

# A Report on the Parsons Community Survey



Brett Zollinger, Ph.D.  
**Director**

Jian Sun, Ph.D.  
**Assistant Director**

Michael S. Walker, M.S.  
**Research Scholar**

Marisa M. Johnson, M.B.A.  
**Administrative Specialist**

Leslie Watson-Divittore, M.S.  
**Research Coord. Admin. Specialist**

Wesley Davis  
**Graduate Research Assistant**

**Mission:**

***To facilitate effective public policy decision-making among  
governmental and nonprofit entities***



Docking Institute of Public Affairs  
Fort Hays State University  
600 Park Street  
Hays, Kansas 67601-4099  
Telephone: (785) 628-4197  
[www.fhsu.edu/docking](http://www.fhsu.edu/docking)



# A Report on the Parsons Community Survey

**Prepared By:**

Morgan Steele, Ph.D.  
Policy Fellow  
Docking Institute of Public Affairs

**Prepared For:**

City of Parsons Police Department, Parsons KS

**Copyright © May 2023**

All Rights Reserved

This report was prepared by the Docking Institute of Public Affairs. All statements, findings, and conclusions of the report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the client.

# Contents

Executive Summary.....	5
Methods.....	6
Measures.....	6
Data Analysis.....	9
Results.....	9
Descriptive Statistics .....	9
Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of Survey Respondents (n = 799) .....	11
Table 2: Parsons Residents’ Opinions About Sales Tax.....	12
Table 3: Distribution of Perceived Crime and Disorder Problems .....	14
Support for Sales Tax Increase.....	15
Table 4: Demographic Differences and their Impact on Supporting Sales Tax Increase .....	16
Table 5: Differences in Community and Perceptions of Police and their Impact on Supporting Sales Tax Increase.....	18
Demographics and Public Support for Police’s Impact on Opposition towards the Sales Tax Increase ....	19
Table 6: Demographics, Experiences, and Perceptions’ Impact on Opposition to Sales Tax Increase.....	21
Appendix 1: Exploratory Factor Analysis Diagnostics .....	22
Appendix 1: Questionnaire .....	23

## Executive Summary

The City of Parsons Police Department conducted a community survey to assess support for a ballot measure to increase sales tax revenue to assist the police and fire departments. The Docking Institute at Fort Hays State University processed the resulting 799 surveys and is providing summary information and statistics concerning the community's support in this report.

First, the community broadly supports the sales tax increase, with 483 respondents (60.45%) being at least somewhat likely to support the sales tax increase. However, this level of support varied across several demographic characteristics. Female respondents and those with at least an Associate degree were more likely to support this increase, while males and those with only a high school diploma or below were less likely to support it. Additionally, those who had experienced more victimizations were less likely to support the increase, while those who had not been victimized were more likely to support it. When support for the sales tax increase was examined across perceptions of the community, several aspects were relevant. First, those who perceive the police as legitimate or effective, as well as their community being well-maintained and with high collective efficacy were much more likely to support the sales tax increase. Perceived safety did not have an impact on the support or opposition to the sales tax increase. Second, those that wanted the police to have a visible presence in the community, for the police to adopt problem- or community-oriented tactics, and for the police to conduct proactive investigations were much more likely to support the tax increase.

However, these characteristics and perceptions have interacting relationships that must be accounted for to make sense of the results. Three regression models were analyzed to understand how demographics and perceptions of Parsons affected the likelihood that they would oppose the sales tax increase. Taken together, the results mean that efforts to obtain community support for the sales tax increase should emphasize how the additional revenue will help the police act in a more legitimate fashion in the community. This may entail being more visible in the community or adopting problem- or community-oriented policing tactics. Moreover, attempting to obtain support for the measure should not discount older or male individuals. Emphasizing the minimal impact that a sales tax increase will have on older individuals may be beneficial. Additionally, since females are much less likely to oppose the tax increase, discussing what men and women want the police to do and not do would be beneficial. This may help efforts to encourage support for the measure by emphasizing what particular groups want as a part of the increase in revenue for the police.

## Methods

The Parsons Police Department administered a survey to adult residents of the town in February 2023, sending a questionnaire to the approximately 4,200 residential utility listings. A total of 799 usable questionnaires were returned either by mail using the pre-addressed envelope with postage provided or by drop-off at City Hall. The Docking Institute of Public Affairs was commissioned to key enter all questionnaires, manage and analyze data, and to report results. Docking Institute associates are survey researchers and also offered consultation on portions of the questionnaire. Appendix 2 contains the questionnaire.

## Measures

The primary objective of this survey was to assess support among Parsons residents for a 1 cent (\$0.01) city sales tax increase that would fund public safety services of the police and fire departments. Support was measured using the question, ***“With the information presented above, how likely is it that you would vote for a 1 cent public safety sales tax to follow the current ½ cent tax when it sunsets at the end of 2023?”*** (see question 118 in Appendix 2). To this question respondents could answer ***“Extremely likely to support the tax increase, Somewhat likely to support, Not likely at all to support,”*** or ***“Don’t know.”*** For the descriptive statistics and bivariate comparisons of levels of support across different community attributes, the level of support continuum is left as a three answer options scale, and the “Don’t know” option is excluded from the comparisons. However, for the logistic regression models discussed in the Demographics and Public Support for Police’s Impact on Supporting Sales Tax Increase section, the scale is condensed to a binary choice (0 = support for the tax increase, 1 = oppose the tax increase). This structure facilitates the interpretation of the model to aid in policy recommendations.

For the demographic characteristics of the respondents, the following were included in the analysis: age, racial or ethnic minority, sex, and education level. While the survey asked for the respondent’s year of birth, this was recalculated to their age in years by subtracting their response from 2023. Those that did not respond or did not provide four digits were marked as missing and excluded from the analysis. Respondents identified their race and ethnicity by selecting the category that best fit them. This was condensed from the eight affirmative options offered (White/Caucasian, Black/African American, Hispanic, Asian, Native American, Pacific Islander, Other, More than one) to a binary measure (Racial or Ethnic Minority = 1, White/Caucasian = 0), with those that preferred not to answer or indicated that they did not know being marked as missing. Marital Status and Education were similarly condensed to facilitate interpretation of bivariate and multivariate results. The survey question concerning marital status allowed respondents to select from the following options: Single, Married, Widowed, and Separated/Divorced (with the additional options of “Don’t Know” and “Prefer not to answer”). For the multivariate analysis, this measure was condensed into two responses (Single versus Married), with those not choosing or providing an answer listed as missing. Information concerning household size and number of children was assessed using four ordinal responses. Seven ordinal responses were used to assess income levels, as well. For these three demographic questions, the response for the top end of the range included a “+” to allow those with outlying numbers of individuals and/or children in their household, as well as larger than average household incomes, to respond. A set of five ordinal responses assessed the education level of the respondent, with an “other” category provided, as well.

The survey asked five questions (Q99-103) concerning the respondent's experiences with crime, the police and city government, with respondents able to select "yes" or "no" as to whether they experienced a crime or interacted with the Parsons Police Department in the past six months. Questions concerning whether the respondent filed a complaint in general or against officers, experienced a proactive stop, or encountered law enforcement in some other capacity had fairly high levels of missing responses (18-22%), which likely impacts the accuracy of these estimates.

Rather than examine responses to perceptions of Parsons questions individually, exploratory factor analysis was used to condense these questions into larger concepts. These include criminologically validated measures of Collective Efficacy (Q36-43), Fear of Crime (Q29-35), Community Quality (Q15-Q28), Police Legitimacy (Q85-98), and Police Effectiveness (Q62-Q67). Questions concerning what the respondents believe the police should be doing were also condensed through EFA into three measures of Police Activities (Q73-84): Visible Patrol, Problem- and Community Oriented, and Proactive Investigations. Each measure was adjusted above zero to facilitate interpretation.

Collective efficacy is a concept representing the extent to which residents believe that 1) their neighbors share the same values and 2) they can work together to solve problems. Pioneered as a way to understand how communities' perceptions of their neighbors affected their ability to control behavior, namely through the number of homicides that occurred in the neighborhood<sup>1</sup>, it has since been used to explain crime overall<sup>2</sup> and other problems within the neighborhood<sup>3</sup>, fear<sup>4</sup>, willingness to report a victimization<sup>5</sup> and perceptions of the police<sup>6</sup>. The eight questions included in the Parsons community survey, were evaluated using exploratory factor analysis with a varimax rotation to reduce the eight questions into one concept, with missing responses replaced with the overall arithmetic mean to incorporate more responses into the final models. This single measure explained 54.992% of the variation in the eight responses, though the value for Cronbach's alpha was lower than expected (likely because Collective Efficacy is a two-dimensional concept).

The survey also included six questions concerning respondents' perceptions of their safety within their neighborhood. This is related to, though still distinct from, collective efficacy<sup>7</sup>, and is often affected by visible issues of crime and disorder. According to a recent meta-analysis, perceptions of safety are often affected by the respondent being female, having been victimized previously, and their perceptions of

---

<sup>1</sup> Sampson, R. J., Raudenbush, S. W., & Earls, F. (1997). Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science*, 277(5328), 918–924. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.277.5328.918>

<sup>2</sup> Kirk, D. S., & Matsuda, M. (2011). Legal cynicism, collective efficacy, and the ecology of arrest. *Criminology*, 49(2), 443–472. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.2011.00226.x>

<sup>3</sup> Wells, W., Schafer, J. A., Varano, S. P., & Bynum, T. S. (2006). Neighborhood residents' production of order: The effects of collective efficacy on responses to neighborhood problems. *Crime & Delinquency*, 52(4), 523–550. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128705284681>

<sup>4</sup> Swatt, M. L., Varano, S. P., Uchida, C. D., & Solomon, S. E. (2013). Fear of crime, incivilities, and collective efficacy in four Miami neighborhoods. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 41(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2012.09.004>

<sup>5</sup> Davis, R. C., & Henderson, N. J. (2003). Willingness to report crimes: The role of ethnic group membership and community efficacy. *Crime & Delinquency*, 49(4), 564–580. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128703254418>

<sup>6</sup> Sargeant, E. (2015). Policing and collective efficacy: The relative importance of police effectiveness, procedural justice and the obligation to obey police. *Policing and Society*, 0(0), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10439463.2015.1122008>

<sup>7</sup> Gibson, C. L., Zhao, J., Lovrich, N. P., & Gaffney, M. J. (2002). Social integration, individual perceptions of collective efficacy, and fear of crime in three cities. *Justice Quarterly*, 19(3), 537–564. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07418820200095341>

the community and police<sup>8</sup>. Following a similar procedure as Collective Efficacy (exploratory factor analysis, mean replacement for missing responses, varimax rotation, and final concept adjusted above zero), which explained 47.590% of the variation within the six questions. There was also a high degree of consistency in responses, with the Cronbach's alpha value being 0.795.

To assess perceptions of amenities and services offered by the City of Parsons, respondents answered fourteen questions, which were then condensed into a single concept. This one score had high reliability (Cronbach's alpha = 0.826) and explained 30.424% of the variation across the questions. This relatively low amount of variation is likely due to the wide array of topics covered by the questions. However, this measure was not broken into separate measures so as to simplify the logistic regression model and bivariate comparisons.

Perceptions of the police's legitimacy and effectiveness were assessed via fourteen and six questions, respectively. As a concept, Police Legitimacy represents the public's belief that law enforcement are genuine authorities and should be respected<sup>9</sup>. This has implications for public support for police, citizen compliance with the police<sup>10</sup>, with the law, violence within the community<sup>11</sup>, collective efficacy<sup>12</sup> and the police's overall effectiveness at solving problems within the community<sup>13</sup>. Following the same procedure noted above, the factored Police Legitimacy measure explained 63.918% of the variation across the 14 questions with very high reliability (Cronbach's alpha = 0.942).

Relatedly, public perceptions of Police Effectiveness also have implications for the extent that civilians will cooperate with law enforcement<sup>14</sup>, or whether they will become cynical and distrustful towards the criminal justice system<sup>15</sup>. Moreover, the police being seen as effective in their capacity of preventing and investigating crimes and responding to issues is crucial in helping neighborhoods develop collective efficacy and in seeing the police as legitimate<sup>14</sup>. Following the same procedure as for the other measures, the concept Police Effectiveness explained 63.031% of the variation in the six questions on this topic, with a very high amount of consistency in responses (Cronbach's alpha = 0.914).

Finally, the Parsons Community Survey included twelve questions on what actions and policies residents believed that the police should prioritize. These preferences for different activities ranged from different

---

<sup>8</sup> Collins, R. E. (2016). Addressing the inconsistencies in fear of crime research: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 47, 21–31. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2016.06.004>

<sup>9</sup> Sunshine, J., & Tyler, T. R. (2003). The role of procedural justice and legitimacy in shaping public support for policing. *Law & Society Review*, 37(3), 513–548.

<sup>10</sup> Tyler, T. R. (2006). *Why People Obey the Law*. Princeton University Press.

<sup>11</sup> Kane, R. J. (2005). Compromised police legitimacy as a predictor of violent crime in structurally disadvantaged communities. *Criminology*, 43(2), 469–498.

<sup>12</sup> Kochel, T. R. (2012). Can police legitimacy promote collective efficacy? *Justice Quarterly*, 29(3), 384–419. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2011.561805>

<sup>13</sup> Saunders, J., Ober, A., Barnes-Proby, D., & Brunson, R. K. (2016). Police legitimacy and disrupting overt drug markets. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 39(4), 667–679. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PIJPSM-02-2016-0014>

<sup>14</sup> Kochel, T. R., Parks, R., & Mastrofski, S. D. (2013). Examining police effectiveness as a precursor to legitimacy and cooperation with police. *Justice Quarterly*, 30(5), 895–925. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2011.633544>

<sup>15</sup> Kirk, D. S., & Matsuda, M. (2011). Legal cynicism, collective efficacy, and the ecology of arrest. *Criminology*, 49(2), 443–472. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.2011.00226.x>



types of patrol (vehicle, ATV, foot, bicycle), proactive investigations focused on persistent problems like narcotics, and organizational policies like School Resource Officer programs and problem- and community-oriented policing. Using exploratory factor analysis, three separate desires for law enforcement behavior were identified. They were Visible Patrol in the Community (Variance Explained = 13.792%), Problem- and Community Orientation (Variance Explained = 34.829%), and Proactive Investigations (Variance Explained = 9.877%). Overall, these questions had a high degree of consistency (Cronbach's alpha = 0.841).

## Data Analysis

The measures described above will be summarized via their univariate statistics (mean and standard deviation or count and percentage of total, where appropriate). Then, the bivariate correlations (Pearson's  $r$ ) and patterns of frequencies across the measures (Chi Square and t-tests for independence of means) and one-way analysis of variance will be discussed. Finally, three binary logistic regression models will be used to examine how different factors affect the likelihood that someone would oppose a sales tax increase. Because most of the survey respondents stated that they were at least somewhat supportive of the sales tax increase, opposition to the increase is used to facilitate a more useful model. The first model regresses the demographic and socioeconomic measures (Age, Racial or Ethnic Minority, Associate degree or above, Unmarried, Female, and the Total number of victimization) on opposition to the sales tax. The second model includes the same predictors used in the first, with the addition of the residents' perceptions of the community (Collective Efficacy, Perceived Safety, Community Quality, Police Legitimacy, and Police Effectiveness). The third model includes the residents' beliefs about what law enforcement should prioritize (Visibility in the Community, Problem- and Community-oriented Policing, and Proactive Investigations) in addition to the other predictors.

## Results

### Descriptive Statistics

This section provides descriptive information concerning the individuals who completed the Parsons Community Survey, spread across three tables concerning demographics, experiences, and perceptions, as well as overall support for the sales tax increase and the extent of perceived crime and disorder problems within Parsons. Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of Survey Respondents displays the demographic and experiential characteristics of the 799 individuals who completed and returned the survey concerning their opinion about the City of Parsons Police Department and their overall support for a sales tax increase. For each question, approximately 10% of responses were not able to be counted, which may impact the representativeness of the survey results.

The average age of respondents was 63.96 years (standard deviation – SD: 15.22), though this ranged from 18 to 102. This is consistent with most community surveys as older residents tend to be more willing to complete paper surveys. Over 80% of respondents listed their race as Caucasian ( $n = 649$ ), with less than ten percent identifying as a racial or ethnic minority ( $n = 70$ , 8.8%). Nearly 50% of respondents reported that they were married ( $n = 378$ , 47.3%), with 132 individuals being single (16.5%). Over one quarter of respondents said that they were either divorced (10.8%) or widowed (15.1%). Parsons  
*Docking Institute of Public Affairs – Parsons Police Department Community Survey*

residents' education was at least at the high school level, with only two percent (n = 14) responding that they had not graduated high school or completed their GED. Fifty-six percent had earned a college degree, with most of those having an Associate degree (n = 205, 25.7% of all residents), and a smaller proportion having a bachelor's degree (n = 146, 18.3) or a graduate degree (n = 99, 12.4%).

Six direct questions were included in the survey concerning the respondent's experiences of victimization and contact with law enforcement. Around 20% of the sample reported experiencing criminal victimization (n = 160, 20%), with slightly more having reported a crime to law enforcement (n = 168, 21%). Over 16% of respondents said that they had filed a complaint (n = 130, 16.3%), with less than three percent indicating that they filed a complaint against an officer (n = 20, 2.5%). Less than fifty individuals reported having been proactively stopped by law enforcement (n = 49, 6.1%), though nearly 200 reported that they had had some kind of encounter with law enforcement (n = 191, 23.9%), which may indicate that there was some confusion about the question. Furthermore, approximately 20% of the data was missing concerning whether individuals filed a complaint or experienced a proactive stop and around 10% of the remaining questions in this area, which may bias the results in an unknown direction.

The univariate statistics and bivariate correlations for the seven aggregated measures of the respondents' perceptions of community and police are also displayed in Table 1. Because these measures were produced via factor analysis, the measures themselves were fairly normally distributed. For Collective Efficacy, it had a moderate positive relationship with Perceived Safety ( $r = 0.364, p < 0.01$ ), Community Quality ( $r = 0.398, p < 0.01$ ), Police Legitimacy ( $r = 0.315, p < 0.01$ ), and Police Effectiveness ( $r = 0.328, p < 0.01$ ), with a weak positive relationship with the desire for a Law Enforcement approach from police ( $r = 0.070, p = 0.049$ ). Perceived Safety also had a moderate positive relationship with Community Quality ( $r = 0.434, p < 0.01$ ), Police Legitimacy ( $r = 0.334, p < 0.01$ ), and Effectiveness ( $r = 0.351, p < 0.01$ ), with a fairly weak negative relationship with the desire for police to be visible in the community ( $r = -0.144, p < 0.01$ ). Similarly, Community Quality had moderate positive relationships with Collective Efficacy ( $r = 0.398, p < 0.01$ ), Perceived Safety ( $r = 0.434, p < 0.01$ ), Police Legitimacy ( $r = 0.494, p < 0.01$ ), and Effectiveness ( $r = 0.516, p < 0.01$ ), and the desire for a Law Enforcement approach from police ( $r = 0.143, p < 0.01$ ), as was Police Legitimacy. Indeed, Police Legitimacy had a very strong positive relationship with Police Effectiveness ( $r = 0.790, p < 0.01$ ) and weak to moderate positive relationships with the desire for police to be visible in the community ( $r = 0.111, p < 0.01$ ), problem- and community oriented ( $r = 0.167, p < 0.01$ ), and conduct proactive investigations ( $r = 0.292, p < 0.01$ ). In contrast, the desire for police to prioritize different goals within the community were broadly unrelated to each other, due to the factor analysis procedure used to create the three aggregate measures.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of Survey Respondents (n = 799)

	<i>Mean (Average)</i>		<i>Standard Deviation</i>		<i>Range</i>		<i>Other/Missing (%)</i>					
<b>Age</b>	63.94		15.22		84 (18 – 102)		96 (12.0)					
<b>Gender</b>	<i>Male (%)</i>			<i>Female (%)</i>			<i>Other/Missing (%)</i>					
	300 (37.5)			425 (53.2)			74 (9.3)					
<b>Race</b>	<i>Caucasian (%)</i>				<i>Racial or Ethnic Minority</i>			<i>Other/Missing (%)</i>				
	649 (81.2)				70 (8.8)			80 (10.0)				
<b>Marital Status</b>	<i>Single</i>		<i>Married</i>		<i>Divorced</i>		<i>Widowed</i>		<i>Missing</i>			
	132 (16.5)		378 (47.3)		86 (10.8)		121 (15.1)		82 (10.3)			
<b>Household Size</b>	<i>One</i>		<i>Two - Five</i>			<i>Six - ten</i>		<i>Eleven+</i>				
	221		460			10		1				
<b>Number of Children</b>	<i>Zero</i>		<i>One</i>			<i>Two – Five</i>		<i>Six +</i>				
	503		107			82		1				
<b>Income</b>	<i>&lt;\$15k</i>	<i>15-24.9k</i>	<i>25-34.9k</i>	<i>35-49.9k</i>	<i>50-74.9k</i>	<i>75-99.9k</i>	<i>100k+</i>					
	36	78	62	110	117	80	99					
<b>Education</b>	<i>Less than H.S.</i>	<i>H.S. / GED</i>	<i>A.S.</i>	<i>B.S.</i>	<i>Grad</i>	<i>Other</i>	<i>Missing</i>					
	14 (1.8)	238 (29.8)	205 (25.7)	146 (18.3)	99 (12.4)	17 (2.1)	80 (10.0)					
<b>Reported a Crime</b>	<i>No (%)</i>				<i>Yes (%)</i>			<i>Missing (%)</i>				
	518 (64.8)				168 (21.0)			113 (14.2)				
<b>Experienced a victimization</b>	596 (74.6)				160 (20.0)			43 (5.4)				
<b>Filed a complaint</b>	520 (65.1)				130 (16.3)			149 (18.6)				
<b>Filed complaint against officer</b>	619 (77.5)				20 (2.5)			160 (20.1)				
<b>Proactive stop</b>	573 (71.7)				49 (6.1)			177 (22.1)				
<b>All other encounters</b>	446 (55.8)				191 (23.9)			162 (20.2)				
<b>Perceptions of Community and Police</b>												
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>St. Dev.</i>	<i>Range</i>		<i>C.E.</i>	<i>P.S.</i>	<i>C.Q.</i>	<i>P.L.</i>	<i>P.E.</i>	<i>P.C.</i>	<i>POP</i>	<i>L.E.</i>
<b>Collective Efficacy</b>	3.07	0.987	5.29		1	0.364 **	0.398 **	0.315 **	0.328 **	0.034	0.050	0.070 *
<b>Perceived Safety</b>	2.89	0.998	5.62		0.364 **	1	0.434 **	0.334 **	0.351 **	0.144 **	0.057	-0.038
<b>Community Quality</b>	3.39	0.999	6.36		0.398 **	0.434 **	1	0.494 **	0.516 **	0.016	0.044	0.143 **
<b>Police Legitimacy</b>	3.94	0.989	5.89		0.315 **	0.334 **	0.494 **	1	0.780 **	0.111 **	0.167 **	0.292 **
<b>Police Effectiveness</b>	3.46	0.991	5.59		0.328 **	0.351 **	0.516 **	0.780 **	1	0.091 **	0.134 **	0.200 **
<b>Patrol &amp; Community Involvement</b>	2.01	0.999	4.63		0.034	0.144 **	0.016	0.111 **	0.091 **	1	0.000	0.000
<b>Problem- and Community Oriented Policing</b>	3.76	0.999	6.56		0.060	0.057	0.044	0.167 **	0.134 **	0.000	1	0.000
<b>Law Enforcement-Focus</b>	5.36	0.999	7.09		0.070 *	-0.038	0.143 **	0.292 **	0.200 **	0.000	0.000	1

\* = p < 0.05; \*\* = p < 0.01

Table 2: Parsons Residents’ Opinions About Sales Tax Increase displays the results of questions concerning respondents’ level of support for a sales tax increase, as well as what they would like the Parsons Police Department to do with the additional funds. The majority of respondents indicated that they supported the sales tax increase, with nearly 40% (n = 302) saying that they were very likely to support the increase, with a further 22.7% (n = 181) indicating that they were somewhat supportive of the increase. Less than 20% of respondents (n = 18.3%) did not support the increase, with slightly more than 20% not answering the question. To further examine respondents’ opinion about the sales tax increase, seven questions were included on the survey to determine how the community believed the police should spend any money gained from the sales tax increase. Nearly 80% of respondents (n = 635) believed that the local government should prioritize ensuring competitive wages, with over 63% (n = 504) believing that they should enhance training for officers. The remaining potential priorities were more evenly split in supporting or opposing these priorities. Approximately 40 – 50% of respondents believed that the additional funds should be used to replace or upgrade vehicles, equipment, and fund the potential new safety center, with about the same opposing those priorities. These differences in support versus opposition were not evenly distributed, indicating that the areas of competitive wages and enhancing training are likely truly supported by the community.

Table 2: Parsons Residents’ Opinions About Sales Tax					
Opinion Concerning Sales Tax					
	<i>Very Likely</i>	<i>Somewhat Likely</i>	<i>Not Likely</i>	<i>Missing</i>	
<b>Support Sales Tax Increase</b>	302 (37.8)	181 (22.7)	146 (18.3)	170 (21.3)	
	<i>Yes (%)</i>		<i>No (%)</i>		<i>Chi Square (p)</i>
<b>Ensure Competitive Wages</b>	635 (79.5)		150 (18.8)		363.937 (0.000)
<b>Replace Capital Equipment</b>	363 (45.4)		420 (52.6)		
<b>Replace Emergency Vehicles</b>	394 (49.3)		389 (48.7)		
<b>Upgrade Radio</b>	368 (46.1)		414 (51.8)		
<b>Fund Safety Center</b>	365 (45.7)		419 (52.4)		
<b>Enhance Training</b>	504 (63.1)		278 (34.8)		
<b>Modernize Equipment</b>	328 (41.1)		454 (56.8)		

Table 3: Distribution of Perceived Crime and Disorder Problems displays the results of questions concerning what residents believed to be the most serious problems facing Parsons. These 13 questions were separated into perceived crime (Drug and Alcohol Use, Burglaries, Vandalism, Car Break-ins, Speeding, Public Intoxication, and Prostitution) versus perceived disorder problems (Mental health concerns, Loose or stray animals, Garbage, Unsupervised youth, Homelessness, and Excessive noise). These individual scores across the seven perceived crime problems and six perceived disorder problems were averaged below each section as a general indicator of the severity of the perceived problems within the community.

For respondents' perceptions of crime problems, the most severe problem is drug or alcohol use, with over 90% of respondents believing that it was somewhat of a problem (19.8%) to a big problem (74.3%). The second highest-ranked problem was burglaries, with over 80% of Parsons residents believing that they presented a problem, though not as severe as drug or alcohol use. Respondents considered vandalism, car break-ins, and speeding within Parsons to be able equally problematic for the city, with between 65-80% of residents considering them to be problems. However, they believed that public intoxication was a relatively minor problem (46.4%), and that there was not a significant problem with prostitution. Perceived disorder problems exhibited a similar pattern of responses. Nearly 80% of respondents believed that mental health presented a problem for Parsons, with over 40% considering it to be a big problem for the city. Similarly, stray animals, garbage, unsupervised youth, and homelessness were all considered to be a problem by 60-70% of the community. Excessive noise, in contrast, was not a problem for nearly 50% of respondents (49.1%), with it being primarily somewhat of a problem for nearly one-third of residents (32.4%). Based on the mean perceived problems, residents believed that crime presents slightly more of an issue than disorder, as both the mean and range were higher for crime. However, the standard deviation was roughly the same, suggesting that these perceptions are likely held across Parsons.

Table 3: Distribution of Perceived Crime and Disorder Problems

<b>Perceived Crime Problems</b>					
<b>Rank</b>		<b><i>A Big Problem (%)</i></b>	<b><i>Somewhat of a problem (%)</i></b>	<b><i>Not a problem (%)</i></b>	<b><i>Missing (%)</i></b>
1	Drug or Alcohol Use	594 (74.3)	158 (19.8)	26 (3.3)	21 (2.6)
2	Burglaries	430 (53.8)	280 (35.0)	56 (7.0)	33 (4.1)
3	Vandalism	315 (39.4)	340 (42.6)	104 (13.0)	40 (5.0)
4	Car Break-ins	304 (38.0)	358 (44.8)	86 (10.8)	51 (6.4)
5	Speeding	217 (27.2)	367 (45.9)	176 (22.0)	39 (4.9)
6	Public Intoxication	97 (12.1)	371 (46.4)	252 (31.5)	79 (9.9)
7	Prostitution	21 (2.6)	156 (19.5)	511 (64.0)	111 (13.9)
		<b><i>Mean</i></b>	<b><i>Std. Dev.</i></b>	<b><i>Range</i></b>	
<b>Total Perceived Crime Problems</b>		<b>6.51</b>	<b>2.36</b>	<b>12</b>	
<b>Perceived Disorder Problems</b>					
1	Mental health	337 (42.2)	296 (37.0)	121 (15.1)	45 (5.6)
2	Loose or stray animals	282 (35.3)	351 (43.9)	123 (15.4)	43 (5.4)
3	Garbage	240 (30.0)	365 (45.7)	159 (19.9)	35 (4.4)
4	Unsupervised youth	165 (20.7)	339 (42.4)	233 (29.2)	62 (7.8)
5	Homelessness	133 (16.6)	461 (57.7)	143 (17.9)	62 (7.8)
6	Excessive noise	97 (12.1)	259 (32.4)	392 (49.1)	51 (6.4)
		<b><i>Mean</i></b>	<b><i>Std. Dev.</i></b>	<b><i>Range</i></b>	
<b>Total Perceived Disorder Problems</b>		<b>5.09</b>	<b>2.23</b>	<b>10</b>	

## Support for Sales Tax Increase

This section examines how demographics, experiences, and perceptions affect respondents' support for increasing the sales tax to improve Parsons police.

Table 4: Demographic Differences and their Impact on Supporting Sales Tax Increase displays the results of the sales tax question across the various demographic factors. To facilitate interpretation, many of these are condensed into two categories, listed in the table. The comparisons concerning differences in support for a sales tax increase across demographic factors (race, gender, marital status, education, household size, number of children, victimization, and income), a Chi Square test for independence was used to determine if the variation in the number of individuals within each category was significantly different. For the difference across age, perceived problems with disorder, perceived crime problems, and the total number of victimizations within the household in the past six months, a one-way analysis of variance was used to determine if differences in means were significantly different.

Neither race and ethnicity, marital status, household size, number of children, whether the respondent was victimized, and nor income level had an impact on the respondent's level of support. This indicates that there is no benefit towards targeting these specific groups with advertisements to gain their support for this measure. Additionally, there were no differences seen in the level of support for the sales tax increase across ages, nor total perceived crime and disorder problems. Thus, there is not likely to be a benefit in trying to convince those who perceive more crime and disorder problems in their area of the need for increased revenue, nor any benefit towards targeting different age groups.

However, other groups of Parsons residents seem to differ substantially in their support for the sales tax increase. First, more educated individuals tended to be more in-favor of the sales tax increase, with 53.8% of respondents with an Associate degree or above being very likely to support the sales tax increase in comparison to only 41.8% of respondents with only a high school diploma ( $X^2 = 7.571$ ,  $p = 0.023$ ). Moreover, female residents were more likely to indicate they would be very likely to support the sales tax increase ( $n = 177$ , 54.3% of all female respondents), compared to 45.7% of males ( $X^2 = 8.756$ ,  $p = 0.013$ ). Finally, those who had experienced more victimizations were less likely to support the sales tax increase compared to those who had experienced fewer ( $F = 3.336$ ,  $p = 0.036$ ), which may suggest an interaction between perceptions of the police and experiencing victimization.

Table 4: Demographic Differences and their Impact on Supporting Sales Tax Increase

	<i>Very Likely</i>	<i>Somewhat Likely</i>	<i>Not Likely</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Chi Square</i>
<b>White/Caucasian</b>	268	157	106	582	1.282 (p = 0.527)
<b>Racial or Ethnic Minority</b>	26	12	13		
<b>Male</b>	118	74	66	584	8.756 (p = 0.013)
<b>Female</b>	177	97	52		
<b>Unmarried</b>	124	85	56	575	2.359 (p = 0.307)
<b>Married</b>	164	84	62		
<b>H.S. or Below</b>	82	66	48	586	7.571 (p = 0.023)
<b>Associates or Above</b>	210	102	78		
<b>One-Person Household</b>	86	52	41	588	2.085 (p = 0.720)
<b>Two -Five</b>	201	115	83		
<b>Six +</b>	7	2	1		
<b>Zero Children in Household</b>	213	119	91	608	7.793 (p = 0.100)
<b>One Child</b>	45	46	21		
<b>Two plus</b>	37	24	12		
<b>Not victimized</b>	231	140	94	598	4.969 (p = 0.083)
<b>Victimized</b>	59	35	39		
<b>Les than \$15k Income</b>	9	5	8	506	20.299 (p = 0.062)
<b>\$15-24.9k</b>	25	29	12		
<b>\$25-34.9k</b>	26	17	12		
<b>\$35-49.9k</b>	49	27	24		
<b>\$50-74.9k</b>	52	29	18		
<b>\$75-99.9k</b>	46	21	8		
<b>\$100k +</b>	52	19	18		
	<i>Very Likely</i>	<i>Somewhat Likely</i>	<i>Not Likely</i>		
	Mean (S.D.)	Mean (S.D.)	Mean (S.D.)	F	p
<b>Age</b>	64.19 (14.81)	63.41 (15.71)	65.40 (13.58)	1.311	0.270



<b>Total Disorder Problems (n = 519)</b>	5.079 (2.150)	5.213 (2.233)	5.128 (2.	0.243	0.785
<b>Total Crime Problems (n = 560)</b>	6.513 (2.222)	6.656 (2.358)	6.480 (2.555)	0.179	0.836
<b>Total Victimizations (n = 598)</b>	0.352 (.815)	0.297 (.680)	0.534 (1.012)	3.336	0.036

Table 5: Differences in Community and Perceptions of Police and their Impact on Supporting Sales Tax Increase displays the differences in average opinions about their community or law enforcement depending on whether the respondent supports or opposes the proposed sales tax increase. Perceived safety is the only perception item in Table 5 in which the mean among supporters is statistically different than the mean among those opposing a sales tax increase. Importantly, no differences were noted in these perceptions based on whether the respondent had any interaction with law enforcement (not shown in table).

However, it is important to recognize that the statistics provided, and relationships described in this section do not represent how combinations of demographic, experiences, and perceptions impact support for the sales tax increase. Consequently, a more rigorous examination of the relationships described above must be conducted.

Table 5: Differences in Community and Perceptions of Police and their Impact on Supporting Sales Tax Increase				
	<i>Support Mean (S.D.)</i>	<i>Oppose Mean (S.D)</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
<b>Collective Efficacy*</b>	3.12 (.97)	2.83 (1.09)	2.966	0.003
<b>Perceived Safety*</b>	2.91 (.96)	2.75 (1.17)	1.536	0.126
<b>Community Quality</b>	3.49 (.99)	3.01 (.96)	5.376	0.000
<b>Police Legitimacy*</b>	4.11 (.88)	3.27 (1.22)	7.807	0.000
<b>Police Effectiveness*</b>	3.60 (.90)	2.84 (1.15)	7.460	0.000
<b>Desire for Police to be Present in Community</b>	2.07 (1.00)	1.74 (.97)	3.661	0.000
<b>Desire for Police to be Problem- and Community-Oriented</b>	3.83 (.96)	3.50 (1.11)	3.341	0.001
<b>Desire for Police to be Law Enforcement Focused*</b>	5.44 (.90)	5.03 (1.26)	3.774	0.000

NOTE: There are no differences noted in perceptions of community by whether the respondent had any interaction with law enforcement.

\*: Equal variance assumption violated – SPSS used un pooled variance and adjusted degrees of freedom to calculate t statistic

*Docking Institute of Public Affairs – Parsons Police Department Community Survey*

## Demographics and Public Support for Police's Impact on Opposition towards the Sales Tax Increase

Table 6: Demographics, Experiences, and Perceptions' Impact on Opposition to Sales Tax Increase displays three binary logistic regression models that predict whether someone will oppose a sales tax increase. This outcome measure was chosen because as most of the Parsons community provided some level of support for increasing the sales tax revenue collected to support law enforcement, the statistical models discussed below provide a clearer picture concerning opposition rather than support.

Model 1 examined the impact of demographic characteristics (Age, whether the respondent was a member of a racial or ethnic minority, whether they were female, unmarried, or had an Associate degree or above), and the number of times that they had been victimized. Three measures had a consistent impact on whether the respondent would oppose a sales tax increase. First, older individuals tended to oppose a sales tax increase ( $b = 0.015$ ,  $p = 0.050$ ), with residents becoming 1.6% more likely to oppose the increase for each year older they were. Additionally, those that had been victimized more often opposed the tax increase ( $b = 0.239$ ,  $p = 0.050$ ), as each victimization increased the likelihood that they would oppose it by 27%. However, female residents were much less likely to oppose a sales tax increase ( $b = -0.878$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). Female residents were 58% less likely to oppose a sales tax increase when compared to male residents. What is concerning about this model is the low Nagelkerke R Squared value of 0.066, which corresponds to less than ten percent of the overall variation in the responses.

Model 2 examined how the addition of respondents' perceptions of their community affected whether they would oppose the sales tax increase, accounting for the demographic characteristics and experiences. Older individuals tended to oppose the increase ( $b = 0.027$ ,  $p = 0.002$ ), with females being nearly 60% less likely to oppose it compared to males ( $b = -0.855$ ,  $p = 0.001$ ). However, the number of victimizations someone experienced had a negative effect when accounting for community perceptions ( $b = -0.005$ ,  $p = 0.001$ ). While this is a change from the results of Model 1, the extremely small effect of victimization on opposition to the sales tax increase ( $< 1.0\%$ ) means that the impact of this measure should be ignored.

Two perceptions of the community had consistent effects on respondents' opposition to the sales tax increase. First, perceiving the community as safer was associated with a significant increase in the likelihood that the respondent would oppose the measure ( $b = 0.318$ ,  $p = 0.037$ ), leading to a near 38% increase in the likelihood that they will oppose the increase. However, perceiving the police as legitimate authorities had a much stronger and more consistent impact; where respondents who perceive the police as legitimate are much less likely to oppose the sales tax increase ( $b = -0.664$ ,  $p = 0.002$ ). This corresponds to a 48% reduction in opposition to the measure. As a whole, this model explained much more variation than Model 1, with a Nagelkerke R Squared value of 0.223.

Model 3 incorporates how the respondent prioritized different police activities in the community, along with the factors described in the previous two models. Similar to Models 1 and 2, age and being female had consistent impacts. Individuals were more likely to oppose the sales tax increase if they were older ( $b = 0.027$ ,  $p = 0.003$ ), with female respondents being much less likely to oppose the increase ( $b = -0.807$ ,  $p = 0.002$ ). Race, education, marital status, and now the number of victimizations did not have a consistent effect on opposition to the sales tax increase. Of the perceptions of the community, only

*Docking Institute of Public Affairs – Parsons Police Department Community Survey*

Police Legitimacy had a consistent effect ( $b = -0.563$ ,  $p = 0.014$ ), with those perceiving the police as authority figures reducing the likelihood that they will oppose the measure by 43%.

Of the three groups of priorities for law enforcement, two had significant effects on the likelihood that the respondent would oppose the sales tax increase. First, those that believed that the police should have a more visible presence in the community were much less likely to oppose the sales tax increase ( $b = -0.326$ ,  $p = 0.020$ ). Similarly, those that wanted the police to adopt more problem- and community-oriented strategies were 22% less likely to oppose the increase ( $b = -0.258$ ,  $p = 0.041$ ). Model 3 explained more of the variation in the responses, with the Nagelkerke R Squared increasing to 0.247.

Taken together, the results mean that efforts to obtain community support for the sales tax increase should emphasize how the additional revenue will help the police act in a more legitimate fashion in the community. This may entail being more legitimate or adopting problem- or community-oriented policing tactics. Moreover, attempting to obtain support for the measure should not discount older or male individuals. Emphasizing the minimal impact that a sales tax increase will have on older individuals may be beneficial. Additionally, since females are much less likely to oppose the tax increase, discussing what men and women want the police to do and not do would be beneficial. This may help efforts to encourage support for the measure by emphasizing what particular groups want as a part of the increase in revenue for the police.

Table 6: Demographics, Experiences, and Perceptions' Impact on Opposition to Sales Tax Increase

	<i>B (s.e.)</i>	<i>p</i>		<i>B (s.e.)</i>	<i>p</i>		<i>B (s.e.)</i>	<i>P</i>
<b>Age</b>	0.015 (.008)	0.050		0.027 (.009)	0.002		0.027 (.009)	0.003
<b>Racial Minority</b>	0.154 (.385)	0.689		0.171 (.409)	0.676		0.222 (.418)	0.596
<b>Associate Degree and Above</b>	-0.246 (.231)	0.287		-0.309 (.249)	0.215		-0.312 (.253)	0.218
<b>Unmarried</b>	0.060 (.234)	0.796		0.020 (.253)	0.937		0.020 (.257)	0.939
<b>Female</b>	-0.878 (.233)	0.000		-0.855 (.257)	0.001		-0.807 (.261)	0.002
<b>Total Number of Victimizations</b>	0.239 (.122)	0.050		-0.005 (.152)	0.001		0.039 (.154)	0.799
<b>Collective Efficacy</b>	-	-		0.030 (.137)	0.824		-0.057 (.139)	0.682
<b>Perceived Safety</b>	-	-		0.318 (.152)	0.037		0.249 (.158)	0.115
<b>Community Quality</b>	-	-		-0.256 (.158)	0.105		-0.275 (.163)	0.092
<b>Police Legitimacy</b>	-	-		-0.664 (.218)	0.002		-0.563 (.230)	0.014
<b>Police Effectiveness</b>	-	-		-0.339 (.218)	0.121		-0.368 (.225)	0.103
<b>Visibility in Community</b>	-	-		-	-		-0.326 (.141)	0.020
<b>Problem- &amp; Community-Orientation</b>	-	-		-	-		-0.258 (.127)	0.041
<b>Proactive Investigations</b>	-	-		-	-		-0.089 (.119)	0.457
<b>Constant</b>	-2.199 (.580)	0.000		0.692 (.823)	0.401		2.549 (1.155)	0.027
<b>Total N</b>	609			609			09	
<b>Nagelkerke R Squared</b>	0.066			0.223			0.247	
<b>Hosmer &amp; Lemeshow</b>	11.182	0.192		3.217	0.920		7.462	0.488
<b>Model Chi Square</b>	24.086	0.000		85.675	0.000		95.543	0.000

## Appendix 1: Exploratory Factor Analysis Diagnostics

<b>Appendix 1: Exploratory Factor Analysis Diagnostics Table</b>							
Concept	Number of Questions	KMO	Bartlett's Test of Sphericity (p)	Eigen Value	Variance Explained	Rotation	Cronbach's Alpha
Collective Efficacy	8	0.903	1641.899 (0.000)	4.399	54.992	Varimax	0.527
Perceived Safety	6	0.839	809.298 (0.000)	2.855	47.590%	Varimax	0.795
Community Quality	14	0.839	2236.19 (0.000)	4.259	30.424%	Varimax	0.826
Police Legitimacy	14	0.962	5133.585 (0.000)	8.948	63.918	Varimax	0.942
Police Effectiveness	6	0.864	1539.007 (0.000)	3.782	63.031%	Varimax	0.914
Police Activity	12	0.833	2052.712 (0.000)			Varimax	0.841
Interactions with Public	5	-	-	1.655	13.792		
Problem & Community Orientation	4	-	-	4.179	34.829		
Proactive Investigations	4	-	-	1.185	9.877		

## Appendix 1: Questionnaire



*Dear Parsons Resident,*

*The Parsons, Kansas, Police Department is conducting a community survey gathering information about your perceptions of crime and policing in the City of Parsons. As your Police Chief, I would sincerely appreciate if you would take the time to complete the questionnaire. Your input will provide us with an updated understanding of the perceptions and wishes of the community. We will use the results to enhance policing services and to direct the department as we strive to provide the most responsive, cost-efficient, and compassionate police services possible to the Parsons community. I want to assure you that your answers are completely confidential.*

*The survey was developed using national benchmarks as part of a federal grant our agency received. The survey was developed at Southern Illinois University. The survey will be tabulated by the Docking Institute at Fort Hays State University to provide detailed and unbiased interpretation of the results.*

*To participate, please answer the questions that best represent your opinion. Your participation in this survey is voluntary and you do not need to answer every question. Please complete and return the survey in the postage paid envelope or drop it off to City Hall at 112 South 17<sup>th</sup> Street, or the Police Department front counter at 217 North Central. The deadline is Monday, February 13, 2023.*

***It is estimated that taking the survey will take approximately 15 minutes.***

*We will publish the results at a later time.*

*If you have any questions about the survey, please contact Deputy Chief Dennis Dodd at (620) 421-7060 or [ddodd@parsonspd.com](mailto:ddodd@parsonspd.com).*

***Robert L. Spinks***

*Robert Spinks, MA, MS  
Chief of Police*

*Docking Institute of Public Affairs – Parsons Police Department Community Survey*

## Community Concerns and Community Safety

---

1. What are your three biggest concerns related to public safety in Parsons?

---



---



---

How much of a problem are the following in your community?

Problem	A Big Problem	Somewhat of A Problem	Not a Problem
2. Homelessness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Drug/alcohol abuse	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Public intoxication	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Loose or stray animals	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Burglaries/break-ins	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Vandalism	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Cars broken into	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. Garbage/trash/litter	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10. Speeding	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11. Excessive noise	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
12. Mental health	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
13. Unsupervised youth	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
14. Prostitution	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

On a scale of 1 to 5 (where 1=poor and 5=excellent), please rate the quality of the following in Parsons.

Amenities	5 (Excellent)	4	3	2	1 (Poor)
15. Parks and playgrounds	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
16. Housing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
17. Housing affordability	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
18. Friendliness of neighbors	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
19. Availability of public transportation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
20. Availability of needed stores	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
21. Activities for youth	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
22. Neighborhood watch	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

*Docking Institute of Public Affairs – Parsons Police Department Community Survey*



23. Police protection	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
24. Trash service	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
25. Library	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
26. Churches	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
27. Childcare	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
28. Public schools	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Next, we are interested in how safe you feel in various situations.

Situation	Very Safe	Safe	Unsafe	Very Unsafe	Not Applicable / Don't Know
29. How safe do you feel walking in Parsons alone during the day?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
30. How safe do you feel walking in Parsons alone at night?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
31. How safe do you feel leaving your home unlocked while you are there?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
32. How safe do you feel inside your home after dark?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
33. How safe are children playing outside in the evening?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
34. How safe is traffic activity in Parsons?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Question	Increased	Decreased	Stayed the Same
35. Over the past six months, have your feelings of safety in Parsons:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

The following questions ask about your agreement with the statement pertaining to the level of cohesiveness within your community. Please state whether you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with each of the following statements.

Community Cohesiveness	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable/ Don't Know
36. I have a lot in common with my neighbors.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
37. My neighbors are willing to assist when I need their help.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Community Cohesiveness	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable/ Don't Know
38. My neighbors are close-knit.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
39. Most of my neighbors know me.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
40. In general, people in this neighborhood can be trusted.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
41. People in this neighborhood <u>do not</u> get along with each other.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
42. People in this neighborhood <u>do not</u> share the same values.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
43. People in this neighborhood work together to get problems solved.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

In the past 6 months have you, or anyone in your household:

Questions	Yes	No	Not Applicable/ Don't Know
44. Been threatened with a weapon for money or valuables?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
45. Had something taken from you by force?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
46. Been attacked by a stranger?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
47. Had someone break into your home or another building on your property?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
48. Had your property damaged and/or vandalized?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
49. Been sexually assaulted?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

The following set of questions pertain to the steps you personally may have taken to make your neighborhood or community safer. In the past 6 months, have you or anyone in your household:

Questions	Yes	No	Not Applicable/ Don't Know
50. Utilized exterior lighting at night for your home.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
51. Submitted an anonymous crime tip to Parsons Police Department.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
52. Inventoried personal property and serial numbers.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Questions	Yes	No	Not Applicable/ Don't Know
53. Volunteered with a local, non-profit organization.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Organization Name: _____			
54. Signed up with <a href="http://www.NextDoor.com">www.NextDoor.com</a> (Electronic Neighborhood Watch).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
55. Taken a self-defense class.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
56. Taken a defensive driving course.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
57. Accessed the Parsons Police website for crime information (e.g., press releases, annual report, "Roll Call" podcast, etc.).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
58. Have a home security survey conducted by the Parsons Police Department.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

The last set of questions ask your general sentiments about safety in Parsons.

Questions	Yes	No	Not Applicable/ Don't Know
59. I feel more aware of crime and policing issues now than a year ago.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
60. Crime has increased in Parsons in the last year.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
61. I would like to have a home survey conducted by the Parsons Police Department.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

## Police Effectiveness, Community Engagement, and Activities

Please select your level of agreement with each of the following statements about police in your community.

Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable/ Don't Know
62. Police effectively patrol the city of Parsons.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
63. Police effectively control crime in the city of Parsons.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
64. Parsons police are effective at traffic enforcement.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

*Docking Institute of Public Affairs – Parsons Police Department Community Survey*

65. Parsons police effectively work with residents to address problems in the community.

Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable/ Don't Know
66. Parsons police effectively respond to non-emergency matters.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
67. Parsons police respond quickly when people ask them for help.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
68. Parsons police provide the same quality of service to all community members.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
69. Parsons Police Department should hire more officers, even if it means reducing other city services.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
70. Parsons police officers should be paid more to retain experienced officers.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
71. Parsons police should involve the public in efforts to improve the quality of life in my community.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

72. If you agree/strongly agree Parsons police should involve the public, what specific efforts do you support?

---



---

Next, please rate how important you believe the following police activities are to your community.

Police Activity	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Not Applicable/ Don't Know
73. Vehicle patrols	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
74. Bicycle patrols	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
75. ATV patrols	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
76. Foot patrols	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
77. Community-policing (i.e. include community in strategic police decisions)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
78. Problem-oriented policing (i.e. police focus on specific problems in specific areas)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

79. Crime analysis	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
80. School resource officer/school patrols	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Police Activity	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Not Applicable/ Don't Know
81. Investigations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
82. Narcotics task force	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
83. Volunteer police service program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
84. Coffee with a Cop	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Next, we would like to ask about how police interact with members of your community.

Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable/ Don't Know
85. Parsons police are committed to helping the residents of my community.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
86. Parsons police would rather stay in their patrol cars than engage with the community.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
87. Parsons police care about the crime-related concerns of the people of this community.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
88. Community members and Parsons police work together to solve problems.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
89. Parsons police are usually fair.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
90. Parsons police are usually honest.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
91. Parsons police are usually courteous.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
92. Parsons police treat people equally under the law.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
93. Parsons police can be trusted to make decisions that are right for the people in this community.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
94. Parsons police work hard to make my community safe.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
95. Parsons police explain their actions to people.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

96. Parsons police take their time to listen to people.
97. I feel proud of the Parsons Police Department.
98. I am supportive of the Parsons Police Department.

## Contact and Satisfaction

---

Next, we would like to ask you about any contact you may have had directly with the Parsons Police Department in the last six months. In the past six months have you contacted the Parsons Police Department:

Questions	Yes	No	Not Applicable/ Don't Know
99. To report a crime	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If yes, were you satisfied with how you were treated?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If yes, were you satisfied with the outcome?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
100. To make a complaint	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If yes, were you satisfied with how you were treated?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If yes, were you satisfied with the outcome?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
101. To make a complaint about an officer	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If yes, were you satisfied with how you were treated?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If yes, were you satisfied with the outcome?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
102. While walking in the street	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If yes, were you satisfied with how you were treated?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If yes, were you satisfied with the outcome?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
103. For any other contact	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If yes, were you satisfied with how you were treated?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If yes, were you satisfied with the outcome?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

The Parsons Police Department is considering several ways of communicating information to the community. Please rate how likely you would be to see/hear information from each of the following:

Questions	Very Likely	Somewhat Likely	Not Likely
104. Television program/news	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
105. Radio broadcast	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
106. <a href="http://mobile.parsonspd.com/the-rap-sheet">http://mobile.parsonspd.com/the-rap-sheet</a> (Podcast)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
107. Blog	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

*Docking Institute of Public Affairs – Parsons Police Department Community Survey*

- 108. Website ([www.parsonspd.com](http://www.parsonspd.com))
- 109. Newsletter
- 110. Email
- 111. Facebook/Twitter/social media
- 112. [www.NextDoor.com](http://www.NextDoor.com) (Electronic Neighborhood Watch)
- 113. Other (Please list \_\_\_\_\_)

Amount of Service	Too Much	Right Amount	Not Enough	Not Applicable/ Don't Know	
114. The amount of service provided by the Parsons Police Department is:	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Overall Service	5 (Excellent)	4	3	2	1 (Poor)
115. Overall, how would you rate the service of the Parsons Police Department?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

General Satisfaction	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Not Applicable/ Don't Know
116. In general, how satisfied are you with the Parsons Police Department?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

## Funding

The current ½ cent public safety sales tax sunsets on December 31, 2023, and without its extension or increase, police and fire services could face reductions in staffing and service. This public safety sales tax means that visitors who shop in Parsons share some of the burden for public safety costs. If a new 1 cent public safety sales tax took effect now, it would make Parsons' overall sales tax rate equal to that of Pittsburg, Joplin, Coffeyville, and Independence.

117. If a new 1 cent public safety sales tax were passed, which of the following are very important activities it should fund in your opinion (check all that apply):

- Ensure competitive wages for police officers and fire fighters to retain trained & experienced staff.
- Purchase capital equipment such as a replacement fire truck to contribute toward maintaining the current Level 3 community fire rating for stable fire insurance rates.
- Provide for the replacement of emergency vehicle's (fire trucks & police vehicles).
- Provide for the upgrading of the police and fire department radio system.

*Docking Institute of Public Affairs – Parsons Police Department Community Survey*

- Provide partial funding for a new public safety center to replace an 80-year-old fire station and consolidate police operations into one building, (providing a match to federal funding and/or grants).
- Enhance fire and police training.
- Modernize equipment used by Public Works.

118. With the information presented above, how likely is it that you would vote for a 1 cent public safety sales tax to follow the current ½ cent tax when it sunsets at the end of 2023?

- Very Likely
- Somewhat Likely
- Not Likely
- Don't Know at this time

## Demographics

---

117. Approximately, how long have you resided in Parsons?

\_\_\_\_\_ years \_\_\_\_\_ months

118. In what year were you born? \_\_\_\_\_

119. With which gender do you identify?

- Male  Female  Other  Prefer not to answer

120. With which race do you identify?

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="radio"/> White/Caucasian        | <input type="radio"/> Pacific Islander     |
| <input type="radio"/> Black/African-American | <input type="radio"/> Other                |
| <input type="radio"/> Hispanic               | <input type="radio"/> More than one listed |
| <input type="radio"/> Asian                  | <input type="radio"/> Don't Know           |
| <input type="radio"/> Native American        | <input type="radio"/> Prefer not to answer |

121. What is the highest level of education completed?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Not a high school graduate/Did not earn GED | <input type="radio"/> Graduate Degree (MA, MS, PhD, JD, DDS, MD) |
| <input type="radio"/> High School Diploma/GED                     | <input type="radio"/> Other                                      |
| <input type="radio"/> Associated Degree/Trade School              | <input type="radio"/> Don't Know                                 |
| <input type="radio"/> Bachelor's Degree (BA, BS)                  | <input type="radio"/> Prefer not to answer                       |

*Docking Institute of Public Affairs – Parsons Police Department Community Survey*



122. Are you currently:

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Single             | <input type="radio"/> Widowed              |
| <input type="radio"/> Married            | <input type="radio"/> Don't Know           |
| <input type="radio"/> Separated/Divorced | <input type="radio"/> Prefer not to answer |

123. How many people currently live in your household, including yourself?

- |                            |  |
|----------------------------|--|
| <input type="radio"/> 1    | <input type="radio"/> 10 or more           |
| <input type="radio"/> 2-5  | <input type="radio"/> Don't Know           |
| <input type="radio"/> 6-10 | <input type="radio"/> Prefer not to answer |

124. How many people currently live in your household, who are under the age of 18?

- |                            |  |
|----------------------------|--|
| <input type="radio"/> 0    |  |
| <input type="radio"/> 1    | <input type="radio"/> 10 or more           |
| <input type="radio"/> 2-5  | <input type="radio"/> Don't Know           |
| <input type="radio"/> 6-10 | <input type="radio"/> Prefer not to answer |

125. What is estimated combined total household income per year?

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Less than \$15,000 | <input type="radio"/> \$50,000-\$74,999    |
| <input type="radio"/> \$15,000-\$24,999  | <input type="radio"/> \$75,000-\$99,999    |
| <input type="radio"/> \$25,000-\$34,999  | <input type="radio"/> \$100,000 or more    |
| <input type="radio"/> \$35,000-\$49,999  | <input type="radio"/> Prefer not to answer |