMY                                   17.7%
V78      USUALLY RPT DRUG SALES POLICE                          17.9%
V64      INCOME                                                  19.2%

2.4% (4 of 168 variables) have > 20% - 40% Missing Values

V82      USUALLY RPT DRUG USE POLICE                            20.9%
V161     THING 1 TO REDUCE DRUGS                                22.9%
V38      DRUGS NO GO TO PARKS                                   31.8%
V151     MORE LKY RPT ANONYMOUS                                 39.6%

49.4% (83 of 168 variables) have > 40% - 100% Missing Values

V153     MORE LKY REPORT FASTER POLICE                          40.8%
V152     MORE LKY RPT POLICE TRAIN ON RPT                       41.0%
V150     MORE LKY RPT REWARD                                    41.3%
V154     MORE LKY REPORT BETTER INV                              41.3%
V79      WHY DONT RPT SALES POLICE 1                            41.8%
V155     MORE LKY RPT IF POLICE FEEDBACK                        41.8%
V156     MORE LKY RPT POLICE NEED HELP                          42.0%
V83      WHY DONT RPT USE POLICE 1                              42.8%
V124     RPT STREET DRUG SALES                                  50.0%
V104     TYPE DRUG RPT ADS 1                                    55.0%
V107     DRUG RPT ADS MORE WILLING RPT                          56.0%
V112     RPT DRUG USE STREETS                                    56.5%
V108     WHY ADS MADE MORE WILLING 1                            61.7%
V24      WHY BETTER WORSE 1                                     61.9%
V45      OTHER EFFECTS OF DRUGS 1                               61.9%
V162     THING 2 TO REDUCE DRUGS                                66.2%
V71      NO TIMES MTH CHURCH                                    69.2%
V52      DID PARTICIPATE IN ACTIVITIES                          70.4%
V157     MORE LKY RPT OTHER 1                                    72.1%
V130     RPT INDOOR DRUG SALES                                  72.4%
V49      GRP 1 FIGHT DRUGS                                     72.6%
V115     RPT DRUG USE BLDGS                                     72.9%
V121     RPT KIDS DRUGS SALES                                    79.9%
V127     RPT DRUG SALES SCHOOLS                                  81.8%
V30      WORSE THAN DRUGS 1                                     82.1%
V165     EVENT 1 AFFECT OPINION                                  83.1%
V146     POLICE INTERESTED IN RPT                                85.1%
V149     WORTHWHILE RPT POLICE                                  85.3%
V118     RPT SHOOTING GALLERIES                                  85.8%
V135     MOST RECENT RPT POLICE                                  86.3%
=====

```

Table 1 (continued)

Variable Name and Label		Percent of Cases with Missing Values
V25	WHY BETTER WORSE 2	86.8%
V147	POLICE ACTED ON RPT	87.1%
V69	NO TIMES MTH PTA	88.6%
V125	NO TIMES RPT STREET DRUG SALES	89.3%
V80	WHY DONT RPT SALES POLICE 2	89.8%
V133	RPT DRUG DELIVERIES	90.8%
V53	PART IN ACT 1	91.3%
V136	RPT BY 911	92.0%
V67	NO TIMES MTH BLOCK ASSOC	92.3%
V113	NO TIMES RPT DRUG USE STREETS	92.5%
V84	WHY DONT RPT USE POLICE 2	92.8%
V148	POLICE TOLD HOW GET FEEDBACK ON RPT	93.0%
V131	NO TIMES RPT INDOOR SALES	93.8%
V105	TYPE DRUG RPT ADS 2	94.0%
V31	WORSE THAN DRUGS 2	94.5%
V163	THING 3 TO REDUCE DRUGS	94.5%
V96	DONT RPT OTHR REASON	94.8%
V46	OTHER EFFECTS OF DRUGS 2	95.0%
V73	NO TIMES MTH ANTICR GRP	95.3%
V122	NO TIMES RPT KIDS DRUGS SALES	96.0%
V102	THREAT AFFECTED WILLINGNESS RPT	96.3%
V116	NO TIMES RPT DRUG USE BLDGS	96.3%
V128	NO TIMES RPT DRUG SALES SCHOOLS	96.3%
V97	OTHER REASON DONT RPT	96.5%
V99	THREAT TYPE 1	97.0%
V119	NO TIMES RPT SHOOTING GALLERIES	97.3%
V26	WHY BETTER WORSE 3	97.5%
V50	GRP 2 FIGHT DRUGS	97.5%
V109	WHY ADS MORE WILLING 2	97.5%
V134	NO TIMES RPT DRUG DELIVERIES	97.5%
V137	RPT MAIN POLICE NO	98.0%
V158	MORE LKY RPT OTHER 2	98.0%
V138	RPT BY HOTLINE	98.3%
V144	RPT TO OTHER	98.3%
V106	TYPE DRUG RPT ADS 3	98.5%
V166	EVENT 2 AFFECT OPINION	98.5%
V32	WORSE THAN DRUGS 3	99.0%
V142	RPT TO PERSON POLICE STATION	99.0%
V143	RPT UNKNOWN PERSON POLICE	99.0%
V47	OTHER EFFECTS OF DRUGS 3	99.3%
V139	RPT TO NARC HDQT	99.3%
V81	WHY DONT RPT SALES POLICE 3	99.5%
V85	WHY DONT RPT USE POLICE 3	99.5%
V140	RPT TO NARC LOCAL	99.5%
V54	PART IN ACT 2	99.8%
V100	THREAT TYPE 2	99.8%
V159	MORE LKY RPT OTHER 3	99.8%
V51	GRP 3 FIGHT DRUGS	100.0%

Table 1 (continued)

```

=====
Variable Name and Label                                     Percent of Cases with
                                                           Missing Values
-----
V55      PART IN ACT 3                                     100.0%
V101     THREAT TYPE 3                                       100.0%
V110     WHY ADS MORE WILLING 3                             100.0%
V141     RPT TO NARC UNIT UNKNOWN                             100.0%
V145     REFUSE ANSWER RPT BEHAVIOR                          100.0%
=====

```

*Variables individually listed only if greater than 5% missing values.
 Data does not contain skip patterns or skip patterns are not reflected
 in the data as coded.

DATA COMPLETENESS REPORT

This report corresponds to the data file: DA9925.P2

Table 2: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values*

```

=====
Variable Name and Label                                     Percent of Cases with
  (Total cases=46)                                       Missing Values
-----
32.3% (20 of 62 variables) have 0% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 62 variables) have > 0% - 1% Missing Values

29.0% (18 of 62 variables) have > 1% - 3% Missing Values

1.6% (1 of 62 variables) have > 3% - 5% Missing Values

9.7% (6 of 62 variables) have > 5% - 10% Missing Values

V27      ENCOURAGE THRU CALLIN TV SHOWS                    6.5%
V39      ANY INEFFECTIVE PRACTICES RE CITIZEN RP          6.5%
V41      WINNING WAR ON DRUGS?                            6.5%
V33      ENCOURAGE THRU NON ENGLISH SPEAKING              8.7%
V50      1 MOST COMMON TYPE REPORT RECEIVED              8.7%
V54      1 WAY PUBLICIZE NEED CITIZEN RPTS                8.7%

1.6% (1 of 62 variables) have > 10% - 20% Missing Values

V46      1 SPECIAL PROCEDURE ENCOURAGE REPORT             13.0%

8.1% (5 of 62 variables) have > 20% - 40% Missing Values

V55      2 WAY PUBLICIZE NEED CITIZEN RPTS                23.9%
V57      1 WAY MOTIVATE CITIZENS TO REPORT                23.9%
V44      2 MOST COMMON WAY CITIZENS REPORT                30.4%
V49      NO OF REPORTS MTH THRU SPECIAL NUMBER            32.6%
V61      2 THING NEEDED TO WIN WAR ON DRUGS               37.0%

17.7% (11 of 62 variables) have > 40% - 100% Missing Values

V51      2 MOST COMMON TYPE REPORT RECEIVED              41.3%
V56      3 WAY PUBLICIZE NEED CITIZEN RPTS                52.2%
V63      EFFECT OF COP ON DRUG PROBLEM                    56.5%
V47      2 SPECIAL PROCEDURE ENCOURAGE REPORT            58.7%
V52      3 MOST COMMON TYPE REPORT RECEIVED              71.7%
V45      3 MOST COMMON WAY CITIZENS REPORT                76.1%
V58      2 WAY MOTIVATE CITIZENS TO REPORT                76.1%
V62      3 THING NEEDED TO WIN WAR ON DRUGS               76.1%
V25      DONT REPORT OTHER REASON                         87.0%
=====

```

Table 2 (continued)

```
=====
Variable Name and Label                                Percent of Cases with
                                                       Missing Values
-----
V48      3 SPECIAL PROCEDURE ENCOURAGE REPORT          95.7%
V59      3 WAY MOTIVATE CITIZENS TO REPORT              95.7%
=====
```

*Variables individually listed only if greater than 5% missing values.
Data does not contain skip patterns or skip patterns are not reflected
in the data as coded.

CODEBOOK

American Bar Association Project
on
Resident Reporting of Drug Crimes

NIJ 8B-IJ-CX-0032

Interviewer Version of
Police Representative Survey

Respondent:_____ City/State:_____

This is_____ from the American Bar Association. I am calling to follow UP on our recent letter about our research project on neighborhood reporting of drug crimes. As you know, we would like you to participate in a 20-25 minute telephone survey on this topic. Is this a good time to do the survey? If not, can we schedule a time in the near future?

Date:_____ Time:_____

Before we start, I would like you to identify a typical neighborhood in your city where drugs and drug-related crimes have had a serious adverse affect on the quality of life for the residents. (INTERVIEWER: If respondent says there is no "typical" neighborhood, ask him to identify the neighborhood which presents the most serious drug-related problems for its residents. If he still cannot respond, ask him to identify a neighborhood which presents serious drug-related problems for its residents.)

Var.# Col

1. Neighborhood:_____ ID# V1 1-2
[INTERVIEWER: Circle one of following: Typical
The most serious
Serious]

2. Could you briefly describe the neighborhood for me, starting with:

a. Ethnic make-up:_____

j. Level of violence associated with drug trafficking

k. Level of violence directed against residents who have reported

l. Other special features of the neighborhood:_____

Please keep this neighborhood in mind and use it as a reference when answering the rest of the questions in this interview.

3. Priorities to control drug activities may vary from police department to police department--for example, arrests of high level or low level buyers, sellers, or manufacturers. What are your department's priorities?

3.a. What strategies or tactics do you use to address these priorities?

		Var.#	Col
4.	On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being not very important and 5 being very important, how important are citizen reports to your department's overall strategy for controlling drug activities in neighborhoods?	V2	3
	1 2 3 4 5 DK		
5.	In your opinion, are citizens who witness drug activities today:	V3	4
	(1) just as likely, (Skip to 6)		
	(2) more likely, or		
	(3) less likely		
	(4) DK (Skip to 6)		
	to report such crimes than citizen witnesses in the same neighborhoods five years ago?		
	5a. Why do you think this is?		
	<hr/>		
	<hr/>		
6.	What is the most common way citizens report drug activities to the police?	V43	43
		V44	44
		V45	45
	(INTERVIEWER USE:		
	"Crime solvers/tipsters" number		
	911 or other emergency police number		
	in-person, to patrol officer		
	Through third party		
	Through written communication]		
	<hr/>		
6.a.	What, if any, special procedures does the department have for encouraging citizen reports of drug activities?	V46	46
		V47	47
		V48	48

INTERVIEWER: IF EITHER OF ABOVE RESPONSES INCLUDES
 "HOTLINE" OR SPECIAL TELEPHONE NUMBER ASK 6.b

6.b. Approximately how many reports per month do the police receive through this special number? V49 49

7. I'd like to find out what kinds of citizen reports You consider most valuable. I'm going to read a list of different kinds of information citizens might provide to the police. Please rate each on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being not very valuable and 5 being very valuable.

- a. Location of street drug use . . . 1 2 3 4 5 V4 5
- b. Location of indoor drug use . . . 1 2 3 4 5 V5 6
- c. Location of street drug sales . . 1 2 3 4 5 V6 7
- d. Location of indoor drug sales . . 1 2 3 4 5 V7 8
- e. Location of places where large amounts
of drugs are packaged or stored . 1 2 3 4 5 V8 9
- f. Individuals involved in drug use . 1 2 3 4 5 V9 10
- g. Individuals involved in low-level
sales 1 2 3 4 5 V10 11
- h. Individuals who are major
suppliers 1 2 3 4 5 V11 12
- i. Information about how low-level
sellers operate 1 2 3 4 5 V12 13
- j. Information about how major
suppliers operate 1 2 3 4 5 V13 14

8. Of the kinds of reports I have just mentioned, what kinds do you most commonly receive? V50 50
V51 51
V52 52

9. Could you briefly describe what action is usually taken in response to citizen reports, e.g., are they used for covert surveillance, undercover investigations, seeking search warrants? (INTERVIEWER: PROBE FOR SPECIFICS] V53 53

10. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being almost never and 5 being almost always, in your opinion how often are each of the following factors responsible for citizens' failure to report drug crimes:
- a. Fear of retaliation to reporter, reporter's family/friends . . . 1 2 3 4 5 DK V14 15
 - b. Belief that report would be a waste of time because police or the courts wouldn't do anything 1 2 3 4 5 DK V15 16
 - c. Concern that if they reported, they would have to go to court and testify 1 2 3 4 5 DK V16 17
 - d. Concern that the report might result in getting the reporter or reporter's family or friends into trouble with police. 1 2 3 4 5 DK V17 18
 - e. Belief that drugs are not a problem in the neighborhood . . 1 2 3 4 5 DK V18 19
 - f. Belief that drug activities benefit the neighborhood economically. 1 2 3 4 5 DK V19 20
 - g. Belief that drug activities shouldn't be a crime. 1 2 3 4 5 DK V20 21
 - h. Belief that the police already know about drug activities so there is no reason to report. . 1 2 3 4 5 DK V21 22
 - i. Mistrust of the police. 1 2 3 4 5 DK V22 23
 - j. Belief that drug activities are none of their business. . . 1 2 3 4 5 DK V23 24

k. Sensational media coverage of threats or violence against people who report drug activity	1	2	3	4	5	DK	V24	25
l. Other: _____	1	2	3	4	5	DK	V25	26
11. I'm going to list a number of ways various jurisdictions try to encourage citizen reports. Whether or not they are used in the neighborhood you mentioned at the beginning of the interview, how important do you think they might be in encouraging citizen reports, using a 1 to 5 scale, with 1 being not very important and 5 being very important?								
a. Well-publicized "sting" operations to assure citizens of an active police presence							V26	27
1	2	3	4	5	DK			
b. "Call-in" television shows							V27	28
1	2	3	4	5	DK			
c. Financial rewards for information leading to arrests/convictions							V28	29
1	2	3	4	5	DK			
d. Confidential telephone numbers							V29	30
1	2	3	4	5	DK			
e. Publicizing existing reporting procedures							V30	31
1	2	3	4	5	DK			
f. Police protections for citizens who report							V31	32
1	2	3	4	5	DK			
g. Alternatives to criminal sanctions for youth and first-time offenders (e.g., diversion to treatment programs)							V32	33

	1	2	3	4	5	DK		
h.	Ready availability of foreign-speaking individuals to whom non-English-speaking residents can report						V33	34
	1	2	3	4	5	DK		
i.	Police visibility in the neighborhood						V34	35
	1	2	3	4	5	DK		
j.	Door-to-door efforts to enlist neighborhood support						V35	36
	1	2	3	4	5	DK		
k.	Interaction between police and church groups, youth groups, schools or other neighborhood organizations						V36	37
	1	2	3	4	5	DK		
l.	Giving citizens who report drug activity feedback about what was done with their report?						V37	38
	1	2	3	4	5	DK		
12.	Does the narcotics unit or any other police agency publicize the need for citizens to report drug crimes to the police?						V38	39
	Yes	(Ask 12.a.)						
	No	DK	(Skip to 13)					
12.a.	How is this publicized?						V54	54
	[INTERVIEWER USE ONLY:						V55	55
	T.V.	Public transportation				V56	56	
	Radio	Community forums						
	Newspaper	Schools						
	Billboards]							

12.b. How do you motivate people to report by these efforts?	V57	57
	V58	58
	V59	59

13. In your opinion, what are the most effective practices your department uses to increase the number of useful citizen reports about drug activities?

14. In your opinion, are there practices your department has used which have proven ineffective in increasing the number of useful citizen reports about drugs activities in these neighborhoods? V39 40

- Yes (Ask 14.a.)
- No DK

14.a. What are these and why are they ineffective?

15. Do you have any suggestions we haven't discussed for increasing or improving citizen reports of drug activities? If so, what are they?

16. Do you think your city is winning the war against drugs? V41 41
 Yes No _____

17. What else needs to happen at the local level? V60 60
 (INTERVIEWER PROBE: How much more can the police do? V61 61
 What is the residents' role?) V62 62

18. Recently there has been a lot of interest in V42 42
 "community-oriented policing" and "problem-oriented
 policing." Does your department employ either of these in
 any of the neighborhoods in your city?

Yes (Ask 18b)

No

18b. How much of a difference have they made with V63 63
 respect to the drug problem?

We very much appreciate your time and assistance. Thank you.

5046A/(9/2/89