

142441

The Relative Importance of Race and Ethnicity on Citizen
Attitudes Toward the Police

By

Vincent J. Webb*
and
Christopher E. Marshall*

MAY 23 1992

142441

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by
Vincent Webb

University of Nebraska at Omaha

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Society of Criminology, November 3-7, 1992, New Orleans, LA.

*Department of Criminal Justice, the University of Nebraska at Omaha, Omaha, Nebraska, 68182

The empirical study of citizen attitudes toward the police has a rich tradition and has been deemed important for several different reasons. Some authors (Murty, Roebuck, and Smith, 1990) have suggested that positive images of the police are necessary in order for the police to function effectively and efficiently. Decker (1981) has argued that the police organization as a public sector organization needs community support in order to meet its goals. He identifies the "attitude-effectiveness" link as especially important in an urban society where the police are primarily reactive and dependent on the public for initiating police activity (p 80). Dunham and Alpert (1988) have pointed out that citizens in neighborhoods that reflect relatively distinct cultures have different values concerning the appropriateness of different police practices. These values are reflected in attitudes toward the police, and police practices that are incompatible with culturally based attitudes may result in ineffective policing (p 506). Murty, Roebuck, and Smith (1990) echo a similar proposition. In their view, as well as that of others (Radelet, 1986 and Skolnick and Bayley, 1986), negative attitudes toward the police result in "mutual ill feelings, lack of respect, disorder, and inefficient police functioning (p 280)". Greene and Decker (1989) point out that the nature of citizen attitudes toward the police and police attitudes toward citizens is an important determinant of whether or not the two groups will be able to work together to implement crime control programs. They note that this is an especially important consideration given the contemporary emphasis on policing strategies that strive to bring "the police and the community into greater interaction."

The research reported in this paper builds on the 30 year tradition of research on attitudes toward the police (ATP). Recent events in American urban centers (e.g. Rodney King and the

Los Angeles police), highlight the continued crisis in American police community relations and underscore the need to continue to examine the nature and source of citizen attitudes toward the police (ATP). Understanding the source of ATP can result in the development of more effective policies and programs for effective policing. In this paper, we are especially interested in reexamining factors that have been previously determined to be predictors of ATP in light of more recent studies that have examined the complexity of ATP across varying populations. Research on ATP has taken at least two different directions. Historically, most research has focused on identifying the determinants of ATP, but more recently, researchers have begun to explore the fundamental and complex structure of ATP. The research reported here attempts to bridge these two directions. From a policy perspective, if ATP is primarily a function of police-citizen interactions, then improving ATP in order to improve the effectiveness of policing would seem to call for strategies that modify police and citizen behavior. If the source of ATP is socialization and the transmission of culturally derived beliefs and values, then policies that focus on behavior may be insufficient, and interventions that impact socialization and alter culturally-based values may be in order. One of the goals of this research is to address these policy considerations.

The Determinants of Attitudes Toward the Police : Selected Literature

Several authors (Decker, 1981; Sullivan, Dunham, Alpert, 1987; and Murty, Roebuck, and Smith, 1990) have reviewed the research on attitudes toward the police extensively. Sullivan, Dunham, and Alpert (1987) point out that the research on ATP was popular in the 1960's and into the 1970's as a result of the events that took place during those years. As they note, the Presidents Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice (1967) was instrumental in generating a number of studies that examined ATP, especially with regard to

differences between Blacks and Whites. One of the early findings, and a finding that has persisted during the ensuing years, was that although citizens in general have favorable attitudes toward the police, the attitudes held by Blacks are less favorable than those held by Whites.¹ Most of these early studies indicated that the variable of race had the most important impact on ATP, although a 1959 study by Fultz indicated that contact with the police was the most important determinant of ATP.

In addition to race, several of the early studies examined the connections between gender, education, income, age, and occupation and ATP. Decker's (1981) review of research on attitudes toward the police is organized on the basis of individual-level and contextual variables. His review identifies four individual-level variables that are important predictors of ATP. These are: race, socioeconomic status, age, and gender. In addition to those studies already mentioned, the finding that ATP varies by race is widely supported in studies such as those reported by Hahn (1971); Zeit (1965); Jacob (1971); Campbell and Schuman (1972); Furstenburg and Wellford (1973); Hadar and Snortum (1975); Skogan (1978); Davis (1990); and Murty, Roebuck, and Smith (1990). It is important to note that the race variable for most of the early studies consisted of Blacks and Whites, with few other racial and ethnic groups being studied. Some exceptions are the inclusion of Hispanics by Carter (1983) and Cubans by Sullivan, Dunham, and Alpert (1987) and Dunham and Alpert (1988).

¹Murty, Roebuck, and Smith (1990) have noted two studies conducted in the 1950's that generated this same finding. See Douglas G. Gourley. Public Relations and The Police. Charles C. Thomas, Publishing Co., Springfield, Ill, 1953., and Larry W. Fultz. Public Relations and the Police: A survey of public opinion. University of Houston, Houston, Texas, 1959.

As Decker notes, the general finding that ATP varies by age, with younger citizens having less favorable attitudes toward the police than older citizens, has less consistent support. Studies by Campbell and Schuman (1972); Walker (1972); Smith and Hawkins (1973); Hadar and Snortum (1975); Feagin (1974); Dunham and Alpert (1988); Sullivan, Dunham, Alpert (1987); and Murty, Roebuck, and Smith (1990) have tended to support this finding, while other studies such as those by Jacob (1971) and Davis (1990) find little support for the age-ATP relationship.

The third individual-level variable considered by Decker (1981) in his review is socio-economic status. In Decker's assessment, research in support of a SES-ATP connection is more equivocal than for the relationships between race and ATP, and age and ATP. Two early studies (Walker, 1972; Jacob, 1971) provided some support for a SES-ATP connection. More recent studies, (Davis, 1991; and Dunham and Alpert, 1988) would seem to challenge the existence of an important relationship between socio-economic status and attitudes toward the police. As Decker (1981) points out, SES is intertwined with neighborhood culture which may be the more important predictor of ATP.

Gender is the fourth individual-level variable considered by Decker in his review. In his examination of works by Hadar and Snortum (1975); Campbell and Schuman (1972); and Winfree and Griffiths (1977), he concludes that gender is a relatively unimportant predictor of ATP. This conclusion is also supported by more recent research such as that conducted by Murty, Roebuck, and Smith (1990).

Contextual-level variables, including neighborhood culture, experiences with police, victimization, and experience with police programs make-up the second category of variables

considered by Decker in his 1981 review. Some early studies such as those conducted by Jacob (1971); and Schuman and Gruenberg (1972) indicate that the interaction between neighborhood and race is an important explanatory variable with regard to ATP. The more recent work of Dunham and Alpert (1988) also underscores the importance of neighborhood. In their study, they concluded that "It is very clear that there is more variation on attitude toward police practice among neighborhoods than within the neighborhoods". Indeed they concluded that the linkage was strong enough to justify the use of different police practices in different neighborhoods. A study conducted by Murty, Roebuck, and Davis (1990) produced similar findings. Their analysis indicated that the most important determinant of the probability of negative or positive attitudes toward the police was a neighborhood/residence variable. Citizens residing in low-crime neighborhoods tended to have more positive attitudes toward the police than citizens who resided in high-crime neighborhoods.

A second contextual-level variable that has received considerable attention in research on ATP is experience with the police or police contact. Decker has noted that citizen contacts with the police can be one of two types, voluntary and involuntary (p 83). In general, it appears that positive voluntary contacts have little impact on ATP, while negative contacts, voluntary or involuntary, have an important impact (Jacob, 1971; Walker, 1972; Furstenberg and Wellford, 1973; Parks, 1976; Winfree and Griffiths, 1977; and Murty, Roebuck, and Smith, 1990).

Decker's (1981) summary of the research on ATP seems to apply not only to the studies he reviewed, but to those studies conducted in more recent years. He concluded that two of the four individual level variables, race and age, were clearly important predictors of ATP, whereas evidence in support of importance of the remaining two, socioeconomic status and gender, was less convincing. The contextual variables of neighborhood culture and contact with the police

as predictors of ATP have research support, unlike victimization and experience with police programs.

The Nature of Attitudes Toward the Police

Much of the research on attitudes toward the police mentioned above has emphasized independent variables, i.e. the determinants of attitudes toward the police, and paid less attention to the dependent variable - attitudes toward the police. Historically, ATP research has encompassed several different attitude dimensions and several different measures of the dependent variables. In a way, the dependent variable, attitudes toward the police, has been ignored in ATP research, or perhaps if not ignored, taken for granted. For example, the excellent Decker (1981) review of ATP research has no discussion of the measurement of ATP. Few empirical studies of ATP have employed rigorous measurement scale development techniques, and only a few have evaluated ATP measures using standard techniques. It can be argued then, that until recently, ATP research was unsophisticated with regard to measuring ATP.

Traditionally, the measurement of ATP has employed a number of evaluative dimensions including assessments of police performance, police services, police resources, police officer characteristics, and police practices. Such measures have been applied uniformly across study populations without a great deal of consideration for the appropriateness of the measure for different groups, especially different racial and ethnic groups. As Sullivan, Dunham, and Alpert (1987) point out after considering ATP differences among ethnic groups:

While the studies....compare attitudes of different groups, none examines the underlying structures of these attitudes or the possibility that fundamental differences exist among the various groups. Research on attitudes in general, however, indicates that attitudes are rarely unidimensional, but are in fact multidimensional, multifaceted and complex. Hence, simplistic measures of attitudes are useful only when the people sampled share the same conception of the attitudes (p 179).

In other words, research comparing Blacks and Whites may make inappropriate use of a common ATP measure if in fact the underlying structure of ATP differs for Blacks and Whites. Indeed, these authors point to research of Scaglione and Condon (1980) as providing evidence of dissimilar cognitive structures for Blacks and Whites.

In their 1987 article, Sullivan, Dunham, and Alpert report on research that examines the structure of attitudes toward the police for different age and ethnic groups. They selected thirty questions that had been previously used in ATP studies, and administered the questions to samples of Anglo, Black, and Cuban adults and students. Using factor analysis, they were able to identify 7 relatively distinct ATP factors and demonstrate that the subpopulations in their study exhibited attitude structures that were similar in some respects and dissimilar in others. They concluded that age and ethnicity are the variables primarily responsible for differences in attitude structure.

In another article Dunham and Alpert (1988) report findings from research on ATP differences in five Miami neighborhoods that they conceptualize as "culturally distinct" (p 507). The neighborhoods studied varied on the basis of ethnicity (Cuban, Black, Anglo) and social class. Using attitude scales and statements gleaned from previous research that they regarded as having "withstood the test of time with regard to reliability and the validity of testing" (p 509), they administered thirty items to a sample of high school students, a sample of police officers, and a sample of residents. They then conducted a factor analysis and were able to identify five ATP domains: Demeanor, Responsibility, Discretion, Ethnic, and Patrol. Their analysis indicates relatively distinct differences in ATP among neighborhoods, and considerable consensus in ATP within neighborhoods.

In sum, although there is a rich tradition of ATP study, most of the studies in this tradition have emphasized the identification of variables that serve as predictors of ATP and have placed considerably less emphasis on the basic structure and measurement of ATP. The more recent efforts described above have demonstrated important differences in attitude structure when such independent variables as ethnicity, age, and neighborhood are considered. The research reported here examines traditional ATP predictor variables using the more recent approaches to the measurement of ATP. We are interested in sorting out the relative importance of the different types of ATP predictor variables while using more complex measures of ATP.

Methods and Procedures

The research reported here is part of more general study of urban conditions and services in the metropolitan area of Omaha, Nebraska (MSA 650,000). The sample includes 229 Blacks, 210 Hispanics, and 351 Whites. Nearly all of the Blacks and Hispanics in the sample are from two relatively distinct neighborhoods, while the Whites are from neighborhoods scattered across the city. The data analyzed here were collected through a telephone survey that was conducted in the spring of 1991.

ATP Measures

Five scales were used to measure attitudes toward the police. Four of these scales were replications of those developed and used by Dunham and Alpert (1988). The fifth scale was one that we have developed and used in three previous studies.

The four scales taken from Dunham and Alpert (1988) were Officer Demeanor (ODEM), Responsibility for Crime Control (RCC), Discretion (DISC), and Active Patrol Strategies (APS).² It should be noted that the names of these scales have been slightly modified for purposes of this paper. The fifth scale taps attitudes toward the professional and personal characteristic of police officers, and is referred to as the Officer Characteristics (OCHR) scale. Dunham and Alpert (1988 : 511-512) describe their scales as follows.

1. Demeanor: This scale consists of eight questions which measure the subject's perceptions of the general demeanor of police officer or his orientation toward citizens.
2. Responsibility: This scale consists of two questions concerning the role of the police and citizens in controlling crime.
3. Discretion: Two questions are involved in this scale, which measure agreement with the need for variability in enforcing the law and especially in stretching procedural safeguards in some neighborhoods or areas.
4. Patrol: Two questions comprise this scale, which measures the approval of active patrol strategies, such as stopping and questioning people walking down the street and stopping cars for random checks.

The fifth scale Officer Characteristics consists of 9 items designed to measure agreement or disagreement with personal and professional characteristics or attributes of police officers such as honesty, prejudice, communication skills, response skills, and so on.

Dunham and Albert reported reliability coefficients (Alphas) for their scales as .88 for Demeanor, .71 for Responsibility, .43 for Discretion, and .66 for Patrol. The reliability coefficients obtained in the present study are: Demeanor (.75); Responsibility (.85); Discretion

² Originally, we planned to use the Ethnic scale reported by Dunham and Alpert (1988). Pre-testing indicated that a substantial number of respondents were likely to refuse to respond to the items for that scale, (e.g. "The police are justified in regarding a hispanic as one who needs to be watched more than others). This sort of item may not work very well when using telephone survey methodology.

(.17); Patrol (.54) and Officer Characteristics (.73). It should be noted that several of the items taken from Dunham and Albert were slightly modified to make them city/department specific. Appendix A provides the wording for each of the 23 items used in this study. A five point Likert type scale was used with the responses ranging from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree. Keying of responses was adjusted so that higher item or scale scores reflect positive ATP.

Item means and standard deviations for the overall sample as well as for Blacks, Whites, and Hispanics are presented in Appendix B. Nearly all of the items comprising the Demeanor and Character scales have means exceeding 3.0 which indicates slightly positive ATP. Nevertheless, a comparison of means indicates significant differences among ethnic groups on all but four of the items that make up these two scales. Averages for the items that comprise the Responsibility, Discretion, and Patrol scales are lower indicating less agreement with the scale items. A comparison of the means indicates significant differences among ethnic groups on all but one of the items.

In general, the differences in item means on all of the scales is consistent with findings from previous research. Whites tend to be most positive followed by Hispanics and then Blacks. The analysis of item means also supports Sullivan, Dunham, and Albert's (1987) finding that the ATP structures of different ethnic groups exhibit both similarities and differences.

Predictor Variables

Four sets of variables that have been used in previous ATP research were included in the present study. They consist of both individual-level and contextual variables.

1. Demographic variables. Two demographic variables, gender and age were used. Gender was coded 1 for males and 0 for females. Age was grouped into 3 categories with 1 representing the youngest and 3 the oldest.

2. Social Class. Two indicators were used, education and income. Education was coded using five values with 1 representing the lowest number of years (less than grade eight) and 5 the highest (graduate/professional school). Income was coded using eleven values with 1 representing the lowest and 11 the highest.
3. Contact with police. Contact with police used two indicators, whether or not a respondent had called for service, and whether or not a respondent had been stopped by police. For both indicators a value of 1 represents contact and 0 represents no contact.
4. Race-ethnicity. On the basis of self-identification, respondents were placed into one of three categories, Black, Hispanic, and White. Since we were interested in the separate effects of each race-ethnic category, we constructed two indicator variables, one for Hispanics and Blacks. For both variables, 1 indicates that the respondent was from the racial-ethnic group with the other racial-ethnic group being suppressed.

In the analysis reported here, race/ethnicity, which is usually treated as an individual-level variable, was placed into a separate category for two different reasons. First, since race has been shown to be such an important predictor of ATP in past research, we wanted to isolate its effects, both analytically and conceptually, from other variables used in the analysis. Second, in general, the Black and Hispanic populations in this study reside in one of two relatively compact geographic areas within the city and the effects of the race/ethnicity variables may in part be due to neighborhood and cultural differences. In other words, race/ethnicity may serve as indicators of distinct social rather than individual-level properties.

Analysis and Findings

Initially, each of the five ATP scales was regressed on the four sets of variables using Ordinary Least Squares Regression. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 1. The total R^2 was significant for each model.

(Table 1, about here)

The demographic and race variables set make statistically significant contributions on the Officer Demeanor scale (ODEM), with the race variable set being by far the largest contributor (.099) to the total amount of variance explained by the four variable sets ($R^2 = .126$). The social class and police contact variables contribute very little in terms of R^2 and are non-significant.

An examination of the regression analysis for the Officer Characteristics (OCHR) scores indicates that three of the four variable sets (demographic, police contact, race) contribute significantly to the total R^2 explained by the model (.18). Nearly all of the variance explained is due to the race variable set (R^2 change = .137).

The four variable sets account for very little of the variance in Responsibility for Crime Control (RCC) scores. The total R^2 for the model is only .067 with the demographic and race variable sets making significant contributions. Once again, nearly all of the variance accounted for by the model is due to the race variable set ($R^2 = .054$).

The total R^2 for the Discretion scale (DISC) is only .027, the demographic variable set making the only significant contribution. Race is the only variable set that significantly contributes ($R^2 = .043$) to the regression model for Active Patrol Strategies (APS). The total R^2 for the model is .053.

Table 2 provides both standardized (beta) and raw regression (B) coefficients, and t tests for the five ATP regression models. Three variables, age, Hispanic, and Black, are significant predictors of Officer Demeanor (ODEM) scores. Older respondents have more favorable ODEM scores, and being Hispanic or being black results in less positive ODEM scores. The magnitudes

of the betas indicated that being Black (-.34) is the most important predictor variable followed by being Hispanic (-.13) and Age (.11).

(Table 2, about here)

Five variables are significant predictors of Officer Characteristic scores (OCHR): Gender, Age, Stopped by Police, Hispanic, and Black. Female and older respondents have more positive OCHR scores than males and younger respondents. Respondents stopped by the police, Hispanic respondents, and Black respondents tend to have less favorable OCHR scores than their counterparts. The relative magnitude of these five betas indicate that Black (-.40) is the most important predictor variable followed by Hispanic (-.17), Stopped by the Police (-.13), Age (.11), and Gender (.10).

The Black and Hispanic variables are the only significant predictors of Responsibility for Crime Control (RCC) scores. The beta is .25 for Hispanic and .12 for Black.

Black is the only significant predictor in the model for Discretion scores with a beta of -.22. For Active Patrol Strategy scores, age is the only significant predictor with a beta of -.13., indicating that younger respondents have higher APS scores.

Discussion

The findings from this analysis are generally consistent with those found in the ATP research literature. Race variables have the greatest effects, with age, gender, and police contact, having significant, but small effects on certain ATP dimensions.

The analysis indicates that the largest effects are for the ATP scales that tap officer demeanor and officer characteristics. None of the variables used in the analysis explain much of the variation in the ATP scales that tap responsibility for crime control, discretion, and active patrol strategies.

When compared to Hispanic and White respondents, Blacks were less likely to agree with positively worded statements about police officer demeanor. Hispanics also were less likely than Whites to agree with such statements. The race effect is even stronger when agreement/disagreement with statements about police officer characteristics is examined. Blacks and Hispanics are less likely than Whites to agree with positive statements about the personal and professional characteristics of police officers.

Hispanic respondents were most likely to agree with statements that asserted that only the police can control crime at the neighborhood level, and a smaller, but significant effect was found for Black respondents. The pattern is different when responses to statements about police discretion are examined. The only significant effect is for Black respondents who were less likely than Hispanics or Whites to agree that it is necessary for the police to stretch procedural safeguards, and less likely than Hispanics or Whites to agree that police are more strict in some neighborhoods than in others. This response pattern appears to be inconsistent, with Blacks being less supportive of stretching procedural safeguards while at the same time disagreeing with the assertion that the police are stricter in some neighborhoods than others. This apparent inconsistency suggests that the two demeanor items are a relatively independent dimension of ATP, and do not tap a common ATP dimension. The reliability for the DISC scale was quite low ($\text{Alpha} = .17$), which reflects inconsistency in the responses to these items and supports the contention that the items are not measuring a common ATP dimension. This is consistent with Dunham and Albert's (1988) finding regarding responses to this scale.

Only one significant effect was found for the statements dealing with active patrol strategies. Younger respondents were most likely to disagree with statements that reflected aggressive patrol strategies.

In general these findings reaffirm the importance of race and ethnicity on attitudes toward the police. We are unable to separate potential neighborhood effects from racial and ethnic effects in the present study since the vast majority reside in geographical areas that are not well defined as neighborhoods. However, we strongly suspect that race and ethnicity are by far the strongest and most important effects since our findings show that their impact on ATP is far greater than indicators of neighborhood differences such as income. Neighborhoods as meaningful units of social organization vary in importance from one city to the next, and this needs to be taken into consideration when making generalizations about the importance of neighborhoods in the development and transmission of attitudes toward to police. In some cities, the primary institutions of socialization other than the family, such as schools, are located in the immediate neighborhood, and in other cities they are located outside the immediate neighborhood. For example, it seems reasonable to expect that for youth, both formal and informal peer group settings, such as schools, and non-school social gathering spots may be important venues for shaping and transmitting ATP, and these settings may or may not be within the immediate neighborhood of residence. Omaha is a case in point. For example, each high school serves several different neighborhoods, as do popular youth gathering spots such as malls and cruising strips.

From a policy perspective, the findings reported here would seem to indicate that improving attitudes toward the police requires the modification of shared values and perceptions

that seem to be related only indirectly to police behavior. Only one significant effect on ATP for contact with police was detected. Policies aimed at modifying the nature of police-citizen contact, while socially desirable, may have little impact on ATP among a communities minority residents, since these residents have less favorable attitudes regardless of police contact.

Future studies of ATP would do well to focus more specifically on the development of attitudes toward the police. Studies that identify the stages of development of ATP in youth may prove to be extremely useful in understanding the distribution of different dimensions of ATP among various populations. Additional studies of the various dimensions of ATP that result in reliable and valid instruments for measuring ATP is another area of research that is needed.

In sum, differences in ATP among racial and ethnic groups is a well established finding. Although the exact source of attitudes toward the police remains to be determined, the findings here reaffirm the proposition that race and ethnicity are important; strategies for providing police services need to take this into consideration.

REFERENCES

Campbell, Angus and Howard Schuman

- 1972 "A comparison of black and white attitudes and experiences in the city. In The end of innocence: A suburban reader, Charles Harr (ed), pp 97-110. Glenview, Il: Scott Foresman.

Carter, David

- 1983 "Hispanic Interaction with the Criminal Justice System in Texas: Experience, Attitudes, and Perceptions" Journal of Criminal Justice 11:213-

Decker, Scott H.

- 1981 "Citizen Attitudes Toward The Police." Journal of Police Science and Administration 9,1:81-87.

Dunham, Roger G, and Geoffrey P Alpert

- 1988 "Neighborhood Differences In Attitudes Toward Policing: Evidence For A Mixed-Strategy Model of Policing In A Multi-Ethnic Setting." The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology 79, 2:504-521.

Feagin, Joe R.

- 1970 "Home defense and the police: Black and white perspectives." American Behavioral Scientist 13:797-814.

Fultz, Larry W.

- 1959 Public Relations and the Police: A Survey of Public Opinion Houston, TX: University of Houston.

Furstenberg, Frank F., and Charles Wellford

- 1973 "Calling the Police: The evaluation of police service. Law and Society Review 7:393-406.

Gourley, Douglas G.

- 1953 Public Relations and The Police Springfield, Il: Charles C. Thomas Publishing, Co.

Greene, Jack R., and Scott H. Decker

- 1989 "Police and Community Perceptions of the Community Role in Policing: The Philadelphia Experience." The Howard Journal 28, 2:105-121.

- Hadar, Ilana and John R. Snortum
1974 "The eye of the beholder: Differential perceptions of police by the police and public." Criminal Justice and Behavior 2:37-54.
- Hahn, Harlan
1971 "Ghetto assessments of police protection and authority." Law and Society Review 6:183-184.
- Jacob, Herbert
1971 "Black and white perceptions of justice in the city." Law and Society Review. 5:69-89.
- Murty, S. Komanduri, Roebuck, Julian B., and Joann D. Smith
1990 "The Image of the Police in Black Atlanta Communities." Journal of Police Science and Administration 17, 4:280-287.
- Parks, Roger B.
1976 "Police response to victimization effects on citizen attitudes and perceptions. In Sample surveys of the victims of crime Wesley G. Skogan (ed) pp. 84-104. Cambridge, MA:Ballinger.
- Radelet, Louis A.
1986 The Police and The Community. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.
- Smith, Paul E., and Richard O. Hawkins
1973 "Victimization, type of police contacts and attitudes toward the police." Law and Society Review 8:135-152.
- Skogan, Wesley G.
1978 "Citizen satisfaction with police services: Individual and Contextual effects." Police Studies Journal 469-479.
- Skolnick, Jerome H., and David H. Bayley
1986 The new blue line: Police innovation in six American cities. New York: The Free Press.
- Sullivan, Peggy S., Dunham, Roger G., and Geoffrey P. Alpert
1987 "Age Structure of Different Ethnic and Age Groups Concerning Police." The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology 78, 1:177-196.

The President' Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice
1967 Task Force Report: The Police. Washington D.C.:Government Printing
Office.

Walker, Darlene

1972 "Contact and support: An empirical assessment of public attitudes
toward the police and the courts." North Carolina Law Review
51:43-79.

Winfree, Thomas L, and Curt Griffiths

1971 "Adolescent attitudes toward the police." In Juvenile Delinquency:
Little brother grows up. Ted Ferdinand (ed) pp. 79-99. Beverly
Hills: Sage Publishing Co.

Zeitz, L.

1965 "Survey of Negro attitudes toward the law." Rutger Law Review
19:288-316.

APPENDIX A. ATP SCALE ITEMS

Officer Demeanor:

Omaha police officers are usually courteous
Omaha police officers are respectful toward people like me
Omaha police officers use more than they need to in carrying out their duties
Most police officers are usually friendly
Most police officers are usually rude
Most police officers give people a chance to explain
Police officers enjoy kicking people around
Police offices show concern when you ask them questions

Officer Characteristics:

Omaha police officers are honest
Omaha police officers are physically fit
Omaha police officers are prejudiced against minority persons
Omaha police officers are hardworking
Omaha police officers are well trained
Omaha police officers are not able to answer citizens' questions correctly
Omaha police officers don't communicate very well
Omaha police officers respond quickly to calls for service
Most police officers are liars

Responsibility for Crime Control:

Only the police can control crime in this area
Only the police can control crime in my neighborhood

Discretion:

In order to prevent crimes and catch criminals, the police are sometimes required to stretch the search and seizure laws and other procedural safeguards
The police are more strict in some neighborhoods than in others

Active Patrol Strategies:

In some neighborhoods, crime preventing requires that police officers stop people walking down the street and ask them where they are going or what they are doing
A good police officer is one who patrols aggressively by stopping cars and checking people who look suspicious

APPENDIX B: COMPARISON OF ATP ITEM MEANS FOR SAMPLE AND SUB-SAMPLES

ATP ITEMS	Overall Omaha Sample		White		Black		Hispanic		F
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Officer Demeanor:									
Omaha police officers are usually courteous	3.38	1.05	3.39	1.15	3.33	.97	3.43	.95	.54
Omaha police officers are respectful toward people like me	3.48	.92	3.36	.98	3.37	.90	3.50	.81	.05
Omaha police officers use more force than they need to in carrying out their duties ^b	3.17	.96	3.53	.83	2.70	.99	3.09	.88	57.44*
Most police officers are usually friendly	3.62	.78	3.72	.73	3.46	.89	3.64	.78	7.72*
Most police officers are usually rude ^b	3.64	.77	3.89	.61	3.36	.90	3.57	.71	36.40*
Most police officers give people a chance to explain	3.35	.89	3.44	.88	3.21	.92	3.34	.86	4.34*
Police officers enjoy kicking people around ^b	3.59	.84	3.92	.65	3.13	.91	3.50	.79	70.94*
Police officers show concern when you ask them questions	3.50	.81	3.64	.76	3.36	.86	3.43	.78	9.24*
Officer Characteristics:									
Omaha police officers are honest	3.42	.89	3.52	.88	3.16	.91	3.54	.79	13.76*
Omaha police officers are physically fit	3.38	.90	3.89	.89	3.37	.92	3.39	.90	.02
Omaha police officers are prejudiced against minority persons ^b	3.09	.98	3.52	.84	2.63	.95	2.90	.93	69.63*
Omaha police officers are hardworking	3.45	.90	3.55	.86	3.25	.99	3.49	.81	7.98*
Omaha police officers are well trained	3.50	.87	3.57	.88	3.34	.88	3.34	.89	5.83
Omaha police officers are not able to answer citizens' questions correctly ^b	3.35	.87	3.65	.73	3.11	.90	3.14	.91	35.56*
Omaha police officers don't communicate very well ^b	3.33	.90	3.60	.78	2.96	.96	3.31	.86	35.24*
Omaha police officers respond quickly to calls for service	3.25	.95	3.39	.88	3.01	1.03	3.28	.95	10.66*
Most police officers are liars ^b	3.76	.72	4.03	.59	3.41	.82	3.69	.65	55.95*
Responsibility for Crime Control:									
Only the police can control crime in this area	2.48	.95	2.27	.83	2.50	.97	2.80	1.02	22.13*
Only the police can control crime in my neighborhood	2.50	.95	2.29	.87	2.56	.99	2.76	.98	16.40*
Discretion:									
Police are sometimes required to stretch procedural safeguards	2.74	.95	2.87	.99	2.57	.89	2.71	.91	6.72*
The police are more strict in some neighborhoods than in others	2.39	.76	2.50	.81	2.09	.60	2.36	.78	16.73*
Active Patrol Strategies:									
Police stop people walking down the street and ask them where going or what doing	2.85	.98	2.63	.93	3.07	1.03	2.96	.94	15.23*
Good police officer one who patrols aggressively by stopping cars & checking	2.27	.98	3.06	.98	2.88	.99	2.90	.97	2.74

a = sample size varies due to missing data on some items; overall n = 801; White n = 331-341; Black n = 212-225; Hispanic n = 192-208. b = scoring reversed to correspond to other scale items.

**TABLE 1 Contribution of Independent Variables to Attitudes Toward Police Scales
(OLS Regression)**

Independent Variable Set	ODEM		OCHR		RCC		DISC		APS	
	R ² Change	F	R ² Change	F	R ² Change	F	R ² Change	F	R ² Change	F
Demographic	.016	6.25*	.02*	6.92*	.011	4.71*	.023	8.99*	.003	1.21
Social Class	.003	1.20	.003	1.52	.001	.73	.000	.19	.002	.77
Police Contact	.007	2.94	.015*	6.58*	.003	1.35	.002	.84	.007	.26
Race	.099	38.78*	.1379*	29.05	.054	22.52*	.002	.83	.043	16.31*
Total R ²	.126	12.35*	.180	17.61*	.067	6.96*	.027	2.58*	.053	4.99*

* p < .05

TABLE 2 Standardized (and Unstandardized) Regression Coefficients
for ATP Scales (OLS Regression)

Independent Variables	SCALE															
	<u>ODEM</u>			<u>OCHR</u>			<u>RCC</u>			<u>DISC</u>			<u>APS</u>			
	beta	B	t	beta	B	t	beta	B	t	beta	B	t	beta	B	t	
<u>Demographic</u>																
Gender	.07	.61	1.93	.10	.88	2.64*	.02	.10	.83	-.03	-.10	-1.03	.08	.28	2.28	
Age	.11	.60	2.95*	.11	.66	3.12**	.10	.24	2.94	.04	.07	1.20	-.13	-.28	-3.60*	
<u>Social Class</u>																
Education	-.03	-.03	-1.08	-.01	-.01	-.39	-.01	-.00 ^a	-.34	.04	.01	1.24	-.02	-.00 ^a	-.54	
Income	-.04	-.00	-1.14	-.05	-.01	-1.60	-.04	-.00 ^a	-1.13	.00 ^a	.00 ^a	--	.01	.00 ^a	-.33	
<u>Contact with Police</u>																
Called for Service	-.05	-.38	-1.46	.009	.009	-.007	-.04	-.13	-1.20	.00 ^a	.01	.17	-.01	-.02	-.27	
Stopped by Police	-.06	-.46	-1.70	-.13	-1.00	-3.54***	-.03	-.10	-.92	.02	.05	.67	-.04	-.12	-1.21	
<u>Race</u>																
Hispanic	-.13	-1.33	-3.47**	-.17	-1.73	-4.34***	.25	1.04	6.66***	-.05	-.17	-1.45	-.01	-.04	-.32	
Black	-.34	-3.27	-8.80***	-.40	-4.07	-10.52***	.12	.49	3.28***	-.22	-.63	-5.65***	.04	.14	1.02	

* p < .05
 ** p < .01
 *** p < .001
 a value < .01