

1-2-2013

# A Juvenile Perspective: What Affects Attitudes Of African American, Hispanic, And White Youth Toward The Police.

Rodney Lamon Lake  
*Wayne State University,*

Follow this and additional works at: [http://digitalcommons.wayne.edu/oa\\_dissertations](http://digitalcommons.wayne.edu/oa_dissertations)

---

## Recommended Citation

Lake, Rodney Lamon, "A Juvenile Perspective: What Affects Attitudes Of African American, Hispanic, And White Youth Toward The Police." (2013). *Wayne State University Dissertations*. Paper 778.

This Open Access Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@WayneState. It has been accepted for inclusion in Wayne State University Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@WayneState.

**A JUVENILE PERSPECTIVE: WHAT AFFECTS ATTITUDES OF AFRICAN  
AMERICAN, HISPANIC, AND WHITE YOUTH TOWARD THE POLICE.**

by

**RODNEY LAMON LAKE**

**DISSERTATION**

Submitted to the Graduate School

of Wayne State University,

Detroit, Michigan

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

**DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**

2013

MAJOR: SOCIOLOGY

Approved by:

---

Advisor

Date

---

---

---

---

---

## **DEDICATION**

This project is dedicated to those that have always pushed me to go further and to be better. Granddaddy, it does not seem real that you have gone on to be with the Lord. This degree and every opportunity that comes along with it is dedicated to you. A man with only a fourth grade education, but raised me to value education and instilled in me a work ethic. You were my hero, role model, strength, and for most of my life the person whom I thought was my biological father. This project and degree is dedicated to my grandmother who raised me and always supported me in my academic endeavors. To you, I say thank you. To my mother, the person that brought me into this world as a single mother, I hope I made you proud. I could not go on without dedicating this project to Nover and Flossie Childs. You all have gone on to be with the Lord as well, but you all taught me how to read. You all sat me down each day and made me read aloud to you.

Getting through this past year or two, would not have been possible without the prayers of Apostle Don W. and Bonita A. Shelby (Burning Bush International Ministries). You all believed in me when I did not even believe in myself or did not feel I had the strength to go on. In addition, there are some who I would like to dedicate this project and degree to, who were there with me from day one. Kenya Crews, you never stopped believing in me and giving me inspiring words that made this journey a little easier. Chandra Lake, you was the fuel that propelled me to believe that I could do anything I sat my mind to. Even though things were hard at times, you never stopped believing and praying for me and for that I am eternally grateful. Lastly to my son (Rodney Lamon Lake II), this project and degree is dedicated to you. I hope that what I have done lays a foundation for you to build upon and that educationally you achieve more than I could ever dream of. You are a great child and I am so proud to say I'm your dad.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are some people who without their help and guidance this project would still be a seed in my mind. First I would like to thank Dr. Heather Dillaway for her unwavering support, listening ear, vote of confidence, and patience. You said that you would see me to the end you did. You are a great asset to Wayne State and the Sociology Department. I would like to also thank Dr. Leon Wilson, Dr. Mary Cay Sengstock, and Dr. Khari Brown for being on my committee. Also, I want to thank Dr. Monica White for her time and encouragement during the last three years. Dr. Bonnie Wu, I want to thank you for helping me with my literature review. Two individuals that went out of their way to help with my statistical analysis were Keith Welker and Devon Witherell from the Research Design and Analysis Consulting Unit. You guys were always willing to meet with me and went above and beyond what was required of you. To Chris Cowen and Michelle Love, thanks for putting up with me and listening to the crazy things I had to say. There are many friends that I made along the way that gave me support and encouragement: Bridgette Johnson, Dr. Brenda Marshall, Dr. Sasha Drummond-Lewis, Dr. Meena Sharma, Henry Wells, Omari Jackson, and Charlotte Winston.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Dedication .....	ii
Acknowledgements .....	iii
List of Tables .....	viii
List of Formulas .....	ix
Chapter 1 Introduction .....	1
Purpose of Study .....	2
Overview of Study .....	4
Summary .....	5
Contributions of the Project .....	6
Limitations of Study .....	7
Chapter 2 Literature Review .....	10
Introduction .....	10
Research on the Significance of Race, Age, Gender, and Class on Juveniles' ATP .....	14
Race .....	14
Age .....	18
Gender .....	20
Class .....	21
Research on the Significance of Contact with the Police on Juveniles' ATP .....	22
Research on the Significance of Neighborhood Characteristics on Juveniles' ATP .....	24

Neighborhood Safety.....	24
Neighborhood Appearance.....	26
Research on the Significance of Prior Victimization on ATP.....	27
Research on the Significance of Parental Authority on Juveniles' ATP.....	28
Research on the Significance of Commitment to School on Juveniles' ATP.....	30
Research on the Significance of Involvement in Delinquency on Juveniles' ATP.....	31
Conclusion.....	33
Chapter 3 Theoretical Framework.....	37
Introduction.....	37
Social Bond Theory and Juveniles' ATP.....	37
Conflict Theory and Juveniles' ATP.....	40
Hypotheses.....	43
Chapter 4 Methodology.....	45
Data Collection for the Current Study.....	45
Sample.....	50
Limitations of Sample.....	50
Definition and Measurements.....	51
Dependent Variable.....	51
Independent Variables.....	52
Information on the 2006 Study.....	57

Comparison of Measurements of Similar Variables in 2006 Study & Current Study.....	59
Conclusion.....	63
Chapter 5 Analysis and Findings .....	65
Introduction.....	65
Juveniles' Overall Attitudes Toward the Police.....	66
Univariate Analysis of White Juveniles .....	71
Univariate Analysis of Black Juveniles .....	78
Univariate Analysis of Hispanic Juveniles.....	85
Conclusion.....	92
Racial Differences based on Univariate Results .....	94
ANOVA Results.....	95
Correlation Results .....	100
Racial Differences based on Bivariate Results .....	105
Multivariate Analysis of Juveniles' Attitudes Toward the Police .....	108
Blacks Compared to Whites .....	108
Hispanics Compared to Whites.....	113
Blacks Compared to Hispanics .....	118
Multivariate Analysis of Juveniles' Attitudes Toward the Police (Continued) .....	127
Determinants of White Juveniles' ATP .....	127
Determinants of Black Juveniles' ATP.....	131

Determinants of Hispanic Juveniles' ATP .....	135
Racial Differences based on Multivariate Results .....	143
Conclusion to Results' Section .....	144
Chapter 6 Conclusion .....	154
Conclusion.....	154
References .....	168
Abstract.....	181
Autobiographical Statement .....	183



## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Juveniles' Attitudes Toward the Police .....	68
Table 2: Juveniles' Attitudes Toward the Police (Recoded) .....	70
Table 3: Univariate Analysis (Whites) .....	77
Table 4: Univariate Analysis (Blacks) .....	84
Table 5: Univariate Analysis's (Hispanics).....	91
Table 6: ANOVA Results .....	99
Table 7: Correlations Results.....	102
Table 8: Blacks ATP Compared to Whites.....	112
Table 9: Hispanics ATP Compared to Whites.....	117
Table 10: Blacks ATP Compared to Hispanics .....	122
Table 11: Determinants of White Juveniles' Attitudes Toward the Police.....	128
Table 12: Determinants of Black Juveniles' Attitudes Toward the Police .....	132
Table 13: Determinants of Hispanic Juveniles' Attitudes Toward the Police .....	136

## LIST OF FORMULAS

Formula 1: Race- Blacks vs. Whites.....	109
Formula 2: Race- Hispanics vs. Whites.....	114
Formula 3: Race- Blacks vs. Hispanics .....	119

## **CHAPTER ONE**

### **INTRODUCTION**

Race is one of the most powerful variables explaining public attitudes toward the police (Skogan, 2006). The majority of studies on race and attitudes toward the police have concluded generally that African Americans are less satisfied with the police than Whites. The emphasis on Black-White comparisons when looking at attitudes has left unanswered many questions about differences across minority groups, especially attitudinal differences between Hispanics/Latinos and African Americans (Martinez, 2007). For example, do Hispanics and African Americans have similar views of the police? Are there similarities and differences in regards to the variables that affect the respective attitudes of Hispanics and African Americans toward the police? Is there an overall difference in the attitudes toward police held by White, African American, and Hispanic juveniles? Are there age and gender differences in the attitudes toward police held by White, African American, and Hispanic juveniles? Those are just a couple of the questions that have gone unanswered in reference to African American and Hispanic groups as it concerns their attitudes toward police.

Historically, African Americans and Hispanics/Latinos have had little in common with each other, besides their membership in a subordinate class (Schaefer, 2006). On the other hand, while both groups have competed against each other for jobs, housing, and other resources, social and political pundits have observed that in some areas both groups have mutual interests that include fear of crime, safety in neighborhoods, and the way in which they are treated by police officers (Skogan And Hartnett, 1997). Because of the need for updated and current scholarly research on these two groups, this study will determine what variables (race, age, gender, class, self-esteem, prior victimization, contact with police, neighborhood context,

parental authority, commitment to school, involvement to delinquency, and involvement in pro-social activities) affect the attitudes of African American, Hispanic, and White juveniles' toward the police.

### **PURPOSE**

Politicians, community activists, social scientists, and sociologists have paid close attention to the relationship between police and citizens. Many researchers have explored the attitudes of adults towards the police and then generalized these findings to youths. However, few studies have examined the attitudes juveniles hold toward the police and the consequences such attitudes have on the relationship between police and juveniles. More importantly, of the existing studies on the relationship between the public and the police, most have failed to assess the attitudes of minorities in more than one racial category. The emphasis of previous research on Black-White comparisons has left many questions unanswered about differences in minority groups' attitudes toward the police, especially between Latinos and African Americans (Martinez, 2007; Cheurprakobkit, 2000; Culver, 2004; and Correia 2010). In addition, relatively few studies have examined immigrants' perceptions of the criminal justice system or the police (Correia 2010). It is a known fact that in the United States, Hispanics/Latinos constitute the largest and fastest-growing minority population (Schaefer 2006). Therefore, in instances where minority groups' attributes vary no longer can they be combined to form one "non-White" group and used for statistical analysis. In light of the limitations in existing literature, that is, (1) Juveniles' attitudes toward the police not receiving much research attention, (2) Blacks and Hispanics racial categories not being separated into two distinct categories in statistical analyses, and (3) Hispanic juveniles being ignored in scholarly research, the purpose of this study is to

determine the different attitudes of African American, Hispanic, and White juveniles' toward the police and the reasons for possible differences in racial/ethnic attitudes.

In fulfillment of the purpose stated above, this study will use secondary data collected between 2004 and 2005 by primary researcher Finn-Aage Esbensen and his research team. The data set chosen is entitled "Outcome Evaluation of the Teens, Crime, and the Community/Community Works (TCC/CW) Training Program in Nine Cities across Four States, 2004-2005." The Teens, Crime, and the Community and Community Works (TCC/CW) program, was a collaborative effort by the National Crime Prevention Council (NCPC) and Street Law, Inc., developed in an effort to reduce adolescent victimization. The data and the results of their evaluation are stored at the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR), which is part of the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan (data set No. 25865 in this archive). These data are instrumental in answering the following research questions concerning African American, Hispanic, and White juveniles:

- What are juveniles' overall attitudes toward police?
- Do Blacks and Hispanics hold similar or different attitudes toward police?
- Are variables such as race, gender, age, class, prior police contact, prior victimization, and neighborhood context still found to be determinants of juveniles' attitudes toward the police, like they are in previous studies?
- Does commitment to school, involvement in delinquent activity, and respect for parental authority determine juveniles' attitudes toward police?
- Which variables explain the most variance in juveniles' attitudes toward the police?

## OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

This proposal consists of several chapters. Chapter Two features an extensive review of the relevant literature on the determinants of the public's attitudes toward the police. I discuss empirical findings on the effect, impact, or influence on attitudes toward the police of variables such as: race, age, gender, class, contact with police, neighborhood characteristics (neighborhood's safety, neighborhood's appearance, and neighborhood involvement), prior victimization, commitment to school, involvement in delinquent activity, parental authority. I conclude Chapter Two by summarizing highlights within the literature.

Chapter Three introduces the theoretical framework for the study and outlines the two theories that will be utilized to help explain findings: social bond theory and conflict theory. Chapter Three also presents the hypotheses for the study.

Chapter Four presents the research methods of this study. It describes the secondary data set ("Outcome Evaluation of the Teens, Crime, and the Community/Community Works (TCC/CW) Training Program in Nine Cities across Four States, 2004-2005") used for analysis in this project. Chapter Four then provides detailed information about the independent and dependent variables of this study. Also, detailed information is provided (overview, data used, and findings) about a 2006 study ("A Juvenile's Perspective: Juveniles' Attitudes Toward the Police" (Lake, 2006) which is the first part of this pilot study that resulted with the composition of a master's thesis and will be used to compare/contrast the proposed study's findings. Chapter Four concludes with a comparison of similar measurements used in the 2006 study and the 2012 proposed study.

## SUMMARY

Race/ethnicity has been found to be one of the most salient factors in predicting attitudes toward the police. Very little, however, is known about minorities' attitudes toward the police and specifically, whether what we know about factors that shape attitudinal similarities and differences between Whites and African Americans can be applied to Hispanics. This study is designed to fill this void. It aims at comprehensively studying the attitudes of minority juveniles (specifically, Blacks and Hispanics) toward the police, and how those minority attitudes compare to White juveniles' attitudes. These ethnic groups have vastly different historical, cultural, and social backgrounds from those of their White counterparts in the U.S. (Cheurprakobkit, 2000). Historically, Blacks were brought to America as slaves, defined and treated as second class citizens, and were subject to enforcement practices by police that made everyday living difficult. On the other hand, Hispanics who immigrated to the U.S. constantly deal with issues of immigration and deportation from law enforcement, and are seen as a threat to Whites and Blacks for employment and other resources. A study of this kind is very timely and highly important considering the rapid growth and enormous potential Hispanic/Latino immigration into the U.S. and immigration being the subject of many heated debates across the country today (Schaefer, 2006). The findings from this study can significantly expand the existing literature on race and attitudes toward the police/policing in general. In addition, results from this study could direct policy makers and police administrators to develop policing strategies and field tactics that can facilitate positive communication between police and minority juveniles (specifically, Blacks and Hispanics).

## **CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE PROJECT**

This project is extremely important because results from this project will serve to add and update the existing literature on the topic. Frank et al. (1996) pointed out that, since most of the previous studies were conducted, considerable changes have occurred in policing in the residential social context (the context within which urban police agencies operate). The most notable change has been an increased representation of African Americans and other minorities in urban communities (Correis, 2010). Thus, this study's emphasis on analyzing African Americans, Hispanics, and Whites' attitudes will provide valuable new information. Information will be revealed as to whether there are similarities or differences in overall attitudes toward police and whether there are similarities or differences in what affects the attitudes of minorities (specifically, African Americans and Hispanics) toward police. As importantly, in simply analyzing Hispanics, this study will be one of few that provide an analysis of one of the largest and fastest growing minority populations in the U.S. While police attention to African American youths is frequent and familiar, little is known about how Hispanic youths respond to the police—perhaps in part because their experiences with the police are assumed to be less common than African Americans' (Lurigio et. al, 2009).

Unlike other studies, this project also will look at independent variables that have not received much attention in previous research on the topic, such as juveniles' prior victimization and neighborhood characteristics, as noted by Hurst and Frank (2000). In addition, limited research has been conducted that analyzes the effect of social institutions on juveniles' attitudes toward police. Specifically, this project will add and update the literature as it relates to commitment to school and involvement in delinquent activity. Further, the project will add to the sparse knowledge on whether respect for parental authority affects minority juveniles' attitudes



toward the police. The research on these variables needs to be expanded so that we can assess the effects of these variables on juveniles' attitudes toward the police. Self-esteem has not received any attention in prior research either and, thus, will be analyzed in this study. Studying self-esteem will allow me to see if it has an impact on juveniles' attitudes toward police. There are many ways in which this research project will add valuable and updated information to the limited, outdated research on juveniles' attitudes towards the police.

Lastly, this study's findings will be compared to findings from a smaller body of work that was completed in 2006 (*A Juveniles Perspective: Juveniles' Attitudes Toward the Police*, by Lake (2006)). This comparison will allow me to see if variables that were determinants of attitudes toward the police in my Master's thesis work will still hold true in my dissertation work, or whether the landscape of this topic has changed. In addition, due to the fact that the data for both projects was collected by the same principal investigator (Esbensen, Finn-Aage), this project affords me the ability to see if different measurements of the same variables have an effect on the variables that affect juveniles' attitudes.

### **LIMITATIONS OF STUDY**

While this study will provide valuable information on the attitudes of African American, Hispanic, and White juveniles toward the police, there are limitations that must be acknowledged. The limitations are similar to those studies that use data collected from public school surveys. The survey was administered in a public school; therefore, there is an exclusion of students from private, vocational, and alternative schools. Because students in private schools may have different experiences with the police, their attitudes may likewise be different. Thus, determinants of attitudes may not be the same. Also, students that had dropped out of school or who were juvenile delinquents in detention facilities at the time of the study were not included.

Those juveniles under state custody may have experienced significantly different social and economic experiences than other juveniles. The juveniles who dropped out of school might have a negative attitude toward the police because they may see police as problem makers instead of problem solvers. These are issues that will be left unresolved. Only the schools that were offering the Teens, Crime, and the Community/Community Works (TCC/CW) program were included. Because of the schools selected and the location (nine in Arizona, one in New Mexico, two in Massachusetts, and three in South Carolina) of these schools, the sample is not representative of students across the nation and strong generalizations cannot be made to the entire adolescent population.

From a data perspective, the data that will be used were not designed with my purpose in mind of determining the foundations of African American, Hispanic, and White juveniles' attitudes toward the police. Since the data used will be secondary data (i.e., collected by and for someone for another purpose) no new or differently measured variables could be created for this study. If additional variables were discovered while composing the literature review, there is no way to measure or analyze these variables. This study also has a limitation that has plagued almost all other existing research on public attitudes toward the police: -it mainly examined citizen-related factors, such as citizens' demographic characteristics, experiences, and neighborhood contexts. No matter how complicated such studies may be, they tend to reveal only half of the picture. For example, they reveal the public or citizens' side of the story, while ignoring the other half of the picture-- the police side. In addition, while some previous research and this current study do examine the role that police-citizen contacts play in shaping juveniles' attitudes of the police, many other factors, such as officer demeanor during police-citizen encounters, officers' perceptions of the public, police training in community policing (especially

as it relates to dealing with minority communities), and departmental policies, strategies for policing, and police culture were not included but need to be considered. No research project is complete, however. Putting aside these limitations, results of this the project can advance the literature on African American, Hispanic, and White juveniles' attitudes toward the police.

## **CHAPTER TWO** **LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **Introduction**

A good deal of research has explored the public's perceptions of the police. However, most studies have focused exclusively on the attitudes of adults. Comparatively, little research has been done concerning the determinants of juvenile attitudes toward the police (Borrero, 2001; Frank et al., 1996; Hurst & Frank, 2000; Hurst et al., 2000; Leiber et al., 1998; Taylor et al., 2001; Webb & Marshall, 1995). As a matter of fact, even less literature exists that employs a theoretical framework in order to better understand juveniles' attitudes toward the police and other authority figures in their lives. In fact, one can safely say that juvenile attitudes toward police and other authority figures are a relatively unexplored topic of research. Only within the last few years have researchers tried to expand the literature and make concerted efforts to examine the complexity of this subject (see, for example, Amoroso and Ware 1983; Hurst and Frank 2000; Levy 2001; & Taylor et al. 2001). This gap in the research is very unfortunate because there is a lack of understanding of what determines juveniles' attitudes toward law enforcement. In addition, because of the lack of research concerning juveniles' attitudes politicians, social scientists, and police administrators have made the mistake of generalizing findings from the adult literature to youths.

Although juveniles have not received much attention, research on citizen attitudes toward the police was initiated during the 1960s (Bayley & Mendohlson, 1969; Boggs & Galliher, 1975; Campbell & Schuman, 1969; Piliavin & Briar, 1964; President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, 1967; Zeitz, 1965). Much of this research was initiated by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice

(1967) because of the social unrest occurring throughout the country. It has been argued that the social unrest during this time period was due to police practices (Goldstein, 1977) that contributed to racial riots in Los Angeles, Miami, and Detroit (Hahn, 1971). These events and the research initiated by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice have resulted in three decades of research focusing on citizen attitudes toward the police. The Commission found that from the complaints filed against police, there was a problem in the relationship between police and ghetto dwellers (President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, 1967).

Prior research has examined the relationship between citizen characteristics such as gender, race, age, and attitudes toward the police. Some researchers have suggested that individual characteristics are not the best predictors of citizen attitudes toward the police. Jesilow, Meyer, and Namazzi (1995) claimed that perceptions of the police are not closely related to factors such as race, gender, or even length of residence, but rather the neighborhood or community within which one resides is an important predictor of attitudes toward the police. In their update of Decker's (1981) review of research on citizen attitudes toward the police, Brown and Benedict (2002) however found that race and age are important, and contact with the police and neighborhood are the most consistent predictors of citizen attitudes toward the police. More recent research has found that the relationship between neighborhood context and socioeconomic status are important to an understanding of attitudes toward the police. Nevertheless from the literature that exists, the common independent variables used to assess juveniles' attitudes have been race, gender, age, previous contacts with the police, class, different neighborhood contexts, and prior victimization.<sup>1</sup> In most studies that analyze the attitudes of

---

<sup>1</sup> Examples of this include the following studies: Brandl et al. (1994), Cao et al. (1996), Decker (1981), Fine, Freudenberg, Payne, Perkins, Smith, & Wanzer (2003), Frank et al. (1996), Griffiths & Winfree (1977), Hurst &

juveniles, many employ a dependent variable that is created from a scale item ranging from three to ten questions to form a composite variable on perceived behavior and characteristics of police using a Likert-type scale (from strongly agree to strongly disagree) to measure responses. Examples of items used to construct the dependent variable of prior studies include questions like police: are smart, really try to help you when you are in trouble, are honest, are rude, are hard working, are friendly, and are respectful.

The questions mentioned above have been grouped together in many prior studies to form the variable attitudes toward the police and run through several statistical tests along with the independent variables to test the researchers' hypotheses. One of the most used statistical procedures done to study the topic of attitudes toward the police at the multivariate level is regression analysis, specifically ordinary least squares regression (OLS). This statistical test is used to analyze the effect that each individual independent variable has on a respondent's overall attitude toward the police (dependent variable) while controlling for all of the remaining independent variables in the model. In looking at the prior research on this topic, most studies analyze this topic quantitatively using surveys and questionnaires to collect data from respondents. Nearly all of the previous research has been conducted in majority White settings (Howell, Perry, and Vile, 2004). Therefore, the research has taken place in cities that were composed of majority White residents and probably policed by a department that resembles its majority residents. Prior research has normally concentrated on analyzing what affects the attitudinal differences toward police between Blacks and Whites. Past studies have used the category of minority to group all minorities and analyzed them as "non-White." This emphasis on Black-White comparisons has left unanswered many questions about differences in minority

---

Frank (2000), Hurst et al. (2000), Jesilow, Meyer, & Namazzi (1995), Leiber et al. (1998), Lowe & Alston (1981), Murty et al. (1990), Peek et al. (1995), Percy (1986), Smith & Hawkins (1973), and Taylor et al. (2001)

group attitudes toward the police, especially the attitudinal differences between Latinos and African Americans (Martinez, 2007).

In general, what is known about attitudes toward police is that, overall, people have positive attitudes toward the police. However when looking at attitudes by race, Whites hold more favorable attitudes toward the police than non-Whites (e.g., Taylor et al., 2001). Leiber et al. (1998) found that members of the lower class were more likely than others to harbor negative attitudes toward the type of authoritative behavior control personified by the police. Regarding gender, women generally hold a more positive view of police than males (Cao et al., 1996). Overall, young people have less favorable attitudes toward the police than do older adults (Borrero, 2001; Cao et al., 1996; Decker, 1981; Hurst & Frank, 2000; Hurst et al., 2000; Jesilow et al., 1995; Smith & Hawkins, 1973; Webb & Marshall, 1995). Lastly, prior victimization affects juveniles' attitudes when they hold police responsible for the victimization (Frank et al., 1996).

Finally, the literature suggests many important reasons why researchers should examine juveniles' attitudes toward the police. First, juveniles make up a significant portion of the population subject to police contact and arrests (Hurst et al., 2000; Hurst & Frank, 2000; Leiber et al., 1998; Snyder & Sickmund, 1996). Second, police are usually the first and only criminal justice officials with whom juveniles have contact (Hurst & Frank, 2000). Finally, since the time most of the studies on attitudes toward the police were conducted (the 1960s and 1970s), considerable change has occurred in policing and in the social context in which urban police agencies operate (Frank et al., 1996). For example, the racial composition of most communities and towns has changed drastically (Hispanics becoming the new minority) and juveniles' involvement in violent crimes has steadily increased. For example, the juvenile murder arrest

rate in 2007 was 4.1 arrests per 100,000 juveniles ages 10 through 17, however, this was 24% more than the 2004 low of 3.3 (Puzzanchera, 2009). It is for these reasons that this study seeks to analyze what are determining factors of minorities' (i.e., African Americans' and Hispanics') attitudes toward police. This study will also compare African American, Hispanic, and White juvenile attitudes to determine the similarities and differences among juveniles' attitudes.

### **Research on the Significance of Race, Gender, Age, and Class on Juveniles' Attitudes Toward the Police**

The following section discusses the results of previous research on the significance of several important socio-demographic variables on juveniles' attitudes toward the police. The variables, which are independently examined, are juveniles' race, age, gender, and class.

#### **Race**

The relationship between race and citizens' attitudes toward the police is by far the most investigated demographic (Decker, 1981) and powerful (Skogan 2006) variable in research on attitudes toward police. Leiber, Nalla, & Farnsworth (1998) found that respondents' race was the strongest predictor of attitudes concerning police fairness and discrimination. Leiber et al. (1998) interviewed a randomly selected sample of 337 male juveniles within a racially stratified population of known delinquents in one of four Iowa counties. Other researchers have agreed that race is the most important variable when looking at attitudes toward the police. Sullivan, Dunham, & Alpert (1987) reported that most studies found Blacks to be less favorable than Whites in their judgments of different aspects of law enforcement, and some reported that race was a more important predictor than age, gender, or socioeconomic status (class). Sullivan et al. (1987) conducted interviews with a representative sample of adults and students (African Americans, Anglo, and Cuban) from five different neighborhoods in Miami, Florida. Sullivan et



al. (1987) used factor analysis to examine the participants' attitudes toward police by looking at officers' demeanor, ethnicity, and the respondents' neighborhood.

Whites and Asians hold significantly more favorable attitudes toward the police than do African Americans (Taylor et al., 2001). Taylor et al. (2001) reached this conclusion after exploring the attitudes of 5,477 eighth graders in 11 U.S. cities, using *t* tests, frequency tables, and one-way analyses of variance (ANOVA) to analyze the data. In addition, Taylor et al. (2001) used race, gender, and city of residence as the independent variables and a seven-item, Likert-type scale for the answer choices. The dependent variable asked students to answer whether they "strongly agreed," "agreed," "neither agreed nor disagreed," "disagreed," or "strongly disagreed" with the following statements: Police are honest; Most police officers are usually rude; Police are hard working; Police are usually friendly; Police are courteous; Police are respectful toward people like me; and Police are prejudiced against minority persons.

When looking at which group of juveniles has the least favorable attitudes toward police, most research suggests that it is African Americans, at least when comparing Whites versus Blacks. A fairly consistent research finding is that non-Whites (principally African Americans) are less satisfied with police services than are Whites. Consequently, Whites generally have more favorable attitudes toward the police (Cao, Frank, & Cullen, 1996; Fine, Freudenberg, Payne, Perkins, Smith, & Wanzer, 2003; Frank et al., 1996; Hurst & Frank, 2000; Hurst et al., 2000; Leiber et al., 1998; Peek et al., 1981; Smith & Hawkins, 1973; Albrecht & Green, 1977; Brown & Coulter, 1983; Campbell & Schuman, 1972; Correia, Reisig, & Lovrich, 1996; Davis, 1990; Decker, 1981; Decker & Smith, 1980; Erez, 1984; Flanagan & Vaughn, 1996; Jefferis, Kaminski, Holmes, & Hanley, 1997; Kaminski & Jefferis, 1998; Mastrofski et al., 1998; Murty et al., 1990; Peak et al., 1992; Reisig & Parks, 2000; Sampson & Jeglum-Bartusch, 1998;

Scaglione & Condon, 1980; Skogan, 1978; Thomas & Hyman, 1977; Tuch & Weitzer, 1997; Walker, 1997; Webb & Marshall, 1995). Reports show that Black juveniles tend to view police as hostile, negative, corrupt, unfair, and harsh, as Hurst and Frank (2000) found. Fine et al. (2003) came to a similar conclusion in their study of 911 New York urban juveniles and young adults (ages 16 to 21). Their respondents were stratified by race, ethnicity, gender, and borough and asked juveniles about their experiences with, attitudes toward, and trust of adult surveillance in communities and schools.

Although a majority of the research shows that Blacks have a more negative attitude toward the police when compared to their White counterparts, Frank, Brandl, Cullen, & Stichman (1996) found the opposite. Frank et al. (1996) found that Blacks hold a more positive attitude toward the police than Whites. Their results were concluded from data obtained through a telephone survey of 560 residents of Detroit. Frank et al. (1996) collected data by using a cluster sampling procedure in a predominately Black and poor area in the city of Detroit. They used multivariate analysis to analyze three attitudes toward the police that household residents over the age of 18 held: (a) global attitudes, (b) attitudes toward the job the police were doing in maintaining order on the streets and sidewalks, and (c) attitudes toward the job the police were doing in controlling the sale and use of drugs. In addition, they looked at demographic factors such as gender, age, income, and education. It is important to note that during the conducting of their study the social context of the city of Detroit had changed whereby, most of the local government officials (mayor, city council, and etc.) and members of the police rank-and-file were African American.

While most studies mentioned above indicate that Whites have a more favorable attitude toward the police, some literature has begun to suggest that there are differences in attitudes

among minority racial groups (Lurigio, Greenwood, & Flexon 2009 and Cheurprakobkit 2000). Lurigio et al. (2009) found that Latino students had a more favorable attitude toward the police. They concluded that Latinos were more likely than Blacks to remain respectful to police even in the face of police disrespectfulness and Latinos' prosocial views made youths more favorably toward police than Blacks (Lurigio et al. 2009). Lurigio et al. (2009) reached these conclusions after analyzing 943 surveys administered to students enrolled in 18 Chicago public schools. The study consisted racially of 55 percent Black, 28 percent Latino, 7 percent White, and 3 percent Asian. In addition, Cheurprakobkit (2000) found that Blacks had less favorable attitudes toward the police than either Whites or English speaking and non-English speaking Hispanics. Cheurprakobkit (2000) study examined the impact of police contacts and language spoken (English versus Spanish) on citizens' attitudes toward police performance. The data analysis was based on a telephone survey of 251 residents in Odessa and Midland, Texas who had contact with the police. Other findings that relate to Hispanics and their attitudes include: Hispanics are in the middle ground between Whites and Blacks in rating attitudes toward police (Lasley 1994) and Hispanics (1) evaluated police less favorably than the general public, (2) were more fearful of crime than the general public, (3) felt that they received inadequate police protection (Carter, 1983), and (4) believed that officers had a negative attitude and discriminated against Hispanics (Carter, 1985).

Research findings reported in the literature consistently show that race is a statistically significant predictor of attitudes toward the police. More specifically, much research shows that non-Whites consistently report more negative attitudes toward the police. Specifically, Blacks appear to have an attitude toward the police that is less favorable than Whites and Hispanics.

However there is little research on the exact variations in attitudes towards police across minority juveniles, and thus more comparative research is needed.

### Age

Age also appears to influence attitudes toward the police (Brown & Coulter, 1983; Cao, Frank, & Cullen, 1996; Chandek, 1999; Chermak, McGarrell, & Weiss, 2001; Correia, Riesig, & Lovrich, 1996; Huang & Vaughn, 1996; Jesilow et al., 1995; Kaminski & Jefferis, 1998; Koenig, 1980; Kusow, et al., 1997; Lasley, 1994; Marenin, 1983; Mastrofski, Parks, Reiss, & Worden, 1998; Murphy & Worrall, 1999; Murty, Roebuck, & Smith, 1990; Percy, 1980, 1986; Reisig & Correia, 1997; Reisig & Giacomazzi, 1998; Sampson & Jeglum-Bartusch, 1998; Schafer, Huebner, & Bynum, 2003; Smith & Hawkins, 1973; Thornton, 1975; Thurman & Reisig, 1996; Worrall, 1999). Peek et al. (1981), in their analysis of a 1973 national poll of a probability sample of non-institutionalized civilian Americans, found that while Blacks were less favorable toward the police than any other racial group, age was a stronger predictor than race. Age is a very common variable of interest in studies of public attitudes toward the police (Jesilow et al., 1995). In general, young people have less favorable attitudes toward the police (Borrero, 2001; Cao et al., 1996; Decker, 1981; Hurst & Frank, 2000; Hurst et al., 2000; Jesilow et al., 1995; Smith & Hawkins, 1973; Webb & Marshall, 1995). Jesilow et al. (1995) stated that older citizens in their sample were more likely to say positive things about the police than were younger respondents. The researchers conducted 538 interviews in Santa Ana, California, to determine which of their variables (ethnicity, gender, age, education, length of residence, contact with police, and neighborhood) were the best predictors of positive attitudes toward the police.

Hurst and Frank (2000) found that as people get older, they tend to believe that the police play a legitimate role in protecting the status quo. The researchers examined the determinants of

juveniles' attitudes toward police, using surveys from 852 urban and suburban ninth-through-twelfth-grade students in Cincinnati, Ohio. Using multivariate analysis, their study looked at age, race, gender, school, victimization, and crime within/outside neighborhood, crime visible within/outside of neighborhood, and police conduct and interactions with citizens. One of the important findings in this context is that juveniles tended to report more negative attitudes toward the police than did adults. Interestingly, Hurst, Frank, and Browning (2000) found that as the age of juveniles increased their perceptions of the police became more positive.

In support of the fact that younger citizens have a more negative perception of police, Hurst and Frank (2000) and Smith and Hawkins (1973) found that young people were more likely to have negative police contact because they have higher victimization rates. Smith and Hawkins (1973) cross-tabulated the citizens' ages with the citizens' colors to assess age and race differences among their sample. Their study used data collected by a survey of 1,411 households in Seattle, Washington, in 1968. They found that a majority of White juveniles held positive attitudes toward police (61 percent), whereas most non-White juveniles' views were negative (56 percent). In general, Hurst, McDermott, and Thomas (2005) found that juvenile girls' attitudes differ by race with Black girls having more negative attitudes toward the police.

In looking at the location of where the juveniles reside, Hurst (2007) examined juvenile attitudes toward police in rural areas and found that rural teens may be more supportive of police than teens residing in urban areas. Hurst arrived at this conclusion after analyzing data collected using self-administered surveys distributed to high school students from four rural towns in Southern Illinois. Specifically the sample consisted of White and Black ninth through twelfth graders. Hurst (2007) examined the attitudes of rural youths toward the police by using as independent variables: race, age, gender, school, victimization, and police-citizen contact. The literature here

is consistent in that younger people have more negative attitudes toward police than their older counterparts.

### **Gender**

Overall, women hold more positive views toward the police because their contact with the police is generally less antagonistic than that of men (Cao et al., 1996). Cao et al. (1996) collected data by mailing questionnaires to 1,000 (57.7% response rate) randomly selected residents in the city of Cincinnati, Ohio, in 1992. The variables they used to determine respondents' confidence in police included race, gender, age, income, education, fear of crime, victimization, conservative crime ideology, and two community concept variables (community disorder and informal collective security). Taylor, Turner, Esbensen, and Winfree (2001) came to the same conclusion as did Cao et al. (1996), who found that females rate police more positively than do males. In addition, Taylor et al. (2001) found that females' attitudes toward the police are more positive because of what is known as the "gender-gap phenomenon: the differences in official rates of offending for male and female youths, where males far outnumber females" (p. 297).

In contrast, there is a small body of research that found males have more positive attitudes toward the police (Brown & Coulter, 1983; Correia, Reisig, & Lovrich, 1996; Gourley, 1954). Still, others have found no significant relationship between gender and attitudes toward the police (Benedict et al., 1999; Chermak et al., 2001; Davis, 1990; Huang & Vaughn, 1996; Jesilow et al., 1995; Kusow et al., 1997; Marenin, 1983; Murty et al., 1990; Parker et al., 1995; Percy, 1980; Reisig & Correia, 1997; Sampson & Bartusch, 1998; Smith & Hawkins, 1973; & Worrall, 1999). Jesilow et al. (1995) did not find a significant difference between male and female attitudes toward the police. They also examined gender differences by ethnicity and

found no differences. Their findings supported previous research by Boggs and Galliher (1975), Davis (1990), and Murty et al. (1990), who all concluded that significant differences in attitudes toward the police do not exist for males and females.

When race is added to a gendered analysis, the results are similar. For example, Biderman et al. (1967) reported that both Black and White females feel more favorably toward local police. However, research findings in this area are not consistent. Neither Ennis (1967) nor Campbell and Schuman (1968) found significant associations between the two variables and attitudes toward police. When age was added, Griffiths and Winfree (1977) found no real differences between the male and female respondents, especially among juveniles.

Based on prior research, an assessment of the importance of gender yielded inconsistent findings in regards to its association with attitudes toward police and demands further examination.

### **Class**

Researchers have highlighted the fact that lower socioeconomic status results in more negative attitudes toward the police (Brown and Coulter, 1983; Cao et al., 1996; Haughn and Vaughn, 1996; Marenin, 1983; Murty et al., 1990; Percy, 1980; Sampson and Jeglum-Bartusch, 1998; and Smith, Graham, and Adams, 1991). Leiber et al. (1998) found that members of the lower class were more likely than others to harbor negative attitudes toward the type of authoritative behavior control personified by the police. Decker (1981) pointed out that socioeconomic status is intertwined with neighborhood culture in a way that may be an important predictor of citizens' attitudes toward the police. Nofziger and Williams (2005) found that individuals who rented, which may be linked to socioeconomic status, had less positive perceptions of police than homeowners.

Of the material found, only two authors tackled the issue of class and its association with race or gender on attitudes toward police. In their review of the literature, Taylor et al. (2001) concluded that much research shows that lower income minority groups have less favorable attitudes toward the police than do middle-income Whites. An explanation for this is provided by Griffiths and Winfree (1977), who suggested that lower class minority males are most likely to have contacts that result in negative perceptions of the police. Conversely, the authors found that, non-minority females of high socioeconomic status constitute the group least likely to have negative contacts, therefore resulting in positive perceptions of police.

### **Research on the Significance of Contact with the Police on Juveniles' Attitudes Toward the Police**

Studies of juveniles' encounters with the police are interesting because early contacts with police are likely to have lasting effects on juveniles' relationships with, and perceptions of, police (Leiber et al., 1998; Brown and Benedict, 2002; and Decker, 1981). Specifically, citizens who had negative or involuntary interactions with the police tended to have negative attitudes toward the police. Walker's (1997) research concluded that involuntary contact with the police results in negative attitudes, especially among African Americans. Positive contacts with the police, however, did not seem to improve opinions about the police. Hagan, Shedd, and Payne (2005) found that African American students were more likely than Latino or White students to have encounters with the police, while Latinos were more likely to respond negatively to these encounters than were other youths. In their reviews of previous research, Frank et al. (2005) also found that contact with the police is important, with a majority of individuals basing attitudes on how they were treated by the officer or on the response time. They found this to be a more significant predictor than the respondents' perception of the outcome of the encounter. This



finding is consistent with research conducted by Nofziger and Williams (2005) who found that quality of police contact was more important than police contact itself.

Overall, research findings are consistent in that positive voluntary contacts have little impact on attitudes toward the police, whereas negative contacts have a significant impact (Brandl et al. 1994; Griffiths & Winfree, 1977; Webb & Marshall, 1995). Similarly, Griffiths & Winfree, (1977) suggested that attitudes toward the police are affected significantly by the positive or negative nature of police-citizen interactions even after controlling for race, gender, class, and place of residence. Jesilow et al. (1995) found that individuals arrested or ticketed in the twelve-months prior to their study had more negative comments about the police than individuals who had no police contact during the same period. Smith et al. (1991) also found that individuals stopped by the police had more negative attitudes toward the police. Cox and White (1988) found that receiving a traffic citation also influences negative attitudes toward the police. Piliavin and Briar (1964) found that juveniles innocent of wrongdoing who had frequent encounters with the police had increased negative attitudes toward the police. However, vicarious contact with the police, usually occurring through peers or relatives, often involves negative descriptions of the police (Hurst et al., 2000; Henderson et al., 1997; Jones-Brown, 2000). Hurst et al. (2000) and Hurst and Frank (2000) found that vicarious contact is a stronger predictor of attitudes toward the police than gender, age, prior victimization, and perceptions of neighborhood crime.

Citizens' treatment by the police has an impact on their attitudes toward the police that are independent of whether the police (a) solve the problem the citizen contacts them for or whether they (b) cite the citizens they have stopped for a violation of the law, as Taylor et al. (2001) found. Smith and Hawkins (1973) stated that (a) citizens' observations of police wrong-

doings, (b) citizens' impressions of police performance on the beat, and (c) citizens' dissatisfaction with police handling of victimization incidents were associated with negative attitudes toward the police. Still others found a relationship between global attitudes toward the police or expectation of police service and actual service received (Brandl, Frank, Worden & Bynum, 1994; Schafer, Huebner & Bynum, 2003). This research is also supported by Schuck and Rosenbaum (2005) who found that attitudes toward police generally and police in an individual's neighborhood do differ. Orr and West (2007) suggested that personal experience is a more significant predictor than global expectations. Finally, Brown and Benedict (2002) cited several studies that found response time to be a predictor of negative attitudes toward the police (see Davis, 1990; Percy, 1980; Poister & McDavid, 1978; Priest & Carter, 1999).

### **Research on the Significance of Neighborhood Characteristics on Juveniles' Attitudes Toward the Police**

#### **Neighborhood Safety**

Certain features of juveniles' environments and social backgrounds negatively affect their attitudes toward the police indirectly through their influences on subcultural norms and behaviors (Leiber et al., 1998). Research has suggested that citizens' perceptions of neighborhood characteristics affect their attitudes towards the police (Taylor et al., 2001) whereby, people who dislike characteristics of their neighborhoods were more likely to have negative feelings about the police (Jesilow et al., 1995). Specifically, as crime in a neighborhood increases, residents have less favorable attitudes toward the police (Cao et al., 1996; Hurst, 2007; Hurst & Frank, 2000; Hurst et al., 2005; Jesilow et al., 1995; Parker, Onyekwuluje, & Murty 1995; Reisig & Parks, 2000; & Weitzer & Tuch, 2005). Since most residents do not have direct contact with the police, public perceptions of the police could be a function of the real or perceived crime problems within neighborhoods (Jacob, 1971). Jesilow et al. (1995) found that individuals who

had negative perceptions of crime or disorder in their neighborhood had more negative attitudes toward the police. Reisig and Parks (2000) found that the homicide rate was inversely associated with satisfaction, but such a relationship was not statistically significant when concentrated disadvantage was added into the model. Hurst et al. (2000) examined whether perceptions of neighborhood safety and police perception affected attitudes toward the police and found that juveniles who believed that their neighborhood had more crime than other neighborhoods tended to be less positive in their assessment of police performance. Hurst et al.'s (2000) findings concurred with a prior study by Apple and O'Brien (1983) that suggested that perceptions of both neighborhood safety and police protection affect attitudes toward the police. Apple and O'Brien (1983) arrived at this conclusion after examining evaluations of police performance among a sample of African Americans. Their regression analysis indicated that age, education, victimization, respondents' evaluations of the safety of their neighborhoods, their evaluations of their neighborhoods, and their evaluations of police response time getting to their neighborhoods all had significant effects upon evaluations of local police performance.

Murty et al. (1990), Davis (1990), and Webb and Marshall (1995) found that individuals living in low-crime neighborhoods had more positive attitudes toward the police than individuals residing in high-crime neighborhoods. Further, Stoutland (2001) found that the residents from areas of concentrated disadvantage have much lower regard for the police than does the general public. Stoutland (2001), whose study examined poor urban residents' expectations of police, found that police often act more aggressively toward residents in these areas than toward those in other areas, most of which had lower crime rates. Interestingly, Howell, Perry, and Vile (2004) found that when Whites are victimized in Black neighborhoods, they have a more negative attitude toward police than if victimized in predominantly White neighborhoods. Overall, a lack

of a feeling of personal safety and perceptions of high crime rates in a neighborhood decrease citizen satisfaction with the police (Weitzer and Tuch 2005). Cao et al. (1996) reported that it is not race, but perceptions of neighborhood disorder, incivility, and informal collective security which have the greatest explanatory power of addressing attitudes toward the police.

Finally, Wu, Sun, and Triplett (2009) found that, the effects of crime rate on residents' satisfaction level with local police can be explained in various ways: high crime rates heighten people's fear of crime, and cast doubt on their confidence on the police's capability of effectively performing crime control function, more police officers are assigned to areas with high crime rates resulting in more negative or involuntary encounters between residents and police which lead to lower public satisfaction with police, and higher crime rates might lead to negative perceptions of police through the intervening mechanism of dissatisfaction and disappointment with the quality of life.

### **Neighborhood Appearance**

Citizens' beliefs regarding whether the police are visible and effective in combating crime have an influence on public attitudes toward the police (Hurst & Frank, 2000). It is plausible that social disorder (e.g., noisy neighbors, loitering by rowdy teens) and physical disorder (e.g., graffiti, deteriorating property) send a message that law enforcement has lost control of or has consciously abandoned the community (e.g., Skogan, 1992), and this message affects attitudes toward the police (Cao et al., 1996). Studies have found that juveniles living in less populated rural/suburban areas had more positive ATP than those living in large urban areas (Hurst & Frank, 2000; Hurst et al., 2000; & Taylor et al., 2001). However, in all three of these studies the actual effects of living in a large city or a rural area seemed to be less important than the racial composition of the area. The racial-composition factors explained attitudes toward the

police in the sense that non-Whites living in areas with a high concentration of non-Whites have less favorable views of the police than do non-Whites living in areas that are racially mixed (Webb & Marshall, 1995). Apple and O'Brien (1983) found that an increase in the proportion of Blacks in the neighborhood will have a negative effect on the manner in which individual Blacks evaluate the police. They offered two possible explanations: first, the greater the number of Blacks in a neighborhood, the greater the opportunity for Blacks to associate with others who have negative attitudes toward the police, and this result in an overall increase in their negative sentiment toward the police (Apple & O'Brien 1983). Second, as the number of Blacks in an area increases, hostile interchanges between Black residents and the police increase, resulting in a greater chance for negative contact with the police (Apple and O'Brien, 1983; see also Smith *et al.*, 1991). One more possible explanation is that Blacks may be more likely to reside in deteriorating neighborhoods.

Lewis and Sullivan (1979) examined whether increased lighting would lead to improved citizen attitudes toward the police and an increase in perceived safety in their neighborhoods. They found that perceptions of police honesty actually decreased, while beliefs about being treated fairly by the police increased. Citizens' attitudes about their neighborhoods also changed after the additional lighting was installed. The percent of residents who thought their neighborhood was a good place to live and would recommend it to others increased, yet perceptions of safety at night decreased.

### **Research on the Significance of Prior Victimization on Juveniles' Attitudes Toward the Police**

Citizens who recently have been victimized may feel the police let them down or that lack of police efficiency or attention contributed to the victimization (Smith & Hawkins, 1973). Studies have found that individuals who have been victimized by criminal acts have less positive

attitudes toward the police than those without similar experiences (Hurst & Frank, 2000; Smith & Hawkins, 1973; Payne & Gainey 2007; Preist & Carter, 1999, and Thurman & Reisig, 1996). Payne and Gainey (2007) found that prior criminal victimization influences citizen attitudes toward the police, and even being approached by drug dealers' impact attitudes toward the police. In their research in disadvantaged neighborhoods, their study focuses on how the experiences of victimization and being approached by a drug dealer related to individuals' perceptions about neighborhood safety and in turn affected perceptions of police. Also, if individuals hold the police responsible for crimes committed against them, the victimization experience tends to affect attitudes negatively (Frank et al., 1996). Frank et al. (1996) found that Blacks are more likely than Whites to become victims of crime, which helps explain Blacks' less than positive attitudes. One of the consistent findings of research on the topic is that prior victimization is negatively associated with juveniles' attitudes toward the police.

### **Research on the Significance of Parental Authority on Juveniles' Attitudes Toward the Police**

Researchers have found that juveniles who are strongly attached to their parents are less likely to engage in delinquent activities (Wright & Cullen, 2001). Therefore, as a result of being less likely to engage in delinquent activities, juveniles with a strong attachment to their parents are less likely to come into negative contact with police. Wright and Cullen (2001) reached this conclusion after analyzing self-administered surveys from over 1500 students ages 10 and over. Indeed, as Agnew (2005) argued, youths who are more attached to their parents should be more likely to agree with their parents' conventional beliefs and model their parents' law-abiding behaviors. Using self-report data from middle and high school students, Nihart, Lersch, Sellers, and Mieczkowski (2005) examined attitudes toward the police in the southeastern United States, indicating that youths who reported more positive feelings about their parents and teachers also

reported positive feeling toward the police. Brown and Benedict (2002), citing studies by Clark and Wenninger (1964), and Krause (1975), stated that favorable attitudes toward parents and teachers interrelated positively with favorable attitudes toward the police. Piquero, Fagan, Mulvey, Steinberg, and Odgers (2005) suggested that adolescents' attitudes and beliefs about the law are shaped by their views of their families and other adults in the community, which could extend to youths' trust in the police.

In a previous study, Amoroso and Ware (1983) found a positive correlation between attitudes toward parents and attitudes toward police. However, they discovered that attitudes toward teachers were better predictors of attitudes toward police. They also found that attitudes toward police were more positive than attitudes toward teachers, but less positive than attitudes toward parents. The results of their study support the notion of generalized attitudes toward authority, but do not suggest that attitudes toward police are derived from attitudes toward parents. These were the findings after Amoroso and Ware (1983) examined the relationship between juveniles' attitudes toward the police and their attitudes toward their parents, teachers, and themselves. The sample consisted of 1,667 juveniles from 30 different schools in Canada who completed questionnaires in class. The dependent variable, attitudes toward the police, was measured by the responses to 13 evaluative statements about police. Similar scales were constructed to measure the juveniles' attitudes toward their parents, teachers, and themselves. However in contrast to Amoroso and Ware (1983) findings, Martsen and Coleman (1961) after analyzing data collected using a Sargent's Insight Test and a background questionnaire, found little evidence that attitudes toward home authority are generalized toward public authority. Furthermore, Nelson, Eisenberg, & Carroll (1982) concluded that adolescents' attitudes in their study were characterized by rather high salience, or "object centrality." Additionally, they

concluded that the belief systems of adolescents in their study were focused more on concrete issues and objects of immediate experience than on abstract ideologies and concepts.

### **Research on the Significance of Commitment to School on Juveniles' Attitudes Toward the Police**

Although considerable research has found that adolescents' commitment to school lowers the risk for delinquency (e.g., Gottfredson, 2001), few studies have investigated the relationship between commitment to school and attitudes toward the police (Flexon, Lurigio, & Greenleaf, 2009). School is a primary vehicle for transmitting conventional values to students on a considerable breadth of issues, including appropriate deference toward authority figures, such as police. Hagan et al. (2005) suggested that adolescent minorities' perceptions of "criminal injustice" and their hostility toward the police are fueled by their lack of attachment to school and their experience of being subject to frequent and unprovoked police stops. The researchers arrived at this conclusion after surveying 91 public high schools in the Chicago area consisting of more than 18,000 nine and tenth grade students. In addition, weak attachment to school and poor relationships with teachers could generalize to more global antisocial values and behaviors, creating hostile sentiments toward the police and other authority figures (Agnew, 2005 & Levy, 2001). Levy (2001) reached this conclusion after surveying 365 adolescents in grades 9 through 12 in different areas of southeast Queensland. Importantly, the adolescents chosen consisted of three groups: non-delinquents, non-institutionalized delinquents, and institutionalized delinquents.

Lurigio et al. (2009) found that for African Americans and Latino youths, being pro-school was related to their expressed intentions to aid officers in need of help. In addition, caring about teachers' opinion of them was related positively to the willingness of students in both groups to assist the police (Lurigio et al. 2009). When looking at trust in police, Flexon et al.



(2009) finds that adolescents with greater commitment to school and teachers also more trust in police than those with no commitment. This finding was derived from an analysis of questionnaire data collected from students in eighteen different public high schools throughout the city of Chicago.

In one of the few studies that touched on this issue, Hurst and Frank (2000) surveyed middle school students in the Cincinnati metropolitan area. Overall, they found that juveniles, who attended public schools in the inner city, where dropout rates are relatively higher (signifying low attachment to school), harbored more negative views toward the police than students who attended public schools in the suburbs, where dropout rates are relatively lower. In the entire sample, approximately 50 percent of the youths reported that they trusted the police, 27 percent reported that they did not trust the police, and 33 percent reported that they were neutral toward the police. Hurst and Frank's research, however, did not investigate whether attitudes toward school or teachers were related to attitudes toward the police.

### **Research on the Significance of Involvement in Delinquency on Juveniles' Attitudes Toward the Police**

Several studies assessing juvenile attitudes toward police have found that involvement in delinquent activities are directly correlated with a negative attitude toward the police (Chapman, 1956; Giordano, 1976; Leiber *et al.*, 1998; Cox & Falkenberg, 1987; Hurst & Frank, 2000; Leiber *et al.* 1998; & Jackson, 2002). This is the case because people with a negative attitude toward the police are more likely to be part of the subculture that commits crime. On the other hand, people who believe that the police are performing their duties with professionalism and integrity are more likely to obey laws and support the system by acting as witnesses (Horowitz, J. 2007). Leiber *et al.* (1998) suggested that it is important to take into account measures of lifestyle and subcultural involvement as these factors may help to explain the police contact -

attitudes link. In their analyses of adolescents in the juvenile justice system, Leiber et al. (1988) found that an individual's delinquent attitudes and delinquent behavior served as measures of their lifestyle and subcultural involvement. Each of these measures displayed a significant effect, suggesting that adolescents who had more deviant attitudes and were more involved in delinquency had less respect for police.

Brown and Benedict (2002) concluded that juveniles who viewed illegal behaviors and delinquency in a positive light would subsequently view police negatively. This conclusion was reached after Brown and Benedict (2002) summarized the findings from more than 100 articles on perceptions of and attitudes toward the police. Of particular importance were the findings regarding less serious forms of delinquency versus more serious forms of delinquency: greater involvement in less serious forms of delinquency was independently related to less favorable attitudes towards police, while involvement in more serious forms of delinquency exerted no independent influence on youths' perceptions of police when demographic and community factors were controlled (Brick, Taylor, & Esbensen, 2009). Brick et al. (2009) arrived at this conclusion after surveying 1300 sixth through ninth grade students while analyzing three specific variables: Police contact, involvement in delinquent subculture, and community contexts and ties.

Racially, Latinos who thought that delinquent acts were harmful were more likely to respect police, than their African American counterparts (Lurigio et al. 2009). Additionally Lurigio et al. (2009) finds that for African Americans, believing that delinquency is harmful was negatively related to whether students would assist the police; whereas for Latinos, the belief that stealing was wrong was positively associated with the expressed willingness to assist police officers. Cohen (1955) found that lower-class and minority juveniles were more likely that other

youths to adhere to the negative norms and values associated with delinquent subcultures, and that these social groups therefore would express greater tolerance for delinquency and less respect for police (p.34). Miller (1958) revealed that members of the lower class were more likely than others to express norms and behavior consistent with a delinquent subculture, and to harbor negative attitudes toward the type of authoritative behavioral control personified by the police. Cloward and Ohlin (1960) asserted that lower-class juveniles tend toward subcultural deviance because of their failure to achieve conventional goals, and attribute the cause of their failure to the social order rather than to their own shortcomings. These scholars further explained that the juveniles' "sense of injustice" and "withdrawal of attributes of legitimacy" would logically explain negative attitudes toward the police because, "When a person ascribes his failure to injustice in the social system, he may criticize that system p. 126."

### **Conclusion**

The literature points to many important variables that affect the attitudes juveniles have toward the police, including race/ethnicity, gender, age, police-citizen contacts, class (socioeconomic status), neighborhood characteristics, prior victimization, commitment to school, involvement in delinquent behavior, and parental authority. Race was the independent variable most used to assess attitudes toward the police (Decker, 1981). Whites and Asians hold significantly more favorable attitudes toward the police than do African Americans (e.g., Taylor et al., 2001). Although, Latinos were found in some studies to have a more positive attitude than their African American minority counterpart toward police (Lurigio et al. 2009). In addition, minorities with lower socioeconomic status have the least favorable attitudes towards the police (Taylor et al., 2001; Griffiths & Winfree, 1977).

Regarding gender, it was found that women hold a more positive view of police than men (Cao et al., 1996). Overall, young people have less favorable attitudes toward the police than do older adults (Borrero, 2001; Cao et al., 1996; Decker, 1981; Hurst & Frank, 2000; Hurst et al., 2000; Jesilow et al., 1995; Smith & Hawkins, 1973; Webb & Marshall, 1995). Teenagers' attitudes toward the police are also determined by whether their contact with police was positive or negative (Taylor et al., 2001). The research also points to the fact that residents from areas of concentrated disadvantage have lower regard for the police than the general public does (Stoutland, 2001). Prior victimization affects juveniles' attitudes when they hold police responsible for the victimization (Frank et al., 1996). The neighborhood's appearance and safety and one's involvement in the neighborhood have been found to impact attitudes (Leiber et al., 1998). The limited research that analyzes attachment to school finds that juveniles with a strong attachment to school have a positive attitude toward the police (Agnew, 2005 & Levy, 2001). It was found that juveniles with involvement in delinquent activities have negative attitudes toward the police (Hurst & Frank, 2000 & Jackson, 2002). Lastly, the literature suggest that juveniles who are strongly attached to their parents are less likely to engage in delinquent activities (Wright & Cullen, 2001), resulting in less negative contacts with police that affect juveniles' attitudes toward the police.

There are limitations to previous research conducted on juveniles' attitudes toward police. Hurst et al. (2000) and Leiber et al. (1998) pointed to restrictions in the way studies measured attitudes. Much research relies on descriptive analyses rather than on multivariate procedures that make it possible to describe attitude formation. Leiber et al. (1998) stated that many studies focus only on adults and their attitudes towards police and apply these findings to juveniles. Although a number of studies compared different ethnic and age groups' attitudes

toward police, they generally failed to consider that the group being compared might have not shared the same ways of conceptualizing the role of police. Researchers should make sure that the groups being measured share the same common notion about the police, their (police) duties, and their responsibilities to the community. Otherwise, results may use inappropriate measurements and provide misleading findings as a result of the subjects being confused about the role of the police.

The emphasis of previous research on Black-White comparisons has left unanswered many questions about differences in minority group attitudes toward the police, especially between Latinos and African Americans (Martinez, 2007; Cheurprakobkit, 2000; Culver, 2004; and Correia 2010). As is often the case, studies that assess attitudes simply group all minorities into one category and compare them against their White counterparts. As mentioned in the introductory chapter, it is of extreme importance that attention be directed toward the Hispanic/Latino community because recent population estimates show that Hispanic/Latinos are the largest and fastest growing minority group in the United States (Schaefer, 2006).

Often, research relies on a single and restricted geographical area instead of drawing a sample from larger and more diverse populations in both metropolitan and rural areas (Hurst & Frank, 2000). Most importantly, a lot of the research on juveniles' attitudes toward the police is outdated (Hurst et al., 2000). Therefore many variables that affect their attitudes are left unanalyzed as communities and society changes. Research on juveniles has just recently begun to put any emphasis on the impact of the social bond among juveniles, their parents, and their schools have on juveniles' attitudes toward the police. More information is needed on what role getting good grades in school and respecting parental figures plays in formulating juveniles' attitudes toward police. Additionally, more research is needed on how a juveniles' involvement

in a delinquent subculture affect their attitude toward the police. Of extreme importance is the failure of research on juveniles' to put any emphasis on whether involvement in pro-social activities by respondents and one's self esteem has any impact on juveniles' attitudes toward the police. This is worth investigating because involvement in pro-social activities is at the foundation of most minority communities and may influence minority identities, community identity, and respect for authority figures. Therefore, immediate attention is needed to fill the gaps in the literature in reference to these two variables.

## **CHAPTER THREE** **THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

### **Introduction**

This study incorporates two theories that will encompass the study's theoretical framework. The two theories to be used are: social bond theory and the conflict theory. While reviewing the literature for the proposal of this research, the research on the relationship between social bond and juveniles' attitudes toward the police was limited, as was also the case for the inclusion of some form of the various conflict perspectives. Studies that have used a form of the conflict theory did so to analyze police behavior regarding: arrest rates, killings, and allocation of police resources. I use these two theories independently of each other, meaning that one does not build upon the other. Although both theories aide in determining what factors determine minorities' attitudes toward police, they are analyzed as separate entities.

### **Social Bond Theory and Juveniles' Attitudes Toward the Police**

According to Travis Hirschi's (1969) social bond theory (a criminology theory), the choice of behavior is considerably affected by the strength of peoples' bonds to conventional role models. Social bonds play an important role in the lives of juveniles, and they affect the way they act, dress, talk, view others, and accept social norms and the development of their social consciousness. Travis Hirschi (1969) revealed that there are four components of the social bond theory, which promotes socialization and conformity: attachment, belief, commitment, and involvement.

The first component of the social bond theory is attachment. Attachment is the affective component of the social bond theory. According to Hirschi (1969), attachment refers to the level of psychological affection one has for prosocial others such as parents or teachers. These

conventional figures are of critical importance because youths that form close attachments to their parents will experience greater levels of social control. Therefore, youths with a greater formation of attachments to their parents will not want to commit offenses that will disappoint those in which they love, particularly their parents. Accordingly, the attachment discourages youths to participate in criminal/deviant behaviors that will likely cause the juveniles to get into trouble or ultimately come into negative contact with police.

The second component of the social bond theory is belief in the central value system of society. Belief represents the moral component of the bonds. The component of belief refers to the degree to which one adheres to the values associated with behaviors that conform to the law; the assumption being that the more important such values are to a person, the less likely he or she is to engage in criminal/deviant behavior (Hirschi, 1969). Those who do not hold strong beliefs in conventional values are freed from the bond and therefore are more likely to commit deviant acts. As the likelihood of these deviant acts manifest into actual acts, the juveniles may come into negative contact with the police resulting in a negative attitude toward police.

The third component refers to someone's commitment to conventional activities, such as getting an education. Commitment is the rational component of the bonds. The strength of a juvenile's commitment to school can be determined best by his/her performance in school, for example, by examining grades. Hirschi (1969) found that the higher a teen scored on school work, the less likely he/she was to have committed delinquent acts and less likely he/she was to have been picked up by the police. It is believed that the juvenile who likes school is less likely to be delinquent or commit delinquent acts. The juvenile who does not do well in school might try to find gratification and respect elsewhere and get involved in delinquent acts, increasing the



likelihood to get in (negative) contact with the police, leading to a negative attitude towards the police. Therefore, it is hypothesized that:

*H2: Commitment to school will be statistically significant in explaining juveniles' attitudes toward the police.*

The fourth component refers to an individual's involvement in delinquency. Involvement is the temporal component of the bonds. Hirschi (1969) believed if people are spending their time engaged in some form of pro-social activity, then they are not, by definition, spending their time engaged in antisocial activity. Ideally, juveniles who are heavily involved in legitimate school-related activities—either academically, socially, or athletically—will not be spending that same time destroying property, stealing things that don't belong to them, or doing drugs, and so on. Because of these criminal acts juveniles would have the possibility of coming into contact with police and, as a result, having a negative contact with the police, which results in an attitude that is less than favorable. However, the premise of the involvement component is not to say that youths cannot engage in those behaviors before or after their legitimate activities. Nevertheless, Hirschi argued that, at least during that time, the youths would not be committing delinquent acts. In regards to involvement in delinquency, it is hypothesized that:

*H1: Involvement in delinquency will be statistically significant in explaining juveniles' attitudes toward the police.*

This study examines how two components (commitment and involvement) of the social bond theory, as well as other variables, are associated with juveniles' attitudes toward police. While it is useful to also examine the remaining two components (attachment and belief), this is not possible because measures of these two components were not included in the survey, which will provide the data for the analysis (This study is based on secondary data.). This study of

juveniles' commitment to school and involvement in delinquency will add much needed social scientific knowledge to the limited amount of research on juveniles' attitudes already collected.

### **Conflict Theory and Attitudes Toward Police**

Conflict theories or perspectives have been the dominant tool used in sociology to explain racial differences in both experiences with and perceptions of the criminal justice system. Conflict theorists conceive society to be an ongoing struggle between groups holding opposing goals and world views (Wu, Sun & Triplett, 2009). There are a variety of perspectives that one could employ under the umbrella of conflict theory that expound upon social inequality as it relates to race, class, gender, and so on. But for this project, the form of conflict theory used can explain the conflict between police and the groups they serve based on the groups' race, from a micro/macro level perspective. The model has its intellectual roots in the works of Mills (1956).

In Mills' view, social structures are created through conflict between people with differing interest and resources in the society. Individuals and resources, in turn, are influenced by these structures and by the unequal distribution of power and resources in society. Specifically as it relates to citizens and the police from a sociological perspective, this theoretical perspective argues that minorities develop distrust for the police because they experience disparate treatment because of their race. The criminal justice institutions, such as the police, are related to the structure of inequality within society (Weitzer and Tuch 1999). Police as agents of official social control target minorities to maintain race and class control and protect the hegemonic interests of dominant White society (Chambliss and Seidman 1982). The police function as a structure to ensure that those in power can retain their status and to minimize the potential threat from other groups (Chambliss & Seidman, 1982; Quinney, 1970; Turk, 1969; Vold, 1958). The less powerful, (lower-class persons and minorities, for example) are scrutinized and controlled much more frequently than others as agents of the state concentrate on protecting

the resources and values of the more powerful. Scholars argued that the interests of the dominant class were represented and protected by police and those from lower class were more likely to be victims of law enforcement (Chambliss & Seidman, 1971; Das, 1983). Since the police are more likely to over enforce the criminal law against the powerless/lower class, they are likely to have more contacts with the police that are negative and bear the brunt of police misbehavior. The existence of more negative attitudes toward the police within these powerless groups is seen as a direct outcome of a categorically different treatment by police.

There have been a number of empirical studies conducted to test the ability of a conflict theory to explain various aspects of police behavior such as: arrest rates (Liska & Chamlin, 1984; Mosher, 2001), use of excessive force (Jacobs & Britt, 1979; Sorensen, Marquart, & Brock, 1993); civilian killings by police (see Binder & Scharf, 1982, for a summary); and size of police departments and allocation of police resources (Jackson, 1986; Jackson & Carroll, 1981; Kent & Jacobs, 2005; Liska, Lawrence, & Benson, 1981; Stucky, 2005), but only a small number of studies have started to use a conflict theory to examine the public side of the story—public attitudes and behaviors toward the police. For example, Weitzer and Tuch (2004 & 2005) extended Blumer's (1958) group position theory of racial prejudice to explain race-differentiated attitudes toward police. The theory asserts that an individual's perceptions stem from his or her sense of group position in the society. Specifically, members of the dominant group tend to share a sense of superiority, view members of the subordinate group as different and alien, and perceive them as significant competitors for a greater portion of dominant group goals and interest (Bobo & Tuan, 2006). Based on these assertions, Weitzer and Tuch (2004 & 2005) argued that Whites were more likely to hold favorable views of police because they perceived racial threats from Blacks, and thus relied on the aggressive law enforcement from police to

control Blacks and their neighborhoods. As a result, this aggressive enforcement in Black neighborhoods assists in the creation of negative attitudes toward police. Conflict theorists explain attitudes toward police as a result of a conflict between police and minorities derived from the majority (powerful) using police to protect the interest of the status quo and minimize the perceived threat from minority members. Therefore when it comes to race from a conflict perspective, it is hypothesized that:

*H3: Black and Hispanic juveniles' attitudes toward the police will be less positive when compared to Whites.*

*H4: As one's class increases, their attitude toward the police will become more positive.*

A full list of hypotheses is found below. These hypotheses are derived from the existing literature covered in Chapter Two as well as the theories covered here in Chapter Three.

## HYPOTHESES

On the basis of a review of the literature, the following hypotheses were tested to examine the determinants of minority juveniles' attitudes toward the police (ATP):

H1: Involvement in delinquency will be statistically significant in explaining juveniles' ATP.

H2: Commitment to school will be statistically significant in explaining juveniles' ATP.

H3: Black and Hispanic juveniles' attitudes toward the police will be less positive when compared to Whites.

H4: As one's class increases, their attitude toward the police will become more positive.

H5: Blacks will have a more negative ATP than Hispanics.

H6: Overall, juveniles have a positive ATP.

H7: Females will have a more positive ATP than males.

H8: Class will be a statistically significant determinant of ATP.

H9: Older juveniles will have a more negative ATP than younger juveniles.

H10: Juveniles involved in pro-social activities will have a positive ATP.

H11: Self-esteem will be a statistically significant determinant of ATP.

H12: Juveniles reporting prior contact with the police will have a negative ATP.

H13: Neighborhood context

Neighborhood appearance will be a statistically significant determinant of ATP.

Neighborhood safety will be a statistically significant determinant of ATP.

H14: Juveniles reporting prior victimization will have a negative ATP.

H15: Parental authority will be a statistically significant determinant of ATP (Parental authority will measure the juveniles' respect for the authority of their parental figure.)

There is interest to see if results garnered from the Master's thesis (Lake, 2006), will mirror the results revealed at the conclusion of this dissertation project. This interest is sparked by the fact that a different data set was used to complete the masters' thesis, than was used to complete the dissertation. However, although the variables used in the two projects have similar names, the variables were measured differently in both projects. Therefore, it is hypothesized that:

H16: Variables that were statistically significant in the first study (Lake, 2006) will also be statistically significant in this second study.

H17: The variables: race, prior contact with police, involvement in delinquency, commitment to school, parental authority, and self-esteem will explain the most variance of all variables included in analysis.

## **CHAPTER FOUR** **METHODOLOGY**

This study builds on a pilot study that began with the composition of a Master's thesis entitled, "A Juvenile's Perspective: Juveniles' Attitudes Toward the Police" (Lake, 2006). This study affords me the opportunity to test new hypotheses, an additional theory, and compare the results of the 2006 study with the current study. Although the first study provided much needed and updated findings on juveniles' attitudes toward the police, the present study extends the previous study in many ways. Unlike the pilot study (Lake, 2006), this study is particularly focused on accessing the differences in the determinants of attitudes towards police of minority groups (specifically, African Americans and Hispanics). In addition to using similar measures as the pilot study, this second study includes five new variables which are used to explore determinants of attitudes toward the police, and these variables include: neighborhood's appearance, involvement in community activities, parental authority, involvement in delinquency, and self esteem. Just as in the pilot study, the current study analyzes variables (e.g., pro-social activity and self esteem) that have not received any attention in the attitudes toward police literature. More importantly, the current study allows me the opportunity to compare results from the pilot study (Lake, 2006) to determine if results that were found still holds true in regards to attitudes toward police today or have things changed. It must be noted that although similar variables names are used, the way in which variables included in the 2006 study and the present study are measured is different. This is a potential limitation in comparing the data.

### **Data Collection for the Current Study**

This study is a secondary data analysis of data collected between 2004 and 2005 by primary researcher Finn-Aage Esbensen and his research team. These data and the results of their

evaluation are stored at the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR), which is part of the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan. The data set chosen was No. 25865 in the ICPSR data archives, entitled "Outcome Evaluation of the Teens, Crime, and the Community/Community Works (TCC/CW) Training Program in Nine Cities across Four States, 2004-2005." The Teens, Crime, and the Community and Community Works (TCC/CW) program, was a collaborative effort by the National Crime Prevention Council (NCPC) and Street Law, Inc., developed in an effort to reduce adolescent victimization (Esbensen, 2005). The program utilized a "risk- and protective-factor" approach and consisted of three components:

1. A 31-lesson interactive curriculum dealing with such topics as conflict management, police and the community, handgun violence, hate crimes, substance abuse, and victimization.
2. Community Resource People (CRP), experts such as police officers, lawyers, counselors, and community volunteers who share information and experiences with the students and also serve as potential role models, and who assist in the delivery of the program.
3. "Action" or service learning projects that allow teens to apply what they have learned.

The purpose of the study was to assess whether the TCC/CW program was successfully implemented and whether it achieved its desired outcome, namely to reduce adolescent victimization. Specifically, the study sought to address three primary questions:

1. Is program participation associated with a reduction in known risk factors (i.e., association with delinquent peers, risk-seeking, lack of commitment to school, etc.)?



2. Are offending and victimization rates lower among the program participants than among the comparison students?
3. Given differential program fidelity, are program effects detectable in those schools meeting minimal standards of program fidelity? (Esbensen, 2005).

To collect the data, the investigator employed a quasi-experimental five-wave panel study of public school students initiated in the fall of 2004. Classrooms in the sample were matched by teacher or subject and one-half of the classrooms received TCC/CW while the other half (the control group) was not exposed to the curriculum. The researchers recruited teachers to assist in the process. Teachers were paid \$2.00 for every consent form collected (whether affirmative or refusal) plus a bonus of \$10 if their classroom exceeded 70 percent, \$20 if it exceeded 80 percent, and \$30 if it exceeded 90 percent. In addition, students were provided an incentive for returning the consent forms (e.g., different types of key chains and different colored lanyards). After a preliminary analysis of the acquired data and discussions with program managers from the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), the outcome evaluation was abbreviated to three waves of outcome data rather than the planned five waves (Esbensen, 2005). A total of 1,686 students representing 98 classrooms in 15 middle schools located in 9 cities in 4 different states (Arizona, New Mexico, South Carolina, and Massachusetts) were surveyed 3 times: pre-tests in Fall 2004 (Wave 1), post-tests in Spring 2005 (Wave 2), and through a one-year follow-up survey in Fall 2005 (Wave 3). The three waves of student questionnaires measured program goals and objectives, implied risk, protective factors, demographic characteristics of the students, as well as attitudinal and behavioral measures (Esbensen, 2005).

A purposive sample of schools was selected for inclusion in the evaluation; only schools offering the Teens, Crime, and the Community and Community Works (TCC/CW) program were eligible for inclusion. The following steps were taken to select a final sample for the study:

1. More than 250 schools identified as offering the Community Works program were contacted.
2. A total of 18 schools met the evaluation criteria (i.e., confirmation that the program was actually being taught in its entirety, a sufficient number of classes to allow for matching of treatment and comparison groups while also being cost-effective in terms of travel to the school for data collection, a willingness to withhold the program from some classes, and agreement to adhere to the evaluation design).
3. The contact person was re-contacted at each eligible site and if the program delivery met the evaluation design criteria and the program providers agreed to adhere to the design (classroom matching, pre-and post-tests with a follow-up survey) then the principal was contacted.
4. With agreement and support from the principal, the school district research and evaluation office (or comparable official) was contacted and proposals were submitted.
5. Three schools declined the opportunity to participate.
6. A total of 15 schools agreed to the evaluation design and participated in the outcome evaluation. (Esbensen, 2005).

The 15 schools participating in the outcome evaluation were concentrated in the Southwest with 9 schools in Arizona and one in New Mexico. The remaining five schools were in South Carolina (three schools) and Massachusetts (two schools). Classrooms were selected based upon the grade in which the program was taught (ranging from sixth to ninth grade). All

students in the selected classrooms were asked to participate in the evaluation and active consent letters were distributed to all students. Further, due to the nature of the study, active parental consent was required before students could participate in the evaluation, resulting in an initial loss rate of 28 percent. Specifically, 12 percent of this initial loss was due to active parental refusals, while another 16 percent was due to the failure of eligible students to return consent forms. The active parental consent for the study was 72 percent. The completion rate for the pre-tests (Wave 1) was 96 percent, for the post-tests (Wave 2) 89 percent, and for the one-year follow-up (Wave 3) was 72 percent (Esbensen, 2005). The final sample was composed of 1,686 students with a racial composition of Black, Hispanic, and White students. The average age of the respondents was approximately thirteen years old, with a range of ten to fifteen (Esbensen, 2005).

For the purpose of my study, I use the data collected during the spring of 2005 for the post-test (Wave 2). The data collected during the spring 2005 for the post-test provided two important benefits to the present study over the other two data sets. The post-test data set (Wave 2) included the most variables (297) when compared to the pretest (Wave 1 had 227 variables) and the follow-up (Wave 3 had 290 variables). This essentially increases my chances of finding variables that could be used in my study to access minority juveniles' attitudes toward the police. For example, the police contact questions were added in Wave 2 of the data collection, thus these responses could not be provided by the other two data sets (Wave 1 & Wave 3). The second benefit can be found in the fact that the follow-up data set (Wave 3) had a significant amount of missing data due to a loss of participants. This could have been due to measures beyond the researchers' control which include: student dropout or families relocating and students enrolling

in different schools not selected to participate in the Teens, Crime, and the Community and Community Works (TCC/CW) program.

### **Sample**

The sample for the present study is composed of 1,686 students. The racial breakdown of the participants includes 32 percent Whites, 11 percent Blacks, and 43 percent Hispanics. Students participating resembled all students in their schools; that is, the sample demographics were similar to the school-level demographics (Esbensen, 2005). The data were collected from students in 15 schools: 9 schools in Arizona, 1 in New Mexico, 3 in South Carolina, and 2 in Massachusetts. The average age of the students is approximately thirteen years old, with a range of ten to fifteen. The sample of juveniles ranged from sixth to ninth grade students. Of the students identifying their gender, 687 were males and 807 were females.

### **Limitations of the Sample**

Many of the limitations of this sample are the same as those discussed in Chapter One. The survey took place only in public schools offering the Teens, Crime, and the Community/Community Works (TCC/CW) program. As a result, there is an exclusion of students from private, vocational, and alternative schools. Because students in private schools may have different experiences with the police, their attitudes may likewise be different. There is an exclusion of students that had dropped out of school or who were juvenile delinquents in detention facilities at the time of the study were not included. Those juveniles under state custody may have experienced significantly different social and economic experiences than other juveniles. The juveniles who dropped out of school might have a negative attitude toward the police because they may see police as problem makers instead of problem solvers. Because of the schools selected and location (nine in Arizona, one in New Mexico, two in Massachusetts,

and three in South Carolina) of these schools, the sample was not representative of students across the nation and strong generalizations cannot be made to the entire adolescent population. While there are enough cases to be able to racially compare the three groups, it is unfortunate that there is not as much power in the African American sample as compared to the others, due to the low number of African American respondents.

### **Definitions and Measurements**

To complete the current study, the dependent and independent variables were created from a national survey, which is entitled, "Outcome Evaluation of the Teens, Crime, and the Community/Community Works (TCC/CW) Training Program in Nine Cities across Four States, 2004-2005." The questions selected from the study's survey are used to assess whether the independent variables are determinants of juveniles' attitudes toward the police. After the questions were selected and grouped into the selected variable, a reliability analysis was conducted to see whether the questions intercorrelated. The reliability analysis was very instrumental in disregarding questions that influenced a low Alpha score for that particular scale. All questions that were grouped together to form singular variables had an Alpha score in the range of .630 to .9. Any questions that did not have at least this score were analyzed independently and not grouped.

### **Dependent Variable**

The study will employ for analysis one dependent variable. The dependent variable (Attitudes Toward Police) in this study is created from five attitudinal items. These five items assessed whether the respondents' felt that police officers: are *honest, hardworking, usually friendly, usually courteous, and respectful toward people like me* (respondent). In order to measure their responses, the respondents were asked to rate their attitudes on the basis of a five-

point Likert scale ranging from *very strongly disagree* to *very strongly agree*. To test the internal consistency of the items, a reliability analysis was conducted. From this reliability analysis, it was determined that the Alpha score for the scale was .905, which confirmed that these questions have a very strong intercorrelation. The final dependent variable is the additive result of these five items. (N = 1438)

### **Independent Variables**

The following groups of independent variables are also used: (1) *socio-demographic variables* (race, gender, class, and age), (2) *personal experiences variables* (prior contact with police, neighborhood context, prior victimization, parental authority, and self-esteem), and (3) *social bond variables* (commitment to school, involvement in delinquency, and involvement in pro-social activities). I describe each group of individual variables below.

#### **Socio-Demographic Variables:**

*Race* was coded as 1 for White and all others = 0 (N = 481), 1 for Black and all others = 0 (N = 162), and 1 for Hispanic and all others = 0 (N = 645). Coding Black as 1 and Hispanic as 1 will allow the opportunity for these categories to be analyzed as dichotomous variables and entered into a regression equation separately. Respondents in the Others category were simply not used in the analysis phase. (N= 1288)

*Gender* was recoded 1 for male (N = 687) and 0 for female (N = 807). (N=1494)

*Class* is a subjective measure and was created by recoding two questions together from the survey. These questions are: *most people are better off than I am*, and *I'll never have as much opportunity to succeed as young people from other neighborhoods* which yielded an Alpha score of .634. (N = 1473)

*Age* is the juvenile respondent's age at the time survey was taken. The ages of the youths was recoded to form two categories: 1. 12 years old and under =0 (N = 634), and 2. 13 years old and over =1 (N = 855). (N = 1489)

**Personal Experience Variables:**

*Self-esteem* variable in this study is a composite measure that consists of five attitudinal items. These five items assessed whether the respondents felt they were: *a useful person to be around, a person of worth; at least as much as others; able to do things as well as most people; feel good about themselves; and when doing a job, do it well.* Respondents rated their answers on a five-point scale that allowed them to select: *almost never, not too often, about half the time, often, and almost always.* To test the internal consistency of the items, a reliability analysis was conducted. From this reliability analysis, it was determined that the Alpha score for the scale was .777, which confirmed that these questions have a very strong intercorrelation. The final measure of the variable *self-esteem* is the additive result of these five items. (N = 1456)

*Prior Contact with Police* is a composite measure of responses to the following questions: *have you ever been stopped by the police for questioning; have you ever been arrested; and have you ever reported the event to the police.* The third question (*have you ever reported the event to the police?*) that helps to measure prior contact with police, was a question used on the original study's survey to see if a youth that reported being victim of a crime reported the event to police. Responses were recoded so that a positive answer to at least one of the three questions resulted in a score of 1 (contact with police N = 396), whereas negative answers to all of them led to a score of 0 (N = 498), signifying no prior contact with police. (N = 894)

*Neighborhood Context* consists of two separate variables: respondent's perceptions of *neighborhood's appearance* and respondent's perceptions of *safety*. The two variables, respondents' perceptions of *neighborhood's appearance* and respondent's perceptions of *safety* are measured as composite variables where respondents answer selections included: *not a problem, somewhat of a problem, and big problem*. Respondents' perceptions of *neighborhood's appearance* consist of three questions that asked respondents about problems in their neighborhood: *run down or poorly kept buildings in the neighborhood; graffiti on buildings and fences in the neighborhood; and buildings or personal belongings being broken or torn up in the neighborhood*. To test the internal consistency of the items, a reliability analysis was conducted. From this reliability analysis, it was determined that the Alpha score for the scale was .738, which confirmed that these questions have a very strong intercorrelation (N = 1468). The variable respondent's perceptions of *safety* was created as a composite variable using the questions: *groups of people hanging out in public places causing trouble; hearing gunshots in the neighborhood; not enough lights in the streets and alleys of the neighborhood; and cars traveling too fast throughout the streets of the neighborhood*. Again, a reliability analysis was performed to test the internal consistency of the items and yielded an Alpha score of .745, which signal a strong intercorrelation between the questions and the questions were grouped together (N = 1476).

*Prior Victimization* is a composite measure of responses to the following questions have you ever: *had things stolen from you at school; been attacked or threatened on your way to or from school; been attacked or threatened at school; have you ever been bullied at school; been hit by someone trying to hurt you; had someone use a weapon or force to get money or things from you; and been attacked by someone with a weapon or by someone trying to seriously hurt*



*or kill you.* Responses were recoded so that a positive answer to at least one of the questions resulted in a score of 1 (N = 813), whereas negative answers to all of them led to a score of 0, signifying no prior victimization (N = 405). (N = 1218)

*Respect for Parental Authority* is a composite measure of responses to the following questions: *when I go someplace, I leave a note for my parents or call them to tell them where I am; my parents know where I am when I am not at home or at school; and my parents know who I am with if I am not at home.* The respondents were given the choice to answer these questions using a five-point Likert scale ranging from, *very strongly disagree* to *very strongly agree*. To test the internal consistency of the items, a reliability analysis was conducted. From this reliability analysis, it was determined that the Alpha score for the scale was .737, which confirmed that these questions have a very strong intercorrelation. The final variable is the additive result of these three items. (N = 1485)

### **Social Bond Variables**

*Commitment to School* is a composite measure of responses to the following questions: *I try hard in school; education is so important that it's worth putting up with things about school that they don't like; in general, I like school; grades are very important to me; and I usually finish my homework.* The respondents were given the choice to answer these questions using a five-point Likert scale ranging from, *very strongly disagree* to *very strongly agree*. To test the internal consistency of the items, a reliability analysis was conducted. From this reliability analysis, it was determined that the Alpha score for the scale was .766, which confirmed that these questions have a very strong intercorrelation. The final variable is the additive result of these five items. (N = 1472)

*Involvement in Delinquency* consists of two separate variables: respondents' admittance to committing *property crimes* and respondents' admittance to *crimes against persons*. Respondents' admittance to property crimes were measured with following three questions: *purposely damaged or destroyed property that did not belong to you; illegally spray painted a wall or a building; and gone into or tried to go into a building to steal something*. Responses were recoded so that a positive answer to at least one of the questions resulted in a score of 1 (N = 308), whereas negative answers to all of them led to a score of 0 (N = 1126), signifying no delinquency as it relates to property crimes. Respondents' admittance to crimes against *persons* were measured with the following five questions: *stolen or tried to steal something worth less than \$50; stolen or tried to steal something worth more than \$50; hit someone with the idea of hurting them; attacked someone with a weapon; and used a weapon or force to get money or things from people*. Responses were recoded so that a positive answer to at least one of the questions resulted in a score of 1 (N = 623), whereas negative answers to all of them led to a score of 0, signifying no (N = 782) delinquency as it relates to crimes against persons. (N = 1405)

*Involvement in Pro-social* is a summative score of four dichotomous items measuring involvement in: *school activities or athletics; community activities such as scouts or athletic leagues; religious activities; and jobs activity or employment*. The respondents were given the choice to answer these questions with either *yes* or *no*. Responses were recoded so that a positive answer to at least one of the questions resulted in a score of 1 (N = 1088), whereas negative answers to all of them led to a score of 0, signifying no involvement in pro-social activities (N = 249). (N = 1337)

### **Information on the 2006 Study**

The 2006 study ( “A Juvenile’s Perspective: Juveniles’ Attitudes Toward the Police” (Lake, 2006) conducted used secondary data (“Evaluation of the Gang Resistance Education and Training (GREAT) Program in the United States, 1995-1999”) collected during 1999 by five professors Finn-Aage Esbensen, D. Wayne Osgood, Terrance J. Taylor, Dana Peterson, and Adrienne Freng. The study, “Evaluation of the Gang Resistance Education and Training (GREAT) Program in the United States, 1995-1999,” variables were geared toward assessing perception and attitudes about the police and the GREAT program and their overall effectiveness, community involvement, neighborhood crime, and gang-related activities (Esbensen, Osgood, Taylor, Peterson, & Freng, 2001).

To collect the data, Esbensen and his team of investigators chose six cities across the United States. These cities were selected on the basis of three criteria: (a) the existence of a viable GREAT program, (b) geographical location, and (c) the cooperation of the school districts and the police department in each city (Esbensen et al., 2001). Esbensen et al. (2001) selected for their study an East Coast city (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania) a West Coast location (Portland, Oregon), the city of the program’s inception (Phoenix, Arizona), a Midwestern city (Omaha, Nebraska), a “non-gang” city (Lincoln, Nebraska), and a small “border town” with a chronic gang problem (Las Cruces, New Mexico) (Esbensen et al., 2001). Within the selected cities, 22 schools were selected, and surveys were distributed to over 2,800 students in 153 classrooms. In the end, 1,761 completed surveys were collected (Esbensen et al., 2001), and 1,375 were useable for the analysis. Students were between the ages of 13 to 18 with an average age of 16.07 years old (Esbensen et al., 2001). Students were classified as follows: (a) being from large, urban areas with a majority of the students belonging to a racial or ethnic minority; (b) being from medium-

sized cities with a majority of White students but a substantial minority enrollment; and (c) being from a small city (fewer than 100,000 inhabitants) with an ethnically diverse student population.

From the data collected by Esbensen, variables created and used for analysis in the 2006 study were the following: socio-demographic variables (race, age, gender), environmental variables (household composition (whom the juveniles live with), prior victimization, socioeconomic status (subjective class), prior contact with police, and neighborhood characteristics), and social institutions (attachment to their parents and commitment to school). Results of the 2006 study showed that juveniles overall have positive attitudes toward the police and that their race, gender, socioeconomic status, prior victimization, contact with police, neighborhood characteristics, attachments to their parents, and commitment to their school are all sources of their attitudes.

When a multivariate regression analysis was performed (three equations were computed), additional results were revealed in reference to each independent variable. Specifically, White juveniles have a more positive attitude than Black juveniles toward the police. Most important, race was the only variable found to be statistically significant in all three equations. When looking at gender, females have a more positive attitude toward the police than do their male counterparts. However, the effect of gender was washed away when the environmental variables were introduced. The age of the teenagers was not found to be a significant determinant of attitudes for any of the three equations. When looking at the environmental variables (household composition, prior victimization, socioeconomic status, prior contact with police, and neighborhood characteristics), the household composition of the teenagers was not found to be statistically significant. On the other hand, the other four variables were found to be statistically significant in determining juveniles' attitudes toward the police. Finally, it was found that

juveniles' bond to social institutions, like their school and their parents, are determinants of their attitudes toward the police. The bond to their school has the largest effect on the attitudes toward the police. It must be noted that when controlling for attachment and commitment to these social institutions, race and prior contact with the police remained statistically significant.

### **A Comparison of the Measurements of Similar Variables in the 2006 Study and Current Study**

#### Dependent Variable:

##### Attitudes Toward Police

**2006** - A composite variable created from the following nine items that assessed whether police were: *honest, usually rude, hardworking, usually friendly, usually courteous, respectful toward people like themselves (respondents), and prejudiced against minority people and if they (respondents) felt safer with police officers in school and whether police officers make good teachers*. These questions produced an Alpha score of .869.

**Current**- A composite variable created from the following five items that assessed whether the respondents' felt that police officers are: *honest, hardworking, usually friendly, usually courteous, and respectful toward people like me (respondent)*. These questions produced an Alpha score of .905.

#### Independent Variables:

##### Class

**2006** - A composite variable created from the following three items: *I'll never have enough money to go to college; most people are better off than I am; and I'll*

*never have as much opportunity to succeed as young people from other neighborhoods*, which yielded an Alpha score of .6558.

**Current** - A composite variable created from the following two items: *Most people are better off than I am and I'll never have as much opportunity to succeed as young people from other neighborhoods*, which yielded an Alpha score of .634.

#### Prior Contact with Police

**2006** - The question used asked respondents if they had ever been arrested.

**Current** - A composite variable created from the following three items: *have you ever been stopped by the police for questioning; ever been arrested; and ever reported the event to the police*. Responses were recoded so that a positive answer to at least one of the three questions resulted in a score of 1, whereas negative answers to all of them led to a score of 0, signifying no prior contact with police.

#### Neighborhood Context

**2006** - Neighborhood Context consisted of two separate variables: *safety- I feel safe in the neighborhood around my school, and informal collective security- I know a lot of people who live in my neighborhood*. The response categories were *Yes and No*.

**Current** - Neighborhood Context consists of three separate variables:

1. Neighborhood's appearance is measured as composite variables with the following three items: *run down or poorly kept buildings in the neighborhood; graffiti on buildings and fences in the neighborhood; and buildings or personal belongings being broken or torn up in the neighborhood*, which yielded an Alpha score of .738

2. Neighborhood's safety is measured as a composite variable using the following four items: *groups of people hanging out in public places causing trouble; hearing gunshots in the neighborhood; not enough lights in the streets and alleys of the neighborhoods; and cars traveling too fast throughout the streets of the neighborhood*, which yielded an Alpha score of .745.

#### Prior Victimization

**2006** - Prior Victimization was a composite measure of responses to the following three questions: *have you ever been hit by someone trying to hurt you; has someone use a weapon or force to get money or things from you; and; have you been attacked by someone with a weapon or by someone trying to seriously hurt or kill you?* Responses were recoded so that a positive answer to at least one of the questions resulted in a score of 1, whereas negative answers to all of them led to a score of 0, signifying no prior victimization.

**Current** -Prior Victimization is a composite measure of responses to the following six questions *have you ever: had things stolen from you at school; been attacked or threatened on your way to or from school; been attacked or threatened at school; have you ever been bullied at school; been hit by someone trying to hurt you; had someone use a weapon or force to get money or things from you; and been attacked by someone with a weapon or by someone trying to seriously hurt or kill you.* Responses were recoded so that a positive answer to at least one of the questions resulted in a score of 1, whereas negative answers to all of them led to a score of 0, signifying no prior victimization.

## Commitment to School

**2006** - Commitment to School is a composite measure of responses to questions regarding the following questions of whether respondents: *feel safe at their school; are involved in school activities or athletics; try hard in school; feel that education is so important that it's worth putting up with things about school that they don't like; like school; feel that whether grades are important to them; usually finish their homework; get along well with teachers and adults at their school; have been thought of as good students; and almost always obey school rules.* The responses to these questions combined had an Alpha score of .8181.

**Current** - Commitment to School is a composite measure of responses to the following questions: *I try hard in school; education is so important that it's worth putting up with things about school that they don't like; in general, I like school; grades are very important to me; and I usually finish my homework.* The responses to these questions combined had an Alpha score of .766.

In conclusion of this methods section, by comparing the two sets of measures, I am able to determine if the measures created by the same principal investigator for both studies (Lake, 2006 and present study) have validity and reliability. Also, the project affords me the ability to see if different measurements of the same variables have an effect on the variables that affect juveniles' attitudes. This comparison also affords me the opportunity to determine if variables that affected juveniles' attitudes toward the police in 2006 still affect their attitudes presently. The present data set introduces five new variables which are used to determine if they are determinants of attitudes toward the police, these variables include: neighborhood's appearance, involvement in community activities, parental authority, involvement in delinquency, and self



esteem. As a result, I can analyze the impact that the inclusion of these new variables has on the variables that were statistically significant in both the 2006 study (Lake, 2006) and the current study. More importantly, which variable has the largest effect on racial (specifically, Blacks and Hispanics) differences in juveniles' attitudes toward the police?

## **Conclusion**

Thus far I have presented many different chapters that taken together will create the foundation for my dissertation project. In Chapter One I present the purpose, significant contributions, and limitations of this project. Chapter Two contains an extensive review of the relevant literature on the determinants of the public's attitudes toward the police. In my review of the literature I discuss such variables as: race, age, gender, class, contact with police, neighborhood characteristics (neighborhood's safety, neighborhood's appearance, and neighborhood involvement), prior victimization, commitment to school, involvement in delinquent activity, and parental authority. I also present (in Chapter Three) the theoretical framework for the study and outline the two theories (social bond theory and an aspect of the conflict theory) that are utilized, along with hypotheses I tested in the current study. In Chapter Four, I present the research methods and provide detailed information about the dependent and independent variables of this study.

Additionally, in these early chapters I show the need for this study by outlining the significant contributions of this project. For example, this study analyzes the attitudes toward police of one of the least studied although, fastest growing racial minority groups (Hispanics/Latinos) in the United States (Schaefer 2006). Unlike many previous studies that have failed to analyze the attitudes of minorities in more than one racial category, this study provides answers to these questions. The emphasis of previous research on Black-White comparisons has

left unanswered many questions about differences in minority group attitudes toward the police, especially between Latinos and African Americans (Martinez, 2007; Cheurprakobkit, 2000; Culver, 2004; and Correia 2010). In addition, relatively few studies have examined immigrants' perceptions of the criminal justice system or the police (Correia 2010). As a result, this study fulfills a need to update the current literature in this area. The reasons listed above are only a few that I use to help substantiate a need for this study.

## **CHAPTER FIVE** **ANALYSIS & FINDINGS**

### **Introduction**

In order to assess juveniles' attitudes toward the police, four strategies were utilized. First, the frequency distributions of the five attitudinal items (the dependent variable-Attitudes Toward Police) were examined to assess juveniles' overall attitudes toward police. A second set of frequency distributions were conducted on each racial group for all variables, dependent (*attitudes toward police*) and independents (*race, age, gender, class, neighborhood context, respect for parental authority, self-esteem, prior contact with police, prior victimization, commitment to school, involvement in delinquent activity, and involvement in pro-social activities*). Second, examinations of bivariate relationships between the dependent variable (*Attitudes toward police*) and the predictor variables are assessed. Specifically, the analysis of variance (ANOVA) technique was used for the following predictor variables: *race, age, prior contact with police, prior victimization, involvement in delinquency, and involvement in pro-social activity*. The purpose of ANOVA is to test for statistically significant differences between means. By using ANOVA, I am trying to determine if statistically significant differences in means exist between the three racial groups' attitudes toward police when specific independent variables are taken into consideration. In addition, correlations were used for the following predictor variables: *class, neighborhood context (appearance and safety), respect toward parental authority, self-esteem, and commitment to school*. The technique of correlation is used to analyze the relationship between two variables. Third, three linear regression models were developed specifically to analyze the racial differences in attitudes towards police between Blacks versus Whites, Hispanics versus Whites, and Blacks versus Hispanics. Finally, the

results of three (one for each racial group) multivariate analyses are presented separately for each racial group (Whites, Blacks, and Hispanics). In exploring attitudes towards the police using multivariate techniques, the analyses examined the following dependent variable, attitudes toward police. The independent variables include: *age, gender, class, neighborhood context, respect for parental authority, self-esteem, prior contact with police, prior victimization, commitment to school, involvement in delinquency, and involvement in pro-social activity*. For each analysis, three models were analyzed: 1). socio-demographic variables, 2). personal experience variables, and 3). social bond variables.

### **Juveniles' Overall Attitudes toward the Police**

Table One displays the distribution of responses to the five attitudinal items used to measure the juveniles' attitudes toward the police. The responses to the five attitudinal questions in Table 1 shed some light on juveniles' attitudes toward the police in the sample. Forty percent of the teenagers responded with "agree," and 10 percent of the juveniles answered the five questions with "disagree." The juveniles who showed very positive attitudes toward the police on the basis of their responses of "strongly agree" accounted for 18 percent. Last, only 5 percent of all the responses to the five items yielded an answer of "strongly disagree." It must be noted that 27 percent of the juveniles who responded to the five attitudinal measures in the present study answered "neither agree nor disagree."

Table One shows that for the responses to all five items, none of the teens' responses within the category of "strongly agree" were over 25 percent. Likewise for the category of "strongly disagree," where none of the teens' responses were over 6 percent. In particular, the question that the juveniles responded most positive to was "most police officers are usually friendly (44.2%)" followed by, "police officers are hardworking (43.2%)." There are two

questions to which the juveniles' most frequent response was "neither agree nor disagree": police officers are honest (29.3%) and police officers are usually courteous (35.1%). In looking at the three questions referencing officer' demeanor (police are courteous, usually friendly, and respectful towards people like me), the question with the highest favorable response is "most police officers are usually friendly (44.2%). Overall, the response "agree" was the most commonly selected response by the teens when looking at the five attitudinal measures in totality. The most critical finding in Table One is that juveniles in the sample have positive attitudes toward the police. It must be noted that this finding supports one of the study's hypothesis which states, (H6): overall, juveniles have a positive attitude toward the police.

Table One  
*Juveniles' Attitudes Toward the Police*

	N	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither Agree/Disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
1. Police officers are honest.	86	5.8%	189 12.7%	435 29.3%	506 34.0%	271 18.2%
2. Police officers are hard working.	60	4.0%	119 8.1%	339 22.8%	643 43.2%	326 21.9%
3. Most police officers are usually friendly.	81	5.4%	158 10.6%	326 21.9%	658 44.2%	266 17.9%
4. Police officers are usually courteous.	66	4.6%	137 9.5%	507 35.1%	549 38.0%	185 12.8%
5. Police officers are respectful toward people like me.	86	5.8%	115 7.7%	375 25.3%	605 40.7%	304 20.5%

N= 1478

In order to assess the sample of juveniles' attitudes more closely, the responses to the five attitudinal questions were collapsed and reexamined (See Table Two).<sup>2</sup> The juveniles' frequencies to the middle category of "neither agree nor disagree," which was 27 percent, were ignored. This table revealed that after combining "disagree" and "strongly disagree," 15 percent of the teens did not show positive attitudes for the police. The teens who did not show positive attitudes answered "disagree" at 10 percent and "strongly disagree" at 5 percent, whereas, on the other hand, 58 percent of the juveniles showed positive attitudes with 40 percent answering "agree" and 18 percent answering "strongly agree." It is clear from these frequencies that juveniles have positive attitudes toward police. This conclusion would give additional support to the results revealed in Table One.

It is worth noting that in Table Two, the juveniles' responses of "agree" to the questions (1) police officers are honest: agree = 52.2% and disagree = 18.5%; (2) police officers are hardworking: agree = 65.1% and disagree = 12%; (3) most police officers are usually friendly: agree = 62.1% and disagree = 16%; (4) police officers are usually courteous: agree = 51% and disagree = 14.1%; and (5) police officers are respectful towards people like me agree = 61.2% and disagree = 12.6%, more than double in percent when compared to responses of "disagree." In some cases, the responses more than tripled. The juveniles in Table Two responded to the five questions with greater percentages in the "agree" category than in the "disagree" category. From an assessment of Table Two, one could argue that juveniles do not express overwhelmingly negative attitudes toward the police.

---

<sup>2</sup> The "disagree" category includes the responses to "disagree" and "strongly disagree," while the "agree" category includes both "strongly agree" and "agree."

Table Two  
*Juveniles' Attitudes Toward the Police (Recoded)*

	Disagree		Agree	
	N	(1) %	N	(2) %
1. Police officers are honest.	275	18.5%	777	52.2%
2. Police officers are hard working.	179	12%	969	65.1%
3. Most police officers are usually friendly.	239	16%	924	62.1%
4. Police officers are usually courteous.	203	14.1%	734	51%
5. Police officers are respectful toward people like me.	201	12.6%	909	61.2%

*Note.* The “disagree” and “strongly disagree” responses were combined to form “disagree,” and the “agree” and “strongly agree” responses were combined to form “agree.” All responses to the “neither agree” nor “disagree” category were ignored.

N = 1478



### **Univariate Analysis of White Juveniles**

A frequency distribution was conducted on each racial group for all variables, both dependent (*attitudes toward police*) and independents (*race, age, gender, class, neighborhood context, respect for parental authority, self-esteem, prior contact with police, prior victimization, commitment to school, involvement in delinquent activity, and involvement in pro-social activities*). The racial groups are analyzed in no particular order. The results for each of the variables for the White juveniles are discussed below.

### **Dependent Variable**

The dependent variable *attitude toward police* is an index of juveniles' attitudes toward police consisting of five attitudinal items. These five items included: *police officers are honest; police officers are hardworking; most police offices are usually friendly; police officers are usually courteous; and police officers are respectful toward people like me* (respondent). For analysis purposes here, the average of the five items on a scale of 1 to 5 (*1. Strongly disagree, 2. Disagree, 3. Neither agree or disagree, 4. Agree, & 5. Strongly agree*) is used. The results revealed there are 477 White juveniles that responded and 4 did not (Table Three). For the juveniles responding, on average "agree" was the most selected response (Table One). The dependent variable reported a mean of 3.67, a median of 4.00, and a mode of 4.00 (Table Three).

### **Independent Variables**

The data consists of 481 White juveniles (Table Three). Of that number, 213 of the White juveniles are 12 years old or under and 267 are 13 years old or older, with 1 missing (Table Three). The frequency distribution for gender revealed that there are 238 White females and 243 White males (Table Three).

For the variable *class*, two questions were used to create the variable and the average of the two items on a scale of 1 to 5 (1. *Strongly disagree*, 2. *Disagree*, 3. *Neither agree or disagree*, 4. *Agree*, & 5. *Strongly agree*) is used for analysis here. These questions used: *Most people are better off than I am, and I'll never have as much opportunity to succeed as young people from other neighborhoods*. Of the 481 cases reporting, there are a total of 3 cases missing (Table Three). On average, the answer choice that the White juveniles selected the most was “*disagree*” (Table Three). Class has a mean of 2.29, a median of 2.00, and a mode of 2.00 (Table Three).

The variable *neighborhood context* is accessed by analyzing two components of the respondents' neighborhood (*neighborhood's appearance and neighborhood's safety*). The questions used to measure *neighborhood's appearance* are: *run down or poorly kept buildings in the neighborhood; graffiti on buildings and fences in the neighborhood; and buildings or personal belongings being broken or torn up in the neighborhood*. The average of these three items measured on a scale of 1 to 3 (1. Not a problem, 2. Somewhat of a problem, & 3. Big problem) is used for analysis. The analysis revealed that 477 out of 481 White juveniles responded to the three questions (Table Three). The answer choice most selected on average by White juveniles was “*not a problem*” (Table Three). For neighborhood appearance, the mean was 1.45, the median was 1.3, and the mode was 1 (Table Three).

The second measure of neighborhood context, *neighborhood's safety* was measured using four questions: *groups of people hanging out in public places causing trouble; hearing gunshots in the neighborhood; not enough lights in the streets and alleys of the neighborhoods; and cars traveling too fast throughout the streets of the neighborhood*. Similar to the variable *neighborhood's appearance*, the average of these four items on a scale of 1 to 3 (1. Not a problem, 2. Somewhat of a problem, & 3. Big problem) is used for analysis. Of the White

juveniles, 476 respondents reported answers to the questions with 5 missing (Table Three). The answer choice most selected on average was “*not a problem*” (Table Three). From the analysis of *neighborhood’s safety*, the mean reported was 1.63, the median was 1.50, and the mode was 1.25 (Table Three).

*Respect toward parental authority* is a composite measure of responses to three questions: *when I go someplace, I leave a note for my parents or call them to tell them where I am; my parents know where I am when I am not at home or at school; and my parents know who I am with if I am not at home*. For analysis here, the average of the three items on a scale of 1 to 5 (*1. Strongly disagree, 2. Disagree, 3. Neither agree or disagree, 4. Agree, & 5. Strongly agree*) is used. There were a total of 475 respondents that answered the questions and 6 did not (Table Three). On average in response to White juveniles’ *respect toward parental authority*, the most selected response was “*strongly agree*” (Table Three). *Respect toward parental authority* reported a mean of 4.07, a median of 4.00, and a mode of 5.00 (Table Three).

*Self Esteem* is a composite measure that consists of five attitudinal items: *I am a useful person to be around; I feel that I am a person of worth, at least as much as others; I am able to do things as well as most people; I feel good about myself; and when I do a job, I do it well*. In the analysis here, the average of the five items on a scale of 1 to 5 (*1. Almost never, 2. Not too often, 3. About half the time, 4. Often, and 5. Almost always*) is used. The results show that there were 470 White juveniles that responded and 11 did not (Table Three). Of those that responded, on average the response selected the most was “*often*” (Table Three). The White juveniles for this variable reported a mean of 3.93, a median of 4.00, and a mode of 4.0 (Table Three).

*Prior contact with police* is a composite measure of responses to the following questions: *have you ever been stopped by the police for questioning; have you ever been arrested; and have*

*you ever reported the event to the police.* The third question (*Have you ever reported the event to the police?*) measured if a youth that reported being victim of a crime reported the event to police. Responses were recoded so that a positive answer to at least one of the three questions resulted in a score of 1 (contact with police), whereas negative answers to all of them led to a score of 0 (no contact with police). In analyzing the frequency distribution for White juveniles' *prior contact with police*, a total of 471 juveniles responded and 10 did not (Table Three). Of those responding, an overwhelming majority (72.1% or 347) reported they had no prior contact with the police (Table Three). The White juveniles that did report prior contact with the police was 25.8% (Table Three).

*Prior Victimization* is a composite measure of seven questions that include: *had things stolen from you at school; been attacked or threatened on your way to or from school; been attacked or threatened at school; have you ever been bullied at school; been hit by someone trying to hurt you; had someone use a weapon or force to get money or things from you; and been attacked by someone with a weapon or by someone trying to seriously hurt or kill you.* Responses were recoded so that a positive answer to at least one of the questions resulted in a score of 1, whereas negative answers to all of them led to a score of 0, signifying no prior victimization. The frequency distribution for Whites revealed that of the 481 juveniles, 466 responded and 15 juveniles did not respond (Table Three). Of those responding, majority (68.2% or 328) of the White juveniles reported prior victimization and only 28.7 percent did not report being the victim of prior victimization (Table Three).

*Commitment to School* is a composite measure of responses to the following five questions: *I try hard in school; education is so important that it's worth putting up with things about school that I don't like; in general, I like school; grades are very important to me; and I*

*usually finish my homework*. For analysis here, the average of the five items on a scale of 1 to 5 (1. *Strongly disagree*, 2. *Disagree*, 3. *Neither agree or disagree*, 4. *Agree*, & 5. *Strongly agree*) is used. The results show there was 475 White juveniles that responded and 6 did not (Table Three). In reference to *commitment to school*, on average the respondents selected “*agree*” the most (Table Three). Commitment to school reported a mean of 3.91, a median of 4.00, and a mode of 4.00 (Table Three).

*Involvement in Delinquency* consists of two separate variables: respondents’ admittance to committing *property crimes* and respondents’ admittance to *crimes against persons*. Respondents’ admittance to *property crimes* were measured with following three questions: *purposely damaged or destroyed property that did not belong to you; illegally spray painted a wall or a building; and gone into or tried to go into a building to steal something*. Respondents’ admittance to *crimes against persons* were measured with the following five questions: *stolen or tried to steal something worth less than \$50; stolen or tried to steal something worth more than \$50; hit someone with the idea of hurting them; attacked someone with a weapon; and used a weapon or force to get money or things from people*. Responses to both measures (*property crimes & crimes against persons*) were recoded respectively, so that a positive answer to at least one of the questions resulted in a score of 1 (signifying involvement), whereas negative answers to all of them led to a score of 0 (signifying no involvement). For the variable *property crimes*, 462 White juveniles responded and 19 did not (Table Three). Of those responding, majority (349 or 72.6%) were not involved in committing property crimes and 113 (23.5%) were involved (Table Three). In respect to *crimes against persons*, 467 juveniles responded and 14 did not (Table Three). In looking at those that responded, more than half of the White juveniles (60.3%

or 290) were not involved in crimes against persons and 177 (36.8%) were involved (Table Three).

*Involvement in pro-social* is a composite measure of responses to the following four questions about involvement in: *school activities or athletics; community activities such as scouts or athletic leagues; religious activities; and jobs activity or employment.* The respondents were given the choice to answer these questions with either *yes* or *no*. Responses were recoded so that a positive answer to at least one of the questions resulted in a score of 1 signifying involvement, whereas negative answers to all of them led to a score of 0, signifying no involvement in pro-social activities. The results show that 418 White juveniles responded and 63 did not (Table Three). Of those responding, majority (356 or 74%) of the juveniles was involved in pro-social activities and 12.9% (62) were not (Table Three).

**Table Three Univariate Analysis (Whites) N = 481**

	Valid	Missing	Mean	Median	Mode	Range	Mini.	Max	Freq.	Percent
<b><i>Dependent Variable</i></b>										
*Attitudes toward Police	477	4	3.67	4.00	4.00	4.00	1.00	5.00		
<b><i>Independent Variables</i></b>										
Race (Whites)	481								481	100.00
Age	480	1								
(12 & under = 1)	213								213	44.30
(13 & over = 2)	267								267	55.50
Gender	481									
0 = Females	238								238	49.50
1 = Males	243								243	50.50
*Class	478	3	2.29	2.00	2.00	4.00	1.00	5.00		
<b>Neighborhood Context</b>										
*Appearance	477	4	1.45	1.33	1.00	2.00	1.00	3.00		
*Safety	476	5	1.63	1.50	1.25	2.00	1.00	3.00		
*Respect Parental Auth.	475	6	4.07	4.00	5.00	4.00	1.00	5.00		
*Self Esteem	470	11	3.93	4.00	4.00	4.00	1.00	5.00		
Prior Contact w/Police	471	10								
0 = No Contact	347								347	72.10
1 = Contact	124								124	25.80
Prior Victimization	466	15								
0 = No Victim.	138								138	28.70
1 = Victim.	328								328	68.20
*Commitment to School	475	6	3.91	4.00	4.00	4.00	1.00	5.00		
<b>Involvement in Delinquency</b>										
<i>Property Crimes Committed</i>	462	19								
0 = No Crime	349								349	72.60
1 = Crimes Com.	113								113	23.50
<i>Crimes against Persons</i>	467	14								
0 = No Crime	290								290	60.30
1 = Crimes Com.	177								177	36.80
Involvement in Pro-Social Act.	418	63								
0 = No Involvement	62								62	12.90
1 = Involvement	356								356	74.00

1. Attitudes toward police- Results are from the average of 5 items on a scale of 1 to 5.
2. Class-Results are from the average of 2 items on a scale of 1 to 5.
3. Neighborhood Context
  - Appearance- Results are from the average of 3 items on a scale of 1 to 3.
  - Safety- Results are from the average of 4 items on a scale of 1 to 3.
4. Respects toward Parental Authority- Results are from the average of 3 items on a scale of 1 to 5.
5. Self Esteem- Results are from the average of 5 items on a scale of 1 to 5.
6. Commitment to School- Results are from the average of 5 items on a scale of 1 to 5.

## **Univariate Analysis of Black Juveniles**

A frequency distribution was conducted on both the dependent (*attitudes toward police*) and independent (*race, age, gender, class, neighborhood context, respect for parental authority, self-esteem, prior contact with police, prior victimization, commitment to school, involvement in delinquent activity, and involvement in pro-social activities*) variables for the Black Juveniles. The results for each of the variables are discussed below.

### **Dependent Variable**

The dependent variable *attitude toward police* is an index of juveniles' attitudes toward police consisting of five attitudinal items. These five items included: *police officers are honest; police officers are hardworking; most police offices are usually friendly; police officers are usually courteous; and police officers are respectful toward people like me* (respondent). For analysis purposes here, the average of the five items on a scale of 1 to 5 (*1. Strongly disagree, 2. Disagree, 3. Neither agree or disagree, 4. Agree, & 5. Strongly agree*) is used. The results revealed there are 158 juveniles that responded and 4 did not (Table Four). For the juveniles responding, on average "agree" was the most selected response (Table Four). The dependent variable reported a mean of 3.39, a median of 3.40, and a mode of 4.00 (Table Four).

### **Independent Variables**

The data consists of 162 Black juveniles (Table Four). Of that number, 49 of the Black juveniles are 12 years old or under and 113 are 13 years old or older (Table Four). The frequency distribution for gender revealed that there are 95 Black females and 66 males and 1 case missing (Table Four).



For the variable *class*, two questions were used to create the variable and the average of the two items on a scale of 1 to 5 (1. *Strongly disagree*, 2. *Disagree*, 3. *Neither agree or disagree*, 4. *Agree*, & 5. *Strongly agree*) is used for analysis here. These questions used: *most people are better off than I am and I'll never have as much opportunity to succeed as young people from other neighborhoods*. Of the 159 cases reporting, there are a total of 3 cases missing (Table Four). On average, the answer choice that the Black juveniles selected the most was “*disagree*” (Table Four). Class has a mean of 2.31, a median of 2.50, and a mode of 2.00 (Table Four).

The variable *neighborhood context* is accessed by analyzing two components of the respondents' neighborhood (*neighborhood's appearance and neighborhood's safety*). The questions used to measure *neighborhood's appearance* are: *run down or poorly kept buildings in the neighborhood; graffiti on buildings and fences in the neighborhood; and buildings or personal belongings being broken or torn up in the neighborhood*. The average of these three items measured on a scale of 1 to 3 (1. Not a problem, 2. Somewhat of a problem, & 3. Big problem) is used for analysis. The analysis revealed that 160 out of 162 Black juveniles responded to the three questions (Table Four). The answer choice most selected on average by Black juveniles was “*not a problem*” (Table Four). For neighborhood appearance, the mean was 1.65, the median was 1.66, and the mode was 1 (Table Four).

The second measure of neighborhood context, *neighborhood's safety* was measured using four questions: *groups of people hanging out in public places causing trouble; hearing gunshots in the neighborhood; not enough lights in the streets and alleys of the neighborhoods; and cars traveling too fast throughout the streets of the neighborhood*. Similar to the variable *neighborhood's appearance*, the average of these four items on a scale of 1 to 3 (1. Not a problem, 2. Somewhat of a problem, & 3. Big problem) is used for analysis. Of the Black

juveniles, 160 respondents reported answers to the questions with 2 missing (Table Four). The answer choice most selected on average was “*not a problem*” (Table Four). From the analysis of *neighborhood’s safety*, the mean reported was 1.84, the median was 1.75, and the mode was 1.25 (Table Four).

*Respect toward parental authority* is a composite measure of responses to three questions: *when I go someplace, I leave a note for my parents or call them to tell them where I am; my parents know where I am when I am not at home or at school; and my parents know who I am with if I am not at home*. For analysis here, the average of the three items on a scale of 1 to 5 (*1. Strongly disagree, 2. Disagree, 3. Neither agree or disagree, 4. Agree, & 5. Strongly agree*) is used. There were a total of 160 respondents that answered the questions and 2 did not (Table Four). On average in response to Black juveniles’ *respect toward parental authority*, the most selected response was “*strongly agree*” (Table Four). *Respect toward parental authority* reported a mean of 3.97, a median of 4.00, and a mode of 5.00 (Table Four).

*Self Esteem* is a composite measure that consists of five attitudinal items: *I am a useful person to be around; I feel that I am a person of worth, at least as much as others; I am able to do things as well as most people; I feel good about myself; and when I do a job, I do it well*. In the analysis here, the average of the five items on a scale of 1 to 5 (*1. Almost never, 2. Not too often, 3. About half the time, 4. Often, and 5. Almost always*) is used. The results show that there were 157 Black juveniles that responded and 5 did not (Table Four). Of those that responded, on average the response selected the most was “*about half the time*” (Table Four). The Black juveniles for this variable reported a mean of 4.07, a median of 4.00, and a mode of 3.80 (Table Four).

*Prior contact with police* is a composite measure of responses to the following questions: *have you ever been stopped by the police for questioning; have you ever been arrested; and have you ever reported the event to the police.* The third question (*have you ever reported the event to the police?*) measured if a youth that reported being victim of a crime reported the event to police. Responses were recoded so that a positive answer to at least one of the three questions resulted in a score of 1 (contact with police), whereas negative answers to all of them led to a score of 0 (no contact with police). In analyzing the frequency distribution for Black juveniles' *prior contact with police*, a total of 155 juveniles responded and 7 did not (Table Four). Of those responding, over half (63.0% or 102) reported they had no prior contact with the police (Table Four). The Black juveniles that did report prior contact with the police was 32.7% (Table Four).

*Prior Victimization* is a composite measure of seven questions that include: *had things stolen from you at school; been attacked or threatened on your way to or from school; been attacked or threatened at school; have you ever been bullied at school; been hit by someone trying to hurt you; had someone use a weapon or force to get money or things from you; and been attacked by someone with a weapon or by someone trying to seriously hurt or kill you.* Responses were recoded so that a positive answer to at least one of the questions resulted in a score of 1, whereas negative answers to all of them led to a score of 0, signifying no prior victimization. The frequency distribution for Blacks revealed that of the 162 juveniles, 152 responded and 10 juveniles did not respond (Table Four). Of those responding, over half (69.1% or 112) of the Black juveniles reported prior victimization and only 24.7 percent did not report being the victim of prior victimization (Table Four).

*Commitment to School* is a composite measure of responses to the following five questions: *I try hard in school; education is so important that it's worth putting up with things*

*about school that I don't like; in general, I like school; grades are very important to me; and I usually finish my homework.* For analysis here, the average of the five items on a scale of 1 to 5 (1. Strongly disagree, 2. Disagree, 3. Neither agree or disagree, 4. Agree, & 5. Strongly agree) is used. The results show there was 158 Black juveniles that responded and 4 did not (Table Four). In reference to *commitment to school*, on average the respondents selected “agree” the most (Table Four). Commitment to school reported a mean of 4.04, a median of 4.00, and a mode of 4.00 (Table Four).

*Involvement in Delinquency* consists of two separate variables: respondents' admittance to committing *property crimes* and respondents' admittance to *crimes against persons*. Respondents' admittance to *property crimes* were measured with following three questions: *purposely damaged or destroyed property that did not belong to you; illegally spray painted a wall or a building; and gone into or tried to go into a building to steal something.* Respondents' admittance to *crimes against persons* were measured with the following five questions: *stolen or tried to steal something worth less than \$50; stolen or tried to steal something worth more than \$50, hit someone with the idea of hurting them, attacked someone with a weapon; and used a weapon or force to get money or things from people.* Responses to both measures (*property crimes & crimes against persons*) were recoded respectively, so that a positive answer to at least one of the questions resulted in a score of 1 (signifying involvement), whereas negative answers to all of them led to a score of 0 (signifying no involvement). For the variable *property crimes*, 150 Black juveniles responded and 12 did not (Table Four). Of those responding, over half (61.1% or 99) were not involved in committing property crimes and 51 (31.5%) were involved (Table Four). In respect to *crimes against persons*, 153 juveniles responded and 9 did not (Table

Four). In looking at those that responded, a little less than half of the Black juveniles (42.0% or 68) were not involved in crimes against persons and 85 (52.5%) were involved (Table Four).

*Involvement in pro-social* is a composite measure of responses to the following four questions about involvement in: *school activities or athletics; community activities such as scouts or athletic leagues; religious activities; and jobs activity or employment.* The respondents were given the choice to answer these questions with either *yes* or *no*. Responses were recoded so that a positive answer to at least one of the questions resulted in a score of 1 signifying involvement, whereas negative answers to all of them led to a score of 0, signifying no involvement in pro-social activities. The results show that 140 Black juveniles responded and 22 did not (Table Four). Of those responding, an overwhelming majority (78.4% or 127) of the juveniles was involved in pro-social activities and 8.0% (13) were not (Table Four).

**Table Four Univariate Analysis (Blacks) N = 162**

	Valid	Missing	Mean	Median	Mode	Range	Mini.	Max	Freq.	Percent
<b><i>Dependent Variable</i></b>										
*Attitudes toward Police	158	4	3.39	3.40	4.00	4.00	1.00	5.00		
<b><i>Independent Variables</i></b>										
Race (Blacks)	162								162	100.00
Age	162									
(12 & under = 1)	49								49	30.20
(13 & over = 2)	113								113	69.80
Gender	161	1								
0 = Females	95								95	58.60
1 = Males	66								66	40.70
*Class	159	3	2.31	2.50	2.00	4.00	1.00	5.00		
<b>Neighborhood Context</b>										
*Appearance	160	2	1.65	1.66	1.00	2.00	1.00	3.00		
*Safety	160	2	1.84	1.75	1.25	2.00	1.00	3.00		
*Respect Parental Auth.	160	2	3.97	4.00	5.00	3.67	1.00	5.00		
*Self Esteem	157	5	4.07	4.00	3.80	3.20	1.00	5.00		
Prior Contact w/Police	155	7								
0 = No Contact	102								102	63.00
1 = Contact	53								53	32.70
Prior Victimization	152	10								
0 = No Victim.	40								40	24.70
1 = Victim.	112								112	69.10
* Commitment to School	158	4	4.04	4.00	4.00	3.60	1.00	5.00		
<b>Involvement in Delinquency</b>										
<i>Property Crimes Committed</i>	150	10								
0 = No Crime	99								99	61.10
1 = Crimes Com.	51								51	31.50
<i>Crimes against Persons</i>	159	9								
0 = No Crime	68								68	42.00
1 = Crimes Com.	85								85	52.50
Involvement in Pro-Social Act.	140	22								
0 =No Involvement	13								13	8.00
1 = Involvement	127								127	78.40

1. Attitudes toward police- Results are from the average of 5 items on a scale of 1 to 5.
2. Class-Results are from the average of 2 items on a scale of 1 to 5.
3. Neighborhood Context
  - Appearance- Results are from the average of 3 items on a scale of 1 to 3.
  - Safety- Results are from the average of 4 items on a scale of 1 to 3.
4. Respects toward Parental Authority- Results are from the average of 3 items on a scale of 1 to 5.
5. Self Esteem- Results are from the average of 5 items on a scale of 1 to 5.
6. Commitment to School- Results are from the average of 5 items on a scale of 1 to 5.

## **Univariate Analysis of Hispanic Juveniles**

A frequency distribution was conducted on both the dependent (*attitudes toward police*) and independent (*race, age, gender, class, neighborhood context, respect for parental authority, self-esteem, prior contact with police, prior victimization, commitment to school, involvement in delinquent activity, and involvement in pro-social activities*) variables for the Hispanic Juveniles. The results for each of the variables are discussed below.

### **Dependent Variable**

The dependent variable *attitude toward police* is an index of juveniles' attitudes toward police consisting of five attitudinal items. These five items included: *police officers are honest; police officers are hardworking; most police offices are usually friendly; police officers are usually courteous; and police officers are respectful toward people like me* (respondent). For analysis purposes here, the average of the five items on a scale of 1 to 5 (*1. Strongly disagree, 2. Disagree, 3. Neither agree or disagree, 4. Agree, & 5. Strongly agree*) is used. The results revealed there are 603 juveniles that responded and 42 did not (Table Five). For the juveniles responding, on average "agree" was the most selected response (Table Five). The dependent variable reported a mean of 3.51, a median of 3.60, and a mode of 4.00 (Table Five).

### **Independent Variables**

The data consists of 645 Hispanic juveniles (Table Five). Of that number, 261 of the Hispanic juveniles are 12 years old or under, 380 are 13 years old or older, 4 cases are missing for the age variable (Table Five). The frequency distribution for gender revealed that there are 348 Hispanic females and 296 males and 1 case missing (Table Five).

For the variable *class*, two questions were used to create the variable and the average of the two items on a scale of 1 to 5 (1. *Strongly disagree*, 2. *Disagree*, 3. *Neither agree or disagree*, 4. *Agree*, & 5. *Strongly agree*) is used for analysis here. These questions used: *most people are better off than I am*, and *I'll never have as much opportunity to succeed as young people from other neighborhoods*. Of the 627 cases reporting, there are a total of 18 cases missing (Table Five). On average, the answer choice that the Hispanics juveniles selected the most was “*disagree*” (Table Five). Class has a mean of 2.53, a median of 2.50, and a mode of 2.00 (Table Three).

The variable *neighborhood context* is accessed by analyzing two components of the respondents' neighborhood (*neighborhood's appearance and neighborhood's safety*). The questions used to measure *neighborhood's appearance* are: *run down or poorly kept buildings in the neighborhood*; *graffiti on buildings and fences in the neighborhood*; and *buildings or personal belongings being broken or torn up in the neighborhood*. The average of these three items measured on a scale of 1 to 3 (1. Not a problem, 2. Somewhat of a problem, & 3. Big problem) is used for analysis. The analysis revealed that 626 out of 645 Hispanic juveniles responded to the three questions (Table Five). The answer choice most selected on average by Hispanic juveniles was “*not a problem*” (Table Five). For neighborhood appearance, the mean was 1.85, the median was 1.66, and the mode was 1.33 (Table Five).

The second measure of neighborhood context, *neighborhood's safety* was measured using four questions: *groups of people hanging out in public places causing trouble*; *hearing gunshots in the neighborhood*; *not enough lights in the streets and alleys of the neighborhoods*; and *cars traveling too fast throughout the streets of the neighborhood*. Similar to the variable *neighborhood's appearance*, the average of these four items on a scale of 1 to 3 (1. Not a



problem, 2. Somewhat of a problem, & 3. Big problem) is used for analysis. For the Hispanic juveniles, 633 respondents reported answers to the questions with 12 missing (Table Five). The answer choice most selected on average was “*not a problem*” (Table Five). From the analysis of *neighborhood’s safety*, the mean reported was 1.95, the median was 2.00, and the mode was 1.50 (Table Five).

*Respect toward parental authority* is a composite measure of responses to three questions: *when I go someplace, I leave a note for my parents or call them to tell them where I am; my parents know where I am when I am not at home or at school; and my parents know who I am with if I am not at home*. For analysis here, the average of the three items on a scale of 1 to 5 (1. *Strongly disagree*, 2. *Disagree*, 3. *Neither agree or disagree*, 4. *Agree*, & 5. *Strongly agree*) is used. There were a total of 641 respondents that answered the questions and 4 did not (Table Five). On average in response to Hispanic juveniles’ *respect toward parental authority*, the most selected response was “*strongly agree*” (Table Five). *Respect toward parental authority* reported a mean of 3.87, a median of 4.00, and a mode of 5.00 (Table Five).

*Self-esteem* is a composite measure that consists of five attitudinal items: *I am a useful person to be around; I feel that I am a person of worth, at least as much as others; I am able to do things as well as most people; I feel good about myself; and when I do a job, I do it well*. In the analysis here, the average of the five items on a scale of 1 to 5 (1. *Almost never*, 2. *Not too often*, 3. *About half the time*, 4. *Often*, and 5. *Almost always*) is used. The results show that there were 625 Hispanic juveniles that responded and 20 did not (Table Five). Of those that responded, on average the response selected the most was “*often*” (Table Five). The Hispanic juveniles for this variable reported a mean of 3.75, a median of 3.80, and a mode of 4.00 (Table Five).

*Prior contact with police* is a composite measure of responses to the following questions: *have you ever been stopped by the police for questioning; have you ever been arrested; and have you ever reported the event to the police.* The third question (*have you ever reported the event to the police?*) measured if a youth that reported being victim of a crime reported the event to police. Responses were recoded so that a positive answer to at least one of the three questions resulted in a score of 1 (contact with police), whereas negative answers to all of them led to a score of 0 (no contact with police). In analyzing the frequency distribution for Hispanic juveniles' *prior contact with police*, a total of 627 juveniles responded and 18 did not (Table Five). Of those responding, an overwhelming majority (71.8% or 463) reported they had no prior contact with the police (Table Five). The Hispanic juveniles that did report prior contact with the police was 25.4% (Table Five).

*Prior Victimization* is a composite measure of seven questions that include: *had things stolen from you at school; been attacked or threatened on your way to or from school; been attacked or threatened at school; have you ever been bullied at school; been hit by someone trying to hurt you; had someone use a weapon or force to get money or things from you; and been attacked by someone with a weapon or by someone trying to seriously hurt or kill you.* Responses were recoded so that a positive answer to at least one of the questions resulted in a score of 1, whereas negative answers to all of them led to a score of 0, signifying no prior victimization. The frequency distribution for Hispanics revealed that of the 645 juveniles, 622 responded and 23 juveniles did not respond (Table Five). Of those responding, over half (62.3% or 402) of the Hispanic juveniles reported prior victimization and only 34.1 percent did not report being the victim of prior victimization (Table Five).

*Commitment to School* is a composite measure of responses to the following five questions: *I try hard in school; education is so important that it's worth putting up with things about school that I don't like; in general, I like school; grades are very important to me; and I usually finish my homework.* For analysis here, the average of the five items on a scale of 1 to 5 (1. *Strongly disagree*, 2. *Disagree*, 3. *Neither agree or disagree*, 4. *Agree*, & 5. *Strongly agree*) is used. The results show there was 633 Hispanic juveniles that responded and 12 did not (Table Five). In reference to *commitment to school*, on average the respondents selected “agree” the most (Table Five). Commitment to school reported a mean of 3.86, a median of 4.00, and a mode of 4.00 (Table Five).

*Involvement in Delinquency* consists of two separate variables: respondents' admittance to committing *property crimes* and respondents' admittance to *crimes against persons*. Respondents' admittance to *property crimes* were measured with following three questions: *purposely damaged or destroyed property that did not belong to you; illegally spray painted a wall or a building; and gone into or tried to go into a building to steal something.* Respondents' admittance to *crimes against persons* were measured with the following five questions: *stolen or tried to steal something worth less than \$50; stolen or tried to steal something worth more than \$50; hit someone with the idea of hurting them; Attacked someone with a weapon; and used a weapon or force to get money or things from people.* Responses to both measures (*property crimes & crimes against persons*) were recoded respectively, so that a positive answer to at least one of the questions resulted in a score of 1 (signifying involvement), whereas negative answers to all of them led to a score of 0 (signifying no involvement). For the variable *property crimes*, 602 Hispanic juveniles responded and 43 did not (Table Five). Of those responding, over half (67.4% or 435) were not involved in committing property crimes and 167 (25.9%) were involved

(Table Five). In respect to *crimes against persons*, 625 juveniles responded and 20 did not (Table Five). In looking at those that responded, a little more than half of the Hispanics juveniles (61.9% or 399) were not involved in crimes against persons and 226 (35.0%) were involved (Table Five).

*Involvement in pro-social* is a composite measure of responses to the following four questions about involvement in: *school activities or athletics; community activities such as scouts or athletic leagues; religious activities; and jobs activity or employment*. The respondents were given the choice to answer these questions with either *yes* or *no*. Responses were recoded so that a positive answer to at least one of the questions resulted in a score of 1 signifying involvement, whereas negative answers to all of them led to a score of 0, signifying no involvement in pro-social activities. The results show that 594 Hispanic juveniles responded and 51 did not (Table Five). Of those responding, an overwhelming majority (70.4% or 454) of the juveniles was involved in pro-social activities and 21.7% (140) were not (Table Five).

**Table Five Univariate Analysis (Hispanics)**  
**N = 645**

	Valid	Missing	Mean	Median	Mode	Range	Mini.	Max	Freq.	Percent
<b>Dependent Variable</b>										
*Attitudes toward Police	603	42	3.51	3.60	4.00	4.00	1.00	5.00		
<b>Independent Variables</b>										
Race (Hispanics)	645								645	100.00
Age	641	4								
(12 & under = 1)	261								261	40.50
(13 & over = 2)	380								380	58.90
Gender	645									
0 = Females	348								348	54.00
1 = Males	296								296	45.90
*Class	627	18	2.53	2.50	2.00	4.00	1.00	5.00		
Neighborhood Context										
*Appearance	626	19	1.85	1.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	3.00		
*Safety	633	12	1.95	2.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	3.00		
* Respect Parental Auth.	641	4	3.87	4.00	5.00	4.00	1.00	5.00		
* Self Esteem	625	20	3.75	3.80	4.00	4.00	1.00	5.00		
Prior Contact w/Police	627	18								
0 = No Contact	463								463	71.80
1 = Contact	164								164	25.40
Prior Victimization	622	23								
0 = No Victim.	220								220	34.10
1 = Victim.	402								402	62.30
* Commitment to School	633	12	3.86	4.00	4.00	4.00	1.00	5.00		
Involvement in Delinquency										
<i>Property Crimes Committed</i>	602	42								
0 = No Crime	435								435	67.40
1 = Crimes Com.	167								167	25.90
<i>Crimes against Persons</i>	625	20								
0 = No Crime	399								399	61.90
1 = Crimes Com.	226								226	35.00
Involvement in Pro-Social Act.	594	51								
0 =No Involvement	140								140	21.70
1 = Involvement	454								454	70.40

1. Attitudes toward police- Results are from the average of 5 items on a scale of 1 to 5.
2. Class-Results are from the average of 2 items on a scale of 1 to 5.
3. Neighborhood Context
  - Appearance- Results are from the average of 3 items on a scale of 1 to 3.
  - Safety- Results are from the average of 4 items on a scale of 1 to 3.
4. Respects toward Parental Authority- Results are from the average of 3 items on a scale of 1 to 5.
5. Self Esteem- Results are from the average of 5 items on a scale of 1 to 5.
6. Commitment to School- Results are from the average of 5 items on a scale of 1 to 5.

## Conclusion

The results highlight the fact that the data set consist of 1288 juveniles of which 481 are White, 162 are Black, and 645 are Hispanics. In analyzing the preliminary results, results point to the conclusion that overall juveniles have favorable attitudes toward the police. This is supported by the fact that for all three racial groups, the response selected the most for the dependent variable (*attitudes toward police*) was “agree.” When assessing the independent variables, many of them revealed similar results about the three different racial groups. For example, the response selected the most by all three racial groups were the same for the independent variables *class* (“disagree” selected most), *neighborhood context* which was measured assessing neighborhood’s appearance (“not a problem” selected most) and neighborhood’s safety (“not a problem” selected most), and *respect toward parental authority* (“agree” selected most). The juveniles’ responses to the variable *self-esteem* varied slightly in reference to the answer selected the most. White and Hispanic juveniles both selected the response “often” the most as their answer choice whereas, “about half the time” was the most selected response for Blacks. Further analysis revealed that a majority of all three racial groups’ members had no prior contact with police (no contact- Whites = 72.1%, Blacks = 63.0%, & Hispanics= 71.8%), but had been the victim of prior victimization (been victimized- Whites = 68.2%, Blacks = 69.1%, & Hispanics 62.3%).

When analyzing the social bond variables (*commitment to school, involvement in delinquency, and involvement in pro-social activities*), results for all three groups remained similar. For example, all three racial groups for the variable *commitment to school* selected the answer choice “agree” the most. Involvement in delinquency was measured looking at: *property crimes committed* and *crimes against persons*. A majority (Whites = 72.6%, Blacks = 61.1%, &

Hispanics 67.45) of the respondents for each group respectively was not involved in property crimes. In analyzing crimes against persons, most of the Whites (60.3%) and Hispanics (61.9%) respondents revealed they had not committed a crime against another person. Whereas for Blacks, a little more than half (52.5%) were involved in crimes against persons. The results for the variable *involvement in pro-social* revealed that an overwhelming majority (Whites = 74%, Blacks = 78.4%, & Hispanics = 70.4%) of juveniles from all three groups were involved in pro-social activities.

Overall, the results for each racial group were fairly similar for all variables (*class, neighborhood context, respect for parental authority, prior contact with police, prior victimization, commitment to school, and involvement in pro-social activities*) except *self-esteem* and one of the measures of involvement in delinquency (*crimes against persons*). In looking at the results from the univariate analysis and the hypotheses presented earlier, only one of the hypotheses is supported. The preliminary univariate results for the dependent variable (*attitudes toward police*) lend support to the study's hypothesis (H6: Overall, juveniles have a positive ATP.) about juveniles overall attitudes. For each racial group, "agree" was the most selected response to the questions that measured the juveniles' attitudes toward police.

### **Racial Differences based on Univariate Results**

- Results for each racial group were similar for the following variables: *class, neighborhood context, respect for parental authority, prior contact with police, prior victimization, commitment to school, and involvement in pro-social activities.*
- For *self-esteem*, Whites and Hispanics juveniles both selected the response “often” the most as their answer choice whereas, “about half the time” was the most selected response for Blacks.
- For *crimes against persons*, most of the Whites (60.3%) and Hispanics (61.9%) respondents revealed they had not committed a crime against another person; whereas for Blacks, a little more than half (52.5%) were involved in crimes against persons.
- Blacks have a higher rate of *prior contact with police* than the other two racial groups (prior contact- Whites = 25.8%, Blacks = 32.7%, & Hispanics= 25.4%).
- Hispanics have the highest non-victimization rate of the three racial groups (not victimized- Whites = 28.7%, Blacks = 24.7%, & Hispanics 34.1%).
- Blacks have a higher rate of *prior victimization* than the other two racial groups (Whites = 68.2%, Blacks = 69.1%, & Hispanics 62.3%)
- Of the three groups, Blacks had the highest rate of involvement in *property crimes* (Blacks = 31.5%, Whites = 23.5%, & Hispanics = 25.9%).



- Although a majority of the respondents from all three groups were involved in *pro-social activities*, Blacks had the highest rate of involvement (Blacks = 78.4%, Whites = 74%, & Hispanics = 70.4%).

To understand the relations among variables and the true effects of the independent variables on attitudes towards police, I report on bivariate and multivariate analyses in the next section/chapter. The racial differences discussed above will also be further tested using bivariate and multivariate procedures.

### **ANOVA Results**

In conducting the first phase of the analysis on juveniles' attitudes toward the police, the second technique used was the analysis of variance (ANOVA). In general, the purpose of ANOVA is to test for statistically significant differences between means. By using ANOVA, I am trying to determine if statistically significant differences in means exist between the three racial groups' attitudes toward police when specific independent variables are taken into consideration. Due to the data requirements of ANOVA (dependent variables must be interval-ratio-level and independent variables must be of two categories (Healey, 2002)), only seven of the independent variables were able to be analyzed using the technique. The independent variables assessed include: race, age, gender, prior-contact, prior-victimization, involvement in delinquency, and involvement in pro-social activity. For the analysis, the variables were recoded as follows: race – 1 = Whites, 2 = Blacks, and 3 = Hispanics; age - 1 = 12 and under & 2 = 13 and over; prior-contact, prior-victimization, involvement in delinquency, and involvement in pro-social activity were all recoded respectively so that 0 = no and 1 = yes to each variable. For this analysis, the dependent variable used was “attitudes toward police.”

It must be noted that the variables analyzed using ANOVA was analyzed in no particular order. In looking at race, there is a statistically significant difference between Whites and Blacks ( $p = .025$ ) and Whites and Hispanics ( $p = .026$ ) attitudes towards police. However, when assessing Blacks and Hispanics there is no statistically significant difference between their attitudes ( $p = 1.000$ ). Further analysis of the mean scores for each racial group revealed that Whites (mean score = 18.51) had the highest mean, followed by Hispanics (mean score = 17.73) and Blacks (mean score = 17.27). Therefore, Whites have a more positive attitude toward police when compared to the other racial groups. There is a statistically significant difference in the means of attitudes toward police for White and Hispanic juveniles when race and age (looking at the difference between those age 12 and under & this age 13 and over) is taken into consideration ( $p = .05$ ) (Table Six). For Blacks, there is no statistically significant difference in the means of attitudes toward police when race and age is taken into consideration (Table Six). For all racial groups, younger teens reported a higher mean score for attitudes toward police (Table Six). As a result, younger teens for each racial group have a more positive attitude toward police. When race and gender is taken into consideration, there is a statistically significant difference in the means of attitudes toward police for White based on gender ( $p = .05$ ) (Table Six). The same was not found for Blacks and Hispanics (Table Six). However, for each racial group females reported a higher mean score than males pointing to the fact that females have a more positive attitude toward police (Table Six).

In assessing race and prior contact with the police, there is a statistically significant difference in the means of White and Hispanic juveniles' attitudes toward the police ( $p = .05$ ) (Table Six). However, Black juveniles had no statistically significant difference in means for their attitudes toward police regardless of if they had or did not have prior-contact with police

(Table Six). Juveniles with no prior contact with police for all racial categories reported a higher mean score than those with such contact (Table Six). Overall, for each racial group those without prior-contact with the police reported a more positive attitude toward the police.

There is no statistically significant difference in the means of attitudes toward police for White and Black juveniles when race and prior victimization is taken into consideration (Table Six). However, there is a statistically significant difference in the means of Hispanics' attitudes toward the police for those with prior victimization and those without ( $p = .05$ ) (Table Six). Both White and Hispanic groups reporting no prior victimization had a higher mean score for attitudes toward police (Table Six). Blacks on the other hand, revealed that those with prior victimization had a higher mean score for attitudes toward the police (Table Six). White and Hispanic juveniles with no prior victimization and Blacks with prior victimization reported a more positive attitude toward police.

The independent variable involvement in delinquency was measured looking at property crimes committed and crimes against persons. Analysis revealed that for each racial group there is a statistically significant difference in the means of attitudes toward the police when race and property crimes committed are taken into consideration ( $p = .05$ ) (Table Six). Juveniles for each racial group who have not committed a property crime have a higher mean score for attitudes toward police (Table Six). Therefore for each racial group, juveniles who have not committed property crimes have a more positive attitude toward police.

When analyzing crimes against persons, both Whites and Hispanics reported a statistically significant difference in means of attitudes toward police when race and crimes against persons are taken into consideration ( $p = .05$ ) (Table Six). For Blacks, there is no

statistically significant difference in means of attitudes toward police for those that have committed crimes against persons and those who have not (Table Six). Juveniles for each racial group who have not committed a crime against persons have a higher mean score for attitudes toward police (Table Six). Therefore for each racial group, juveniles who have not committed a crime against persons have a more positive attitude toward police.

In assessing race and pro-social activities, there is a statistically significant difference in the means of attitudes toward police for Whites when the two (race and pro-social activities) variables are taken into consideration ( $p = .05$ ) (Table Six). Black and Hispanic juveniles revealed that there is no statistically significant difference in means of attitudes toward police when race and pro-social activities are taken into consideration (Table Six). For all racial groups, those involved in pro-social activities reported a higher mean score for attitudes toward police (Table Six). Therefore, those involved in pro-social activities for each racial group have a more positive attitude toward police than those who are not involved.

Table Six ANOVA Results

Variable	Race	Categories	Mean	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
<b>Age</b>	White	12 & under	19.47	18.88	20.05	
		13 & over	17.54	17.02	18.07	
	Black	12 & under	18.00	16.75	19.24	
		13 & over	16.55	15.74	17.30	
	Hispanic	12 & under	18.52	17.98	19.07	
		13 & over	16.94	16.48	17.39	
<b>Gender</b>	White	Female	19.71	18.61	19.74	
		Male	17.63	17.07	18.19	
	Black	Female	17.30	16.40	18.20	
		Male	16.53	15.46	17.61	
	Hispanic	Female	17.86	17.38	18.34	
		Male	17.30	16.78	17.83	
<b>Prior Contact</b>	White	No Contact	19.21	18.82	19.73	
		Contact	16.21	15.46	16.97	
	Black	No Contact	17.60	16.75	18.45	
		Contact	16.20	15.04	17.36	
	Hispanic	No Contact	18.19	17.79	18.59	
		Contact	15.94	15.25	16.62	
<b>Prior Victimization</b>	White	No Vic. Victimization	18.81 18.27	18.07 17.79	19.55 18.75	
		Black	No Vic. Victimization	16.97 17.03	15.58 16.02	18.36 17.86
	Hispanic		No Vic. Victimization	18.05 17.18	17.90 16.73	19.10 17.63
		<b>Involvement in Delinquency</b> <i>(Property Crimes Committed)</i>  <i>(Crime Against Person)</i>	White	No Crime	19.27	18.83
	Crime Commit			16.22	15.45	16.99
	Black		No Crime	17.96	17.13	18.80
Crime Commit			15.96	14.82	17.09	
Hispanic	No Crime		18.54	18.14	18.94	
	Crime Commit		15.49	14.84	16.13	
White	No Crime		19.52	19.02	20.02	
	Crime Commit		16.78	16.15	17.41	
Black	No Crime		17.59	16.56	18.62	
	Crime Commit		16.78	15.84	17.71	
Hispanic	No Crime		18.35	17.92	18.79	
	Crime Commit		16.32	15.75	16.90	
<b>Pro-social Activities</b>	White	Not Involved	16.72	15.61	17.83	
		Involved	18.46	18.00	18.92	
	Black	Not Involved	14.69	12.28	17.09	
		Involved	17.23	16.45	18.01	
	Hispanic	Not Involved	16.95	16.19	17.71	
		Involved	17.67	17.26	18.09	

## **Correlations Results**

The independent variables that did not meet the data requirements of ANOVA (dependent variables must be interval-ratio-level and independent variables must be of more than two categories (Healey, 2002) was analyzed using correlations. Correlations require for dependent and independent variables that are measured at the continuous level (Healey, 2002). The technique of correlation is used to analyze the relationship between two variables. The variables included in correlation analyses were: class, neighborhood context, respect toward parental authority, self-esteem, and commitment to school. Similar to the ANOVA analysis that was conducted, the dependent variable used for this analysis was “attitudes toward police.”

In analyzing class and attitudes toward police, results revealed that there is a statistically significant positive ( $p = .000$  &  $r = .150$ ) relationship between the two (Table Seven). Therefore, as one's class status increases their attitudes toward the police are more positive. The next variable neighborhood context was measured by looking at neighborhood safety and neighborhood appearance. For the variable neighborhood appearance, there is a statistically significant negative ( $p = .003$  &  $r = -.078$ ) relationship between it and attitudes toward the police (Table Seven). As a result, as the physical appearance of one's neighborhood deteriorates (decreases) their attitude toward the police becomes more negative. In regards to neighborhood safety and attitudes toward the police, results show a statistically significant negative ( $p = .004$  &  $r = -.077$ ) relationship between the two variables (Table Seven). Thus, when the safety decreases in one's neighborhood, their attitude toward police as a result become more negative. When assessing the variable respect toward parental authority, there is a statistically significant positive ( $p = .000$  &  $r = .268$ ) relationship between it and attitudes toward police (Table Seven). Therefore, as juveniles' respect for parental authority increases their attitudes toward the police

are more positive. The variable self-esteem revealed that there is a statistically significant positive ( $p = .000$  &  $r = .229$ ) relationship between it and the dependent variable (Table Seven). As juveniles' self-esteem become more positive, their attitudes toward police become more positive as well. When analyzing the relationship between attitudes toward police and commitment to school, the results show that a statistically significant positive ( $p = .000$  &  $r = .404$ ) relationship exists between the two (Table Seven). As juveniles' commitment to school increases their attitudes toward police become more positive.

**Table Seven Correlations Results**

		Attitudes toward Police (5Q)	Class	Neighborhood Appearance	Neighborhood Safety	Respect Parental Authority	Self Esteem	Commitment to School
Attitudes toward Police (5Q)	Pearson Correlation	1	.150*	-.078*	-.077*	.268*	.229*	.404*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.003	.004	.000	.000	.000
	N	1438	1426	1414	1421	1430	1414	1423
Class	Pearson Correlation	.150*	1	-.165*	-.148*	.197*	.366*	.243**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	1426	1473	1452	1457	1466	1447	1457
Neighborhood Appearance	Pearson Correlation	-.078*	-.165*	1	.730*	-.083*	-.054*	-.039
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.003	.000		.000	.002	.040	.142
	N	1414	1452	1468	1459	1457	1434	1445
Neighborhood Safety	Pearson Correlation	-.077*	-.148*	.730*	1	-.087*	-.035	-.034
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.004	.000	.000		.001	.180	.197
	N	1421	1457	1459	1476	1466	1441	1454
Respect Parental Authority	Pearson Correlation	.268*	.197*	-.083*	-.087*	1	.340*	.438*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.002	.001		.000	.000
	N	1430	1466	1457	1466	1485	1448	1464
Self Esteem	Pearson Correlation	.229*	.366*	-.054*	-.035	.340*	1	.489*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.040	.180	.000		.000
	N	1414	1447	1434	1441	1448	1456	1441
Commit to School	Pearson Correlation	.404*	.243*	-.039	-.034	.438*	.489*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.142	.197	.000	.000	
	N	1423	1457	1445	1454	1464	1441	1472

\*Statistically Significant (.05)



In conclusion, when assessing attitudes towards the police using ANOVA, there is a statistically significant difference in attitudes towards police between Whites compared to Blacks and Whites compared to Hispanics. When assessing Blacks and Hispanics attitudes there is no statistically significant difference between the two. When age and race is considered, only Whites and Hispanics have a statistically significant difference in the means of attitudes toward police. However, younger teens for all three racial groups reported a higher mean score for attitudes toward police and therefore, have a more positive attitude toward police. When race and gender is considered, there is a statistically significant difference in the means of attitudes toward police for Whites based on gender ( $p = .05$ ). The same was not found for Blacks and Hispanics. Nevertheless, for each racial group females reported higher mean scores than males pointing to the fact that females have a more positive attitude toward police.

In assessing race and prior contact with the police, there is only a statistically significant difference in the means of White and Hispanic juveniles' attitudes toward the police. Juveniles with no prior contact with police for all three racial categories reported a higher mean score than those with such contact. Overall, for each racial group those without prior-contact with the police reported a more positive attitude toward the police. When race and prior victimization is considered, Hispanics were the only group that reported a statistically significant difference in the means of attitudes toward police. Both White and Hispanic groups reporting no prior victimization had a higher mean score for attitudes toward police. For Blacks, juveniles with prior victimization had a higher mean score for attitudes toward the police. As a result, White and Hispanic juveniles with no prior victimization and Blacks with prior victimization reported a more positive attitude toward police. In looking at one of the measures of involvement in delinquency, property crimes committed; each racial group had a statistically significant

difference in the means of attitudes toward the police when race and property crimes committed were considered. Juveniles for each racial group who have not committed a property crime have a higher mean score for attitudes toward police. Therefore, those who have not committed property crimes have a more positive attitude toward police. For crimes against persons, only Whites and Hispanics reported a statistically significant difference in means of attitudes toward police when race and crimes against persons are considered. Juveniles for each racial group who have not committed a crime against persons have a higher mean score for attitudes toward police. Thus, juveniles who have not committed a crime against persons have a more positive attitude toward police. In assessing pro-social activities, Black and Hispanic juveniles revealed that there is no statistically significant difference in means of attitudes toward police when race and pro-social activities are considered. For all racial groups, those involved in pro-social activities reported a higher mean score for attitudes toward police. Therefore, those involved in pro-social activities for each racial group have a more positive attitude toward police than those who are not involved.

Of the five independent variables (class, neighborhood context, and respect toward parental authority, self-esteem, and commitment to school) analyzed using correlations, only one of the variables (neighborhood context) revealed a negative relationship with juveniles' attitudes toward police. Both measures of neighborhood context (appearance and safety) revealed a negative effect on the juveniles' attitude toward police. The negative relationships can be expressed as: when the physical appearance of one's neighborhood deteriorates (decreases) their attitude toward the police becomes more negative, and when the safety decreases in one's neighborhood, their attitude toward the police becomes more negative. Whereas on the other

hand, as the juveniles' class status, respect toward parental authority, and commitment to school increase and self-esteem become more positive, their attitudes toward police are more positive.

### **Racial Differences based on Bivariate Results**

- There is a statistically significant difference between Whites and Blacks ( $p = .025$ ) and Whites and Hispanics ( $p = .026$ ) attitudes towards police.
- There is no statistically significant difference between Blacks and Hispanics attitudes ( $p = 1.000$ ).
- Based on means reported, Whites have a more positive attitude toward police followed by Hispanics then Blacks.
- There is a statistically significant difference in the means of attitudes toward police for White and Hispanic juveniles when race and age (looking at the difference between those age 12 and under & this age 13 and over) is taken into consideration ( $p = .05$ ), but not for Blacks.
- Only Whites reported a statistically significant difference in mean scores for attitudes toward police in reference to race and gender.
- When race and prior contact with the police is taken into consideration, there is a statistically significant difference in the means of White and Hispanic juveniles' attitudes toward the police ( $p = .05$ ), but not for Blacks.
- Unlike Hispanics, there is no statistically significant difference in the means of attitudes toward police for White and Black juveniles when race and prior victimization is taken into consideration.
- White and Hispanic groups reporting no prior victimization had a higher mean score for attitudes toward police.

- Blacks revealed that those with prior victimization had a higher mean score for attitudes toward the police whereas for White and Hispanic juveniles, those with no prior victimization had a higher mean score.
- Whites and Hispanics reported a statistically significant difference in means of attitudes toward police when race and crimes against persons are taken into consideration ( $p = .05$ ), but not for Blacks.
- Unlike Whites, Black and Hispanic juveniles revealed that there is no statistically significant difference in means of attitudes toward police when race and pro-social activities are taken into consideration.

It must be noted that the preliminary bivariate results lend support to several of the study's hypotheses. These results were concluded based on the mean scores of the three racial groups. There are findings that support the hypotheses in reference to race and attitudes toward the police. The hypotheses about race and attitudes toward to police stated: H3: Black and Hispanic juveniles' attitudes toward the police will be less positive when compared to Whites and, H5: Blacks will have a more negative attitude toward police than Hispanics. The bivariate results revealed that Whites indeed have a more positive attitude toward police than Blacks and Hispanics and that Hispanics' attitudes were more positive than Blacks.

For age, it was hypothesized that older juveniles will have a more negative attitude toward the police than younger juveniles (H9). The results from the ANOVA analysis revealed that for all three racial groups, younger juveniles have a more positive attitude toward police. The results from the bivariate analysis also supported the hypothesis in reference to gender and attitudes toward police (H7: Females will have a more positive attitude toward the police than

males). The analysis revealed that females for each racial group have a more positive attitude toward the police.

Earlier in the study, the hypothesis in reference to prior contact with police stated that juveniles reporting prior contact with the police will have a negative attitude toward the police (H12). The results from the bivariate analysis supported this hypothesis finding that for each racial group those without prior-contact with the police reported a more positive attitude toward the police.

In looking at prior victimization, it was hypothesized that juveniles' reporting prior victimization will have a negative attitude toward the police (H14). The ANOVA results provided support for Whites and Hispanics, but not for Blacks. The results revealed that White and Hispanic juveniles with no prior victimization reported a more positive attitude toward police thus confirming what was hypothesized. For Blacks where the hypothesis does not hold true, the ANOVA results revealed that Blacks with prior victimization have a more positive attitude toward police.

The bivariate analysis results for involvement in pro-social activities support the study's hypothesis that, juveniles involved in pro-social activities will have a positive attitude toward the police (H10). The results revealed that those involved in pro-social activities for each racial group have a more positive attitude toward police than those who are not involved. Although this section provides support for some of the hypotheses of this study, additional analysis will be conducted to test each hypothesis in later sections.

## *Multivariate Analysis of Juveniles' Attitudes Toward the Police*

### **Blacks Compared to Whites**

In an effort to advance the literature on juveniles' attitudes toward the police, three linear regression models were developed specifically to analyze the racial differences between Blacks versus Whites, Hispanics versus Whites, and Blacks versus Hispanics. To conduct this analysis, race was re-coded into three dichotomous variables as follows: 1. Blacks = 1, Whites = 0, and everyone else equal to system missing, 2. Hispanics = 1, Whites = 0, and everyone else equal to system missing, and 3. Blacks = 1, Hispanics = 0, and everyone else equal to system missing. The variables analyzed in each model includes: *Model 1 Demographic Variables*- age, gender, and class; *Model 2 Personal Experience Variables*- prior victimization, prior contact with police, neighborhood context, respect for parental authority, and self-esteem; and *Model 3 Social Bond Variables*- involvement in delinquency, involvement in pro-social activity, and commitment to school. The linear regression models permitted a simultaneous examination of all the variables that affect juveniles' attitudes toward the police. In order to assess which demographic, personal experiences, and social bonds variables are the determinants of juveniles' attitudes, dependent variable, "attitudes toward the police" is used.

Of the Demographic variables analyzed in Table Eight Equation 1 (Black vs. White), the dichotomous race variable (BlackD), age, gender and class are statistically significant. More important, further analysis shows that White juveniles have a more positive attitude than Black juveniles toward the police (Formula 1).

*Formula 1: Race- Blacks vs. Whites*

$$\text{Equation: } Y_1 = a + b_1x_1 + b_2x_2$$

$$a = \text{Constant (35)}$$

$$b_2 = \text{Unstandardized Coefficient for race (-1.327)}$$

$$x_2 = \text{Race (Black = 1, White = 0)}$$

In order to focus on the effect of race, we hold gender as a constant ( $b_1x_1$ ) and regard its effects as zero; therefore, when race equals to Black ( $x_2 = 1$ ),

$$Y_1 = a + b_1x_1 + (-1.327) \quad (1)$$

$$Y_1 = a + b_1x_1 + -1.327$$

$$Y_1 = 35 + -1.327$$

$$Y_1 = 33.673$$

In order to focus on the effect of race, we hold gender as a constant ( $b_1x_1$ ) and regard its effects as zero; therefore, when race equals to White ( $x_2 = 0$ ),

$$Y_2 = a + b_1x_1 + (-1.327) \quad (0)$$

$$Y_2 = a + b_1x_1 + 0$$

$$Y_2 = 35 + 0$$

$$Y_2 = 35$$

The difference between Blacks and Whites equals

$$Y_1 - Y_2.$$

$$33.673 - 35 = -1.327$$

The next set of variables in Table Eight Equation 2 to assess juveniles' attitudes toward the police using the dichotomous race variable (Black vs. White) is grouped together because they measure the impact of the juveniles' personal experiences on their attitudes. The variables (prior victimization, prior contact with police, neighborhood context, respect for parental authority, and self-esteem) are assessed in Table Eight Equation 2, along with the four demographic variables (BlackD, age, gender, and class) previously mentioned in Table Eight Equation 1. An analysis of Table Eight Equation 2 revealed that the impact of the dichotomous race variable (BlackD), age and class remains statistically significant even after the addition of the personal experience variables. Of the personal experience variables (prior victimization, prior contact with police, neighborhood context, respect for parental authority, and self-esteem) in Table Eight Equation 2, only two of the variables were found to be statistically significant. These two variables are respect for parental authority ( $p = .000$ ) and prior contact with police ( $p = .001$ ). In Table Eight Equation 2, of the variables found to be statistically significant, the standard regression coefficient for age (-.217) exerts the greatest effect on juveniles' attitudes toward the police when Blacks are compared to Whites, followed by respect for parental authority (.187), prior contact with police (-.132), the dichotomous race variable (BlackD = -.117), and class (-.085). In addition, the test for the increase of variance explained in Table Eight Equation 2 (.202) increased from that of Equation 1 (.142). Thus, the F-test associated with the increase of the R-squared suggests that the variables related to the juveniles' personal experiences in this equation contribute substantially to our ability to predict what affect juveniles' attitudes toward the police when Blacks are compared to Whites (R-squared change: Model 1= .142 & Model 2= .059).

With the addition of the social bond variables (involvement in delinquency, involvement in pro-social activity, and commitment to school) in Table Eight Equation 3, two of the



demographic variables (Dichotomous race variable and age) were found to be statistically significant. In Equation 3, none of the juveniles' personal experience variables were statistically significant. In regards to the social bond variables in Table Eight Equation 3, two (commitment to school and involvement in delinquency) of the three variables was found to be statistically significant. Involvement in delinquency was assessed by looking at property crimes committed and crimes committed against persons. Both measures of involvement in delinquency were found to be statistically significant. In addition, the standard coefficient in Table Eight Equation 3 for commitment to school (.197) revealed that it had the largest effect on juveniles' attitudes toward the police when Blacks are compared to Whites, followed by property crimes committed (-.184), age (-.173), crimes against persons (-.100), and the dichotomous race variable (-.097). Furthermore, the test for the increase of variance explained for Equation 3 in Table Eight (.263) substantially exceeds those that are explained by Equation 1(.142) and Equation 2 (.202). Therefore, the F-test associated with the increase of the R-squared suggest that Equation 3 within Table Eight better explains and predicts juveniles' attitudes toward police when Blacks are compared to Whites than do Equations 1 and 2 (R-squared change: Model 1= .134, Model 2= .053, & Model 3= .077) (see Table Eight).

**Table Eight Blacks ATP Compared to Whites (N= 481)**

	Equation 1			Equation 2			Equation 3		
	b	Beta	Sig.	b	Beta	Sig.	b	Beta	Sig.
Dependent: Juveniles' attitudes toward the police - constant	35			27			23		
Independent Variables:									
Age	-1.090*	-.228	.000	-1.005*	-.0217	.000	-.800*	-.173	.000
Gender (male=1) (female=0)	-1.192*	-.128	.001	-.354	-.039	.330	.186	.021	.633
Class	-.451*	-.164	.000	-.226*	-.226	.051	-.200	-.074	.105
Race (Blacks=1) (Whites=0)	-1.327*	-.122	.001	-1.241*	-.0117	.003	1.027*	-.097	.021
Neighborhood Context									
	<i>Appearance</i>			-.024	-.009	.870	.021	.007	.894
	<i>Safety</i>			-.024	-.011	.837	-.055	-.026	.649
Respect Parental Auth.				.351*	.187	.000	.123	.065	.168
Self Esteem				.048	.064	.148	-.008	-.011	.897
Prior Contact				-1.315*	-.132	.001	-.737	-.074	.092
Prior Victimization				.161	.016	.679	.697	.071	.096
Commitment to School							.265	.197*	.000
Involvement in Delinquency							-1.819	-.187*	.000
	<i>Property Crimes</i>						-.904	-.100*	.028
	<i>Crimes against Persons</i>						.672	.052	.211
Involvement in Pro-Social Act.									
R-square =	.114			.202			.263		
F =	21.143			14.152			11.831		
Significance =	.000			.000			.000		

P= .05

### **Hispanics Compared to Whites**

In further analysis, the attitudes of Hispanic juveniles were compared to those of Whites using the same procedures as the analysis above. The variables analyzed in each model includes: *Model 1 Demographic Variables*- age, gender, and class; *Model 2 Personal Experience Variables*- prior victimization, prior contact with police, neighborhood context, respect for parental authority, and self-esteem; and *Model 3 Social Bond Variables*- involvement in delinquency, involvement in pro-social activity, and commitment to school.

Analyses of Table Nine Equation 1 (Hispanics vs. Whites) Demographic variables reveal that the dichotomous race variable (HispanicsD) is statistically significant along with the variables age, gender and class. More important, further analysis shows that White juveniles have a more positive attitude than Hispanic juveniles toward the police (Formula 2).

*Formula 2: Race- Hispanics vs. Whites*

Equation:  $Y1 = a + b1x1 + b2x2$

$a = \text{Constant (34)}$

$b2 = \text{Unstandardized Coefficient for race (-.639)}$

$x2 = \text{Race (Hispanic = 1, White = 0)}$

In order to focus on the effect of race, we hold gender as a constant ( $b1x1$ ) and regard its effects as zero; therefore, when race equals to Hispanic ( $x2 = 1$ ),

$$Y1 = a + b1x1 + (-.639)(1)$$

$$Y1 = a + b1x1 + -.639$$

$$Y1 = 34 + -.639$$

$$Y1 = 33.361$$

In order to focus on the effect of race, we hold gender as a constant ( $b1x1$ ) and regard its effects as zero; therefore, when race equals to White ( $x2 = 0$ ),

$$Y2 = a + b1x1 + (-.639)(0)$$

$$Y2 = a + b1x1 + 0$$

$$Y2 = 34 + 0$$

$$Y2 = 34$$

The difference between Hispanics and Whites equals

$$Y1 - Y2.$$

$$33.361 - 34 = -.639$$

The next set of variables in Table Nine Equation 2 to assess juveniles' attitudes toward the police using a dichotomous race variable (Hispanics vs. Whites) is grouped together because they measure the impact of the juveniles' personal experiences on their attitudes. The variables (prior victimization, prior contact with police, neighborhood context, respect for parental authority, and self-esteem) are assessed in Table Nine Equation 2, along with the four demographic variables (HispanicsD, age, gender, and class) previously mentioned in Table Nine Equation 1. An analysis of Table Nine Equation 2 revealed that age is the only demographic variable that remains statistically significant after the addition of the personal experience variables. Of the personal experience variables (prior victimization, prior contact with police, neighborhood context, respect for parental authority, and self-esteem) in Table Nine Equation 2, three of the variables were found to be statistically significant. These three variables are respect for parental authority ( $p = .000$ ), self-esteem ( $.000$ ) and prior contact with police ( $p = .000$ ). In Table Nine Equation 2, of the variables found to be statistically significant, the standard regression coefficient for respect for parental authority (.211) exerts the greatest effect on juveniles' attitudes toward the police when Hispanics are compared to Whites, followed by age (-.203), prior contact with police (-.151), and self-esteem (.129). In addition, the test for the increase of variance explained in Table Nine Equation 2 (.203) significantly increased from that of Equation 1 (.097). Thus, the F-test associated with the increase of the R-squared suggests that the variables related to the juveniles' personal experiences in this equation contribute substantially to our ability to predict what affect juveniles' attitudes toward the police when Hispanics are compared to Whites (R-squared change: Model 1= .105 & Model 2= .099).

With the addition of the social bond variables (involvement in delinquency, involvement in pro-social activity, and commitment to school) in Table Nine Equation 3, only one of the

demographic variables (age) were found to be statistically significant. In Equation 3, two of the juveniles' personal experience variables were statistically significant (respect toward parental authority and prior contact with police). In regards to the social bond variables in Table Nine Equation 3, two (commitment to school and involvement in delinquency) of the three variables was found to be statistically significant. Involvement in delinquency was assessed by looking at property crimes committed and crimes committed against persons. Both measures of involvement in delinquency were found to be statistically significant. In addition, the standard coefficient in Table Nine Equation 3 for commitment to school (.203) revealed that it had the largest effect on juveniles' attitudes toward the police when Hispanics are compared to Whites, followed by age (-.163), property crimes committed (-.158), crimes against persons (-.111), respect toward parental authority (.087), and prior contact with police (-.076). Furthermore, the test for the increase of variance explained for Equation 3 in Table Nine (.260) substantially exceeds those that are explained by Equation 1 (.097) and Equation 2 (.203). Therefore, the F-test associated with the increase of the R-squared suggest that Equation 3 within Table Nine better explains and predicts juveniles' attitudes toward police when Hispanics are compared to Whites than do Equations 1 and 2 (R-squared change: Model 1= .099, Model 2= .089, & Model 3= .072) (see Table Nine).

**Table Nine Hispanics ATP Compared to Whites (N= 1065)**

	Equation 1			Equation 2			Equation 3		
	b	Beta	Sig.	b	Beta	Sig.	b	Beta	Sig.
Dependent: Juveniles' attitudes toward the police - constant	34			24			20		
Independent Variables:									
Age	-1.012*	-.214	.000	-.941*	-.203	.000	-.747*	-.163	.000
Gender (male=1) (female=0)	-.807*	-.090	.002	-.198	-.022	.456	.163	.019	.553
Class	-.449*	-.169	.000	-.146	-.057	.084	-.084	-.033	.337
Race (Hispanics=1) (Whites=0)	-.639*	-.071	.017	-.433	-.049	.111	-.506	-.058	.067
Neighborhood Context									
	<i>Appearance</i>			-.061	-.025	.565	-.073	-.030	.504
	<i>Safety</i>			.126	.065	.127	.126	.067	.132
Respect Parental Auth.				.354*	.211	.000	.145*	.087	.011
Self Esteem				.090*	.129	.000	.042	.061	.101
Prior Contact				-1.518*	-.151	.000	-.755*	-.076	.022
Prior Victimization				-.369	-.039	.184	.235	.026	.420
Commitment to School							.254*	.203	.000
Involvement in Delinquency							1.520*	-.158	.000
							-.994*	-.111	.001
	<i>Property Crimes</i>								
	<i>Crimes against</i>								
	<i>Persons</i>						.338	.031	.304
Involvement in Pro-Social Act.									
R-square =	.097			.203			.260		
F =	28.307			24.929			21.102		
Significance =	.000			.000			.000		

P= .05

### **Blacks Compared to Hispanics**

In further analysis, the attitudes of Black juveniles were compared to those of Hispanics using the same procedures as the analysis above. The variables analyzed in each model includes: *Model 1 Demographic Variables*- age, gender, and class; *Model 2 Personal Experience Variables*- prior victimization, prior contact with police, neighborhood context, respect for parental authority, and self-esteem; and *Model 3 Social Bond Variables*- involvement in delinquency, involvement in pro-social activity, and commitment to school.

Analyses of Table Ten Equation 1 (Blacks vs. Hispanics) Demographic variables reveal that only age is statistically significant. More important, further analysis shows that Hispanic juveniles have a more positive attitude than Black juveniles toward the police (Formula 2).



*Formula 3: Race- Blacks vs. Hispanics*

$$\text{Equation: } Y_1 = a + b_1x_1 + b_2x_2$$

$$a = \text{Constant (30)}$$

$$b_2 = \text{Unstandardized Coefficient for race (-.548)}$$

$$x_2 = \text{Race (Black = 1, Hispanic = 0)}$$

In order to focus on the effect of race, we hold gender as a constant ( $b_1x_1$ ) and regard its effects as zero; therefore, when race equals to Black ( $x_2 = 1$ ),

$$Y_1 = a + b_1x_1 + (-.548) (1)$$

$$Y_1 = a + b_1x_1 + -.548$$

$$Y_1 = 30 + -.548$$

$$Y_1 = 29.452$$

In order to focus on the effect of race, we hold gender as a constant ( $b_1x_1$ ) and regard its effects as zero; therefore, when race equals to Hispanic ( $x_2 = 0$ ),

$$Y_2 = a + b_1x_1 + (-.548) (0)$$

$$Y_2 = a + b_1x_1 + 0$$

$$Y_2 = 30 + 0$$

$$Y_2 = 30$$

The difference between Blacks and Hispanics equals

$$Y_1 - Y_2.$$

$$29.452 - 30 = -.548$$

The next set of variables in Table Ten Equation 2 to assess juveniles' attitudes toward the police using a dichotomous race variable (Blacks vs. Hispanics) is grouped together because they measure the impact of the juveniles' personal experiences on their attitudes. The variables (prior victimization, prior contact with police, neighborhood context, respect for parental authority, and self-esteem) are assessed in Table Ten Equation 2, along with the four demographic variables (BlackHisD, age, gender, and class) previously mentioned in Table Ten Equation 1. An analysis of Table Ten Equation 2 revealed that two (age and dichotomous variable race) of the demographic variables remain statistically significant after the addition of the personal experience variables. Of the personal experience variables (prior victimization, prior contact with police, neighborhood context, respect for parental authority, and self-esteem) in Table Ten Equation 2, three of the variables were found to be statistically significant. These three variables are respect for parental authority ( $p = .000$ ), self-esteem (.001) and prior contact with police ( $p = .001$ ). In Table Ten Equation 2, of the variables found to be statistically significant, the standard regression coefficient for respect for parental authority (.230) exerts a greatest effect on juveniles' attitudes toward the police when Blacks are compared to Hispanics, followed by age (-.191), self-esteem (.142), prior contact with police (-.123), and the dichotomous variable race (-.079). In addition, the test for the increase of variance explained in Table Ten Equation 2 (.176) significantly increased from that of Equation 1 (.052). Thus the F-test associated with the increase of the R-squared suggests that the variables related to the juveniles' personal experiences in this equation contribute substantially to our ability to predict what affect juveniles' attitudes toward the police when Blacks are compared to Hispanics (R-squared change: Model 1= .066 & Model 2= .110).

With the addition of the social bond variables (involvement in delinquency, involvement in pro-social activity, and commitment to school) in Table Ten Equation 3, only one of the demographic variables (age) were found to be statistically significant. In Equation 3, only one of the juveniles' personal experience variables were statistically significant (respect toward parental authority). In regards to the social bond variables in Table Ten Equation 3, two (commitment to school and involvement in delinquency) of the three variables was found to be statistically significant. Involvement in delinquency was assessed by looking at property crimes committed and crimes committed against persons. Both measures of involvement in delinquency were found to be statistically significant. In addition, the standard coefficient in Table Ten Equation 3 for commitment to school (.300) revealed that it had the largest effect on juveniles' attitudes toward the police when Blacks are compared to Hispanics, followed by property crimes committed (-.163), age (-.149), respect toward parental authority (.088), and crimes against persons (-.081). Furthermore, the test for the increase of variance explained for Equation 3 in Table Ten (.267) substantially exceeds those that are explained by Equation 1(.052) and Equation 2 (.176). Therefore, the F-test associated with the increase of the R-squared suggest that Equation 3 within Table Ten better explains and predicts juveniles' attitudes toward police when Blacks are compared to Hispanics than do Equations 1 and 2 (R-squared change: Model 1= .066, Model 2= .091, & Model 3= .110) (see Table Ten).

**Table Ten Blacks ATP Compared to Hispanics (N= 745)**

	Equation 1			Equation 2			Equation 3		
	b	Beta	Sig.	b	Beta	Sig.	b	Beta	Sig.
Dependent: Juveniles' attitudes toward the police - constant	30			21			16		
Independent Variables:									
Age	-.928*	-.199	.000	-.887*	-.191	.000	-.679*	-.149	.000
Gender (male=1) (female=0)	-.495	-.057	.115	.111	.013	.731	.405	.047	.210
Class	-.140	-.056	.123	.062	.025	.531	.054	.021	.602
Race (Blacks=1) (Hispanics=0)	-.548	-.051	.160	-.863*	-.079	.031	-.725	-.067	.076
Neighborhood Context									
	<i>Appearance</i>			-.069	-.028	.589	-.151	-.062	.234
	<i>Safety</i>			.108	.058	.262	.145	.081	.122
Respect Parental Auth.				.366*	.230	.000	.139*	.088	.028
Self Esteem				.100*	.142	.001	.027	.040	.378
Prior Contact				-1.191*	-.123	.001	-.280	-.029	.454
Prior Victimization				-.529	-.058	.111	-.063	-.007	.852
Commitment to School							.374*	.300	.000
Involvement in Delinquency							1.493*	-.163	.000
	<i>Property Crimes</i>						-.698*	-.081	.040
	<i>Crimes against Persons</i>						.270	.026	.479
Involvement in Pro-Social Act.									
R-square =	.052			.176			.267		
F =	10.188			14.447			15.272		
Significance =	.000			.000			.000		

P = .05

In conclusion, there are many statements that can be made based upon the analyses performed using race a dichotomous variable. From a racial perspective, it is found that Whites have a more positive attitude toward the police than Blacks. With the addition of the personal experience variables (Equation 2), the dichotomous variable race (BlackD), age, class, respect for parental authority, and prior contact with the police was statistically significant. Of these variables (Demographic and personal experience variables) found to be statistically significant, the standard regression coefficient for age (-.217) revealed it exerts the greatest effect on juveniles' attitudes toward the police when Blacks are compared to Whites. In Table Eight Equation 3 that compares Blacks to Whites, the only variables found to be statistically significant was the dichotomous race variable (BlackD), age, commitment to school, and involvement in delinquency. Involvement in delinquency was assessed by looking at property crimes committed and crimes committed against persons. Both measures of involvement in delinquency were found to be statistically significant. It is important to note that age and race remain statistically significant through all three equations. In addition, the standard coefficient in Table Eight Equation 3 for commitment to school (.197) revealed that it had the largest effect on juveniles' attitudes toward the police. Also when looking at the comparison between Blacks versus Whites, the dichotomous variable race (BlackD) along with age remains statistically significant even with the addition of the personal experience (Equation 2) and social bond variables (Equation 3).

In looking further at the analysis of Hispanics compared to Whites, age is the only variable that remains statistically significant throughout all three equations. Before the addition of the personal experience and social bond variables in Equations 2 and 3, all demographic variables were statistically significant (Table Nine Equation 1). Also, analysis revealed that Whites have a more positive attitude toward the police than Hispanics. Once the personal

experience variables are taken into consideration, the only variables that are statistically significant include: age, respect for parental authority, self-esteem, and prior contact with police. Of these variables, respect for parental authority has the greatest effect on juveniles' attitudes toward the police. Equation 3 of Table Nine included all of the study's variables and those found to be statistically significant included: age, respect toward parental authority, prior contact with police, commitment to school, and both measures of involvement in delinquency (property crimes committed and crimes committed against persons), with commitment to school (.203) exerting the largest effect on juveniles attitudes toward the police.

In analyzing Blacks compared to Hispanics (Table Ten), just as with Hispanics compared to Whites and Blacks compared to Whites age is the only variable that remains statistically significant throughout all three equations. Further analysis show that Hispanics have a more positive attitude toward the police than Blacks. With the addition of the personal experience variables, the dichotomous variable race (BlackHisD) remains statistically significant along with age, respect toward parental authority, self-esteem, and prior contact with police. When the same variables are included in Equation 3 along with the social bond variables, the variables that are statistically significant are age, respect toward parental authority, commitment to school, and both measures of involvement in delinquency (property crimes committed and crimes committed against persons). Just as with Hispanics compared to Whites, commitment to school (.300) exerted the largest effect on juveniles' attitudes toward the police. The results revealed in Table Ten were similar to Tables Eight and Nine in that Equation 3 explains the most variance.

Overall, for all three comparisons groups (Black vs. Whites, Hispanics vs. Whites, & Black vs. Hispanics) age is the only variable that remains statistically significant throughout each equation (Equation 1, 2, & 3). When only looking at Equation 2 for all three comparison groups,

of the personal experience variables, respect toward parental authority and prior contact with police are two variables found to be statistically significant for each group. When looking at Equation 3 only, the social bond variables commitment to school and involvement in delinquency (both measures- personal crimes committed and crimes against persons) was found to be statistically significant for all groups. The personal experience variables, neighborhood context and prior victimization were not found to be statistically significant in any of the equations for neither of the comparison groups. Gender and class were only found to be statistically significant when comparing Blacks versus Whites and Hispanics versus Whites. The effects of these two variables (gender and class) were not statistically significant when comparing both minority groups (Blacks vs. Hispanics). More importantly, Whites have a more positive attitude toward the police than do both Blacks and Hispanics. On the other hand, Hispanics have a more positive attitude toward the police than do Blacks. The dichotomous race variable when comparing Blacks versus Whites remain statistically significant for all three equations. Whereas, when analyzing Hispanics versus Whites the race variable is only statistically significant in Equation 1 and it is only statistically significant in Equation 2 for Blacks versus Hispanics. Therefore, the race variable has more of an effect when analyzing Blacks versus Whites than when looking at the other two comparison groups. For each comparison group analyzed, Equation 3 does the best job in explaining and predicting juveniles' attitudes toward police than any of the other equations, when analyzing the F-test associated with the increase of the R-squared. Commitment to school in Equation 3 for each comparison group analyzed revealed that it has the largest effect on juveniles' attitudes toward the police than any other variable.

It must be noted that from these multivariate analyses support was found for some of the study's hypotheses. In particular, it was hypothesized that involvement in delinquency would be statistically significant in explaining juveniles' attitudes toward the police (H1). The analysis performed above provided support for this hypothesis whereby, involvement in delinquency was statistically significant for all racial group comparison. One of the study's earlier hypothesis stated that commitment to school would be statistically significant in explaining juveniles' attitudes toward the police (H2). When looking at the social bond variables analyzed, commitment to school was statistically significant for all racial groups compared. It was hypothesized that Black and Hispanic juveniles' attitudes toward the police would be less positive when compared to Whites (H3). The results from the multivariate analyses confirmed that Whites have a more positive attitude toward the police than do Blacks and Hispanics. In addition, it was hypothesized earlier that Blacks would have a more negative attitude toward the police than Hispanics (H5). This hypothesis was supported by results showing Hispanics having a more positive attitude when compared to their Blacks minority counterparts. It was hypothesized earlier that (H8) class will be a statistically significant determinant of attitudes toward the police. The results show that when Blacks are compared to Whites and Hispanics are compared to Whites that class is statistically significant. The analyses also lend support for the hypothesis stated, (H15): respect for parental authority will be a statistically determinant of juveniles' attitudes toward the police. Additional analyses will be performed to determine if additional support is found that support the study's hypotheses.



**Multivariate Analysis of Juveniles' Attitudes Toward the Police (Continued)**

**Determinants of White Juveniles' Attitudes Toward the Police**

In an effort to advance the literature on White juveniles' attitudes toward the police, three linear regression models were developed for each racial group (White, Black, and Hispanics) independently. The variables analyzed in each model includes: Model 1 demographic variables- age, gender, and class; Model 2 personal experience variables- prior victimization, prior contact with police, neighborhood context, respect for parental authority, and self-esteem; and Model 3 social bond variables- involvement in delinquency, involvement in pro-social activity, and commitment to school. The linear regression models permitted a simultaneous examination of all the variables that affect juveniles' attitudes toward the police. In order to assess which demographic, personal experience, or social bond variables are the determinants of juveniles' attitudes, my combined dependent variable, "global attitudes toward the police (5 questions added together)" is used for analysis.

From the analysis, Table Eleven Equation 1 (White respondents only are included) Demographic variables reveal that the respondents' age, gender, and class are all statistically significant in explaining White juveniles' attitudes toward the police.

**Table Eleven Determinants of White Juveniles' Attitudes Toward the Police (N= 481)**

	Equation 1			Equation 2			Equation 3		
	b	Beta	Sig.	b	Beta	Sig.	b	Beta	Sig.
Dependent: Juveniles' attitudes toward the police – constant	37			28			25		
Independent variables:									
Age	-1.133*	-.237	.000	-1.036*	-.226	.000	-.899*	-.197	.000
Gender (male=1) (female=0)	-1.220*	-.131	.002	-.533	-.060	.190	-.122	-.014	.784
Class	-.707*	-.251	.000	-.398*	-.147	.003	-.330*	-.122	.021
Neighborhood Context									
<i>Appearance</i>				-.066	-.023	.694	.025	.009	.887
<i>Safety</i>				.060	.027	.655	.010	.005	.942
Respect Parental Auth.				.288*	.152	.003	.112	.060	.285
Self-Esteem				.129	.101	.067	.125	.102	.112
Prior Contact				-1.667*	-.164	.000	-1.108*	-.109	.032
Prior Victimization				.129	.013	.767	.769	.079	.109
Commitment to School							.097	.075	.240
Involvement in Delinquency									
<i>Property Crimes</i>							-1.886*	-.187	.000
<i>Crimes against Persons</i>							-1.179 *	-.129	.015
Involvement in Pro-social Act.							.540	.043	.358
R-square =	.149			.222			.271		
F =	27.508			12.129			9.355		
Significance =	.000			.000			.000		

*P* = .005

The next set of variables in Table Eleven Equation 2 to assess White juveniles' attitudes toward the police are grouped together because they measure the impact of the juveniles' personal experiences on their attitudes. The variables (prior victimization, prior contact with police, neighborhood context, respect for parental authority, and self-esteem) are assessed in Table Eleven Equation 2, along with the three demographic variables (age, gender, and class) previously mentioned in Table 3 Equation 1. An analysis of Table Eleven Equation 2 revealed that the impact of age and class remains statistically significant even after the addition of the personal experience variables. The prior victimization of White juveniles was not statistically significant. Neighborhood context was measured by looking at safety and appearance, however, neither variable was found to be statistically significant in determining White juveniles' attitude toward the police. In addition, self-esteem was not statistically significant.

In reference to respect for parental authority, the linear regression reveals that it is statistically significant in explaining White juveniles' attitudes toward the police. The variable prior contact was also found to be statistically significant in Equation 2. In Table Eleven Equation 2, of the variables found to be statistically significant, the standard regression coefficient for age (-.226) exerts a larger effect on White juveniles' attitudes toward the police followed by prior contact with police (-.164), respect for parental authority (.152), and class (-.147). In addition, the test for the increase of variance explained by Table Eleven Equation 2 (.222) increased from that of Equation 1 (.144). Thus, the F-test associated with the increase of the R-squared suggests that the variables related to the White juveniles' personal experiences in this equation contribute substantially to our ability to predict what affects Whites' attitudes toward the police (R-squared change: Model 1= .160 & Model 2= .060).

With the addition of the social bond variables (involvement in delinquency, involvement in pro-social activity, and commitment to school) in Table Eleven Equation 3, two of the demographic variables (age and class) and one of the personal experience variables (prior contact) remained statistically significant. However, involvement in pro-social activity and commitment to school were not found to be statistically significant. In Equation 3, involvement in delinquency was assessed by looking at property crimes committed and crimes committed against persons. Both measures of involvement in delinquency were found to be statistically significant. In addition, the standard coefficient in Table Eleven Equation 3 for age (-.197) revealed that age had the largest effect on White juveniles' attitudes compared to other independent variables in the equation, followed by involvement in delinquency- (1) property crimes committed (-.187) and (2) crimes against persons (-.129), class (-.122), and prior contact (-.109). Furthermore, the test for the increase of variance explained by Equation 3 in Table Eleven (.271) exceeds that explained by Equation 1(.144) and Equation 2 (.222). Therefore, the F-test associated with the increase of the R-squared suggests that Equation 3 better explains and predicts White juveniles' attitudes toward police than do Equations 1 and 2 (R-squared change: Model 1= .147, Model 2= .062, & Model 3= .058). (see Table Eleven).

**Determinants of Black Juveniles' Attitudes toward the Police**

In an effort to advance the literature on Black juveniles' attitudes toward the police, three linear regression models were developed for Black juveniles. The variables analyzed in each model includes: Model 1 demographic variables- age, gender, and class; Model 2 personal experience variables- prior victimization, prior contact with police, neighborhood context, respect for parental authority, and self-esteem; and Model 3 social bond variables- involvement in delinquency, involvement in pro-social activity, and commitment to school. The linear regression models permitted a simultaneous examination of all the variables that affect juveniles' attitudes toward the police. In order to assess which demographic, personal experience, and social bond variables are the determinants of Black juveniles' attitudes, my combined dependent variables, "global attitudes toward the police (5 questions added together)" is used for analysis.

From the analysis, Table Twelve Equation 1 (Black respondents only are included) Demographic variables reveals that only the respondents' age is statistically significant in explaining Black juveniles' attitudes toward the police.

**Table Twelve Determinants of Black Juveniles' Attitudes Toward the Police (N= 162)**

	Equation 1			Equation 2			Equation 3		
	b	Beta	Sig.	b	Beta	Sig.	b	Beta	Sig.
Dependent: Juveniles' attitudes toward the police – constant	28			20			12		
Independent variables:									
Age	-.920*	-.194	.016	-.835*	-.179	.043	-.521	-.110	.228
Gender (male=1) (female=0)	-.627	-.069	.387	.597	.067	.465	.778	.088	.356
Class	.208	-.085	.288	.114	.048	.642	-.041	-.016	.882
Neighborhood Context									
<i>Appearance</i>				-.027	-.010	.932	-.184	-.070	.567
<i>Safety</i>				-.152	-.080	.513	-.015	-.008	.950
Respect Parental Auth.				.409*	.235	.017	.086	.049	.634
Self-Esteem				.126	.092	.343	-.123	-.092	.412
Prior Contact				-.448	-.049	.592	-.057	-.006	.945
Prior Victimization				.548	.055	.524	.818	.085	.360
Commitment to School							.610*	.403	.000
Involvement in Delinquency									
<i>Property Crimes</i>							-1.905*	-.212	.030
<i>Crimes against Persons</i>							-.253	-.029	.758
Involvement in Pro-social Act.							1.382	.091	.320
R-square =	.050			.138			.308		
F =	2.642			1.978			3.057		
Significance =	.051			.041			.001		
P= .005									

The next set of variables in Table Twelve Equation 2 to assess Black juveniles' attitudes toward the police are grouped together because they measure the impact of the juveniles' personal experiences on their attitudes. The variables (prior victimization, prior contact with police, neighborhood context, respect for parental authority, and self-esteem) are assessed in Table Twelve Equation 2, along with the three demographic variables (age, gender, and class) previously mentioned in Equation 1. An analysis of Table Twelve Equation 2 revealed that age is the only demographic variable that remains statistically significant with the addition of the personal experience variables. The only personal experience variable found to be statistically significant in Equation 2 is respect for parental authority. In Table Twelve Equation 2, of the variables found to be statistically significant, the standard regression coefficient reveals respect for parental authority (.235) exerts a larger effect on Black juveniles' attitudes toward the police than age (-.179). In addition, the test for the increase of variance explained by Table Twelve Equation 2 (.138) increased from that of Equation 1 (.050). Thus, the F-test associated with the increase of the R-squared suggests that the variables related to the Black juveniles' personal experiences in this equation contribute substantially to our ability to predict what affect Black juveniles' attitudes toward the police (R-squared change: Model 1= .042 & Model 2= .068).

With the addition of the social bond variables (involvement in delinquency, involvement in pro-social activity, and commitment to school) in Table Twelve Equation 3, neither of the demographic variables (age, gender, and class) nor personal experience variables (neighborhood context, respect for parental authority, self-esteem, prior contact with police, and prior victimization) remained statistically significant. Of the social bond variables, involvement in pro-social activity was not found to be statistically significant. The variables found to be statistically significant includes commitment to school and one of the measures of involvement

in delinquency (property crimes committed). In addition, the standard coefficient in Table Twelve Equation 3 for commitment to school (.403) revealed that it had the largest effect on Black juveniles' attitudes when compared with the other statistically significant variable property crime (-.212). Furthermore, the test for the increase of variance explained by Equation 3 in Table Twelve (.308) substantially exceeds those that are explained by Equation 1(.050) and Equation 2 (.138). Therefore the F-test associated with the increase of the R-squared suggests that Equation 3 within Table Twelve better explains and predicts Black juveniles' attitudes toward police than do Equations 1 and 2 (R-squared change: Model 1= .065, Model 2= .043, & Model 3= .201). (see Table Twelve).



**Determinants of Hispanic Juveniles' Attitudes toward the Police**

In an effort to advance the literature on Hispanic juveniles' attitudes toward the police, three linear regression models were developed for each racial group (White, Black, and Hispanics) independently. The variables analyzed in each model includes: Model 1 demographic variables- age, gender, and class; Model 2 personal experience variables- prior victimization, prior contact with police, neighborhood context, respect for parental authority, and self-esteem; and Model 3 social bond variables- involvement in delinquency, involvement in pro-social activity, and commitment to school. The linear regression models permitted a simultaneous examination of all the variables that affect juveniles' attitudes toward the police. In order to assess which demographic, personal experience, or social bond variables are the determinants of juveniles' attitudes, my combined dependent variable, "global attitudes toward the police (5 questions added together)" is used for analysis.

From the analysis, Table Thirteen Equation 1 (Hispanic respondents only are included) Demographic variables reveals that the respondents' age and class are statistically significant in explaining Hispanic juveniles' attitudes toward the police.

**Table Thirteen Determinants of Hispanic Juveniles' Attitudes Toward the Police (N= 591)**

	Equation 1			Equation 2			Equation 3		
	b	Beta	Sig.	b	Beta	Sig.	b	Beta	Sig.
Dependent: Juveniles' attitudes toward the police – constant	31			21			17		
Independent variables:									
Age	-.923*	-.198	.000	-.921*	-.197	.000	-.721*	-.158	.000
Gender (male=1) (female=0)	-.426	-.049	.221	.097	.011	.784	-.278	.033	.436
Class	-.246*	-.097	.016	.003	.001	.980	.060	.024	.599
Neighborhood Context									
<i>Appearance</i>				-.104	-.043	.455	-.188	-.079	.180
<i>Safety</i>				.167	.090	.116	.214*	.121	.040
Respect Parental Auth.				.328*	.212	.000	.143*	.094	.035
Self-Esteem				.230*	.194	.000	.091	.076	.131
Prior Contact				-1.422*	-.144	.000	-.411	-.042	.337
Prior Victimization				-.759*	-.084	.036	-.194	-.022	.601
Commitment to School							.313*	.260	.000
Involvement in Delinquency									
<i>Property Crimes</i>							-1.316*	-.143	.002
<i>Crimes against Persons</i>							-.886*	-.102	.020
Involvement in Pro-social Act.							.126	.013	.753
R-square =	.055			.206			.273		
F =	11.358			13.968			12.726		
Significance =	.000			.000			.000		
P= .005									

The next set of variables in Table Thirteen Equation 2 to assess Hispanic juveniles' attitudes toward the police are grouped together because they measure the impact of the juveniles' personal experiences on their attitudes. The variables (prior victimization, prior contact with police, neighborhood context, respect for parental authority, and self-esteem) are assessed in Table Thirteen Equation 2, along with the three demographic variables (age, gender, and class) previously mentioned in Table Thirteen Equation 1. An analysis of Table Thirteen Equation 2 reveals that age is the only demographic variable that remains statistically significant after the addition of the personal experience variables. Neighborhood context was measured by looking at safety and appearance, however, neither variable was found to be statistically significant in determining Hispanic juveniles' attitude toward the police.

In reference to respect for parental authority, the linear regression reveals that it is statistically significant in explaining Hispanic juveniles' attitudes toward the police. The variables self-esteem, prior contact, and prior victimization were found to be statistically significant in Equation 2. In Table Thirteen Equation 2, of the variables found to be statistically significant, the standard regression coefficient for respect for parental authority (.212) exerts the largest effect on Hispanic juveniles' attitudes toward the police followed by age (-.197), positive self-esteem (.194), prior contact (-.144), and prior victimization (-.084). In addition, the test for the increase of variance explained by Table Thirteen Equation 2 (.206) increased significantly from that of Equation 1 (.055). Thus, the F-test associated with the increase of the R-squared suggests that the variables related to the Hispanic juveniles' personal experiences in this equation contribute substantially to our ability to predict what affect Hispanics' attitudes toward the police (R-squared change: Model 1= .062 & Model 2= .133).

With the addition of the social bond variables (involvement in delinquency, involvement in pro-social activity, and commitment to school) in Table Thirteen Equation 3, only the demographic variable age and two of the personal experience variables (one of the measures of neighborhood context- neighborhood safety and respect for parental authority) were statistically significant. However, of the social bond variables involvement in pro-social activity (ProsocialRecode) was not found to be statistically significant. In Equation 3, commitment to school was found to be statistically significant along with involvement in delinquency which was assessed by looking at property crimes committed and crimes committed against persons. Both measures of involvement in delinquency were found to be statistically significant. In addition, the standard coefficient in Table Thirteen Equation 3 for commitment to school (.260) revealed that it had the largest effect on Hispanic juveniles' attitudes, followed by age (-.158), property crimes committed (-.143), neighborhood safety (.121), crimes against persons (-.102), and respect for parental authority (-.079). Furthermore, the test for the increase of variance explained by Equation 3 in Table Thirteen (.273) increases over that explained by Equation 2 (.206) and Equation 1 (.055). Therefore, the F-test associated with the increase of the R-squared suggests that Equation 3 within Table Thirteen better explains and predicts Hispanic juveniles' attitudes toward police than do Equations 1 and 2 (R-squared change: Model 1= .063, Model 2= .117, and Model 3= .092). (see Table Thirteen).

In conclusion, from assessing the multivariate analyses many interesting findings are highlighted about each racial group. When performing the multivariate analysis, each racial group was analyzed separately which resulted in three linear regressions. The linear regressions allowed for an analysis to determine if there are similarities or differences among the racial groups in reference to the independent variables found to be statistically significant. The results

for each racial group discussed in this conclusion appear in the same order (Whites, Blacks, and Hispanics) as to which they were analyzed.

An analysis of variables found to be statistically significant predictors of Whites attitudes toward the police are three demographic variables (age, gender, and class). Once the personal experience variables (prior victimization, prior contact with police, neighborhood context, respect for parental authority, and self-esteem) were included, age and class remain statistically significant along with respect for parental authority and prior contact with police. Of these variables found to be statistically significant, the standard regression coefficient for age (-.226) exerts a larger effect on White juveniles' attitudes toward the police followed by prior contact with police (-.164), respect for parental authority (.152), and class (-.147). With the addition of the social bond variables (involvement in delinquency, involvement in pro-social activity, and commitment to school) in analyzing Whites attitudes toward the police in Table Eleven Equation 3, two of the demographic variables (age and class) and one of the personal experience variables (prior contact) remained statistically significant. Of the social bond variables, both measures of involvement in delinquency were statistically significant. Involvement in delinquency was assessed by looking at property crimes committed and crimes committed against persons. In addition, the standard coefficient in Table Eleven Equation 3 for age (-.197) revealed that age had the largest effect on White juveniles' attitudes, followed by involvement in delinquency- (1) property crimes committed (-.187) and (2) crimes against persons (-.129), class (-.122), and prior contact (-.109).

In looking at the analysis of the determinants of Black juveniles' attitudes toward the police, the only demographic variable found to be statistically significant in equation 1 is age. Once the personal experience variables (prior victimization, prior contact with police,

neighborhood context, respect for parental authority, and self-esteem) are taken into consideration, age remains statistically significant. The only personal experience variable found to be statistically significant in Equation 2 is respect for parental authority. Of the variables found to be statistically significant, the standard regression coefficient reveals respect for parental authority (.235) exerts a larger effect on Black juveniles' attitudes toward the police than age (-.179). In addition, the proportion of variance explained by Table Twelve Equation 2 (.138) increased from that of Equation 1 (.050).

With the addition of the social bond variables (involvement in delinquency, involvement in pro-social activity, and commitment to school) in Table Twelve Equation 3, neither of the demographic variables (age, gender, and class) nor personal experience variables (neighborhood context, respect for parental authority, self-esteem, prior contact with police, and prior victimization) remained statistically significant. The social bond variables found to be statistically significant includes commitment to school and one of the measures of involvement in delinquency (property crimes committed). The standard coefficient in Table Twelve Equation 3 for commitment to school (.403) revealed that it had the largest effect on Black juveniles' attitudes when compared with the other statistically significant variable property crimes committed (-.212).

In looking at the analysis of the determinants of Hispanic juveniles' attitudes toward the police when assessing only the demographic variables, age and class are statistically significant. However, once the personal experience variables (prior victimization, prior contact with police, neighborhood context, respect for parental authority, and self-esteem) are added only age from the demographic variables remains statistically significant. The variables respect for parental authority, self-esteem, prior contact, and prior victimization were found to be statistically

significant. The standard regression coefficient for the variables found to be statistically significant reveal that respect for parental authority (.212) exerts the largest effect on Hispanic juveniles' attitudes toward the police followed by age (-.197), positive self-esteem (.194), prior contact (-.144), and prior victimization (-.084).

With the addition of the social bond variables (involvement in delinquency, involvement in pro-social activity, and commitment to school), only the demographic variable age and two of the personal experience variables (one of the measures of neighborhood context- neighborhood safety and respect for parental authority) were statistically significant. Of the social bond variables, commitment to school was found to be statistically significant along with both measures of involvement in delinquency (property crimes committed and crimes committed against persons). In addition, the standard coefficient in Table Thirteen Equation 3 for commitment to school (.260) revealed that it had the largest effect on Hispanic juveniles' attitudes, followed by age (-.158), property crimes committed (-.143), neighborhood safety (.121), crimes against persons (-.102), and respect for parental authority (-.079).

In looking at further analysis of the results, age is the only independent variable that remains statistically throughout all three equations for Whites and Hispanics. For Blacks, age is only statistically significant in equation 1 and 2. However when looking at equation 2, age and respect for parental authority was found to be statistically significant for all three racial groups. For some variables, they were only found to be statistically significant predictor of attitudes for one racial group. For example, self-esteem, prior victimization, and neighborhood context (measured neighborhood's appearance and safety) was only statistically significant for Hispanic youths and not Black or White youths. The social bond variable involvement in pro-social activities was the only variable not found to be statistically significant for neither of the racial

groups. Both measures of involvement in delinquency (property crimes committed and crimes committed against other persons) was statistically significant for Whites and Hispanics, but only one (property crimes committed) of the measures were statistically significant for Blacks. The variable commitment to school was statistically significant for Black and Hispanic juveniles, but not for Whites.

Hispanics reported the most number of independent variables that are statistically significant predictors of attitudes toward police followed by Whites and then Blacks. The results showed that the following variables were not statistically significant for the following groups: Blacks- gender, class, neighborhood context, self-esteem, prior contact, prior victimization, and involvement in pro-social activities; Whites- neighborhood context, self-esteem, prior victimization, commitment to school, and involvement in pro-social activities; and Hispanics- gender and involvement in pro-social activities. The variable commitment to school exerted the largest effect of all the independent variables found to be statistically significant on attitudes toward police for Blacks (Beta = .403) and Hispanics (Beta = .260). For Whites, the variable that exerted the largest effect was age (Beta = -.197). These results were based on an analysis of each racial group's equation 3 which took into consideration all the independent variables. Furthermore, equation 3 for each racial group reports the highest amount of variance explained and therefore, does the best job in explaining and predicting what variables affect juveniles' attitudes toward police. This conclusion was reached after analyzing the F-test associated with the increase of the R-squared for each racial group.

It must be noted that from these multivariate analyses support was found for some of the study's hypotheses. In particular, it was hypothesized that involvement in delinquency would be statistically significant in explaining juveniles' attitudes toward the police (H1). The analysis



performed above provided support for this hypothesis whereby, involvement in delinquency was statistically significant for all racial group comparison. Particularly, both measures of involvement in delinquency were statistically significant for Whites and Hispanics and only one measure (property crimes committed) was statistically significant for Blacks. One of the study's earlier hypothesis stated that commitment to school would be statistically significant in explaining juveniles' attitudes toward the police (H2). When looking at the social bond variables analyzed, commitment to school was statistically significant for Blacks and Hispanics, but not Whites. It was hypothesized earlier that (H8) class would be a statistically significant determinant of attitudes toward the police. The results show that for Whites and Hispanics that class is statistically significant. The analysis revealed that self-esteem is statistically significant for Hispanics which lends support to hypothesis H11: self-esteem will be a statistically significant determinant of attitudes toward the police. The analyses also lend support for the hypothesis stated, (H15): respect for parental authority will be a statistically determinant of juveniles' attitudes toward the police. For all three racial groups the variable was statistically significant.

### **Racial Differences based on Multivariate Results**

- Age remain statistically significant for all three linear regression equations for Whites and Hispanics, but not for Blacks.
- Commitment to school had the largest effect on Blacks and Hispanics attitudes toward the police whereas; age had the largest effect on Whites.
- Black youths reported the least number of statistically significant variables as opposed to Hispanics who had the most followed by Whites.

- Neighborhood context is only statistically significant for Hispanics and not Blacks or Whites.
- Prior victimization is only statistically significant for Hispanics and not Blacks or Whites.
- Prior contact with the police is only statistically significant for Whites and Hispanics, but not Blacks.
- Commitment to school was statistically significant for Blacks and Hispanics, but not Whites.
- Class remained statistically significant for all three equations for Whites, for one equation for Hispanics, and neither equation for Blacks.
- Self-esteem was statistically significant only in one Hispanic equation. It was not found to be statistically significant in either of the Black or White's equations.
- Gender was statistically significant only in one White equation. It was not found to be statistically significant in either of the Black or Hispanic's equations.

### **Conclusion to Results' Section**

In assessing juveniles' attitudes toward the police, four strategies were utilized. First, the frequency distributions of the five attitudinal items (dependent variable-Attitudes toward Police) were examined to assess juveniles' overall attitudes toward police. A second set of frequency distributions were conducted on each racial group for all variables (*attitudes toward police, race, age, gender, class, neighborhood context, respect for parental authority, self-esteem, prior contact with police, prior victimization, commitment to school, involvement in delinquent activity, and involvement in pro-social activities*). Second, examinations of bivariate relationships between the dependent variable and the predictor variables were assessed. Specifically, the analysis of variance (ANOVA) technique was used for the following predictor

variables: *race, age, prior contact with police, prior victimization, involvement in delinquency, and involvement in pro-social activity*. In addition, correlations were used for the following predictor variables: *class, neighborhood context (appearance and safety), respect toward parental authority, self-esteem, and commitment to school*. Third, three linear regression models were developed specifically to analyze the racial differences in attitudes towards police between Blacks versus Whites, Hispanics versus Whites, and Blacks versus Hispanics. Finally, the results of three (one for each racial group) multivariate analyses were presented separately for each racial group (Whites, Blacks, and Hispanics). For each multivariate analysis, three models were analyzed: 1). socio-demographic variables, 2). personal experience variables, and 3). social bond variables. These four techniques provided much needed information on the variables and juveniles' attitudes toward the police.

The most critical finding is that overall juveniles in the sample have positive attitudes toward the police based on the results of the first univariate technique used. This finding supports one of the study's hypothesis which states, (H6): overall, juveniles have a positive attitude toward the police. The results were gathered from the distribution of responses to the five attitudinal items used to measure the juveniles overall attitudes toward the police. The responses to these measures consisted of a Likert-type scale from which students were asked to choose (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) neither agree nor disagree, (4) agree, or (5) strongly agree. Overall, the response "agree" was the most commonly selected response by the teens when looking at the five attitudinal measures in totality.

Further univariate analysis (frequency distribution) highlight the fact that the data set consist of 1288 juveniles, of which 481 are White (*213 are 12 years old or under and 267 are 13 years old or older*), 162 are Black (*49 are 12 years old or under and 113 are 13 years old or*

older), and 645 are Hispanics (261 are 12 years old or under and 380 are 13 years old or older). In analyzing the frequency distribution's preliminary results, analysis reaffirms the conclusion that overall juveniles have favorable attitudes toward the police. This is supported by the fact that for all three racial groups, the response selected the most for the dependent variable (*attitudes toward police*) was "agree." Overall, the results for each racial group were similar in that the response selected the most by all three racial groups were the same for both demographic and personal experience variables (class- "disagree" selected most, neighborhood context- measured assessing neighborhood's appearance ("not a problem" selected most) and neighborhood's safety ("not a problem" selected most), respect for parental authority- "agree" selected most, prior contact with police- "no" selected most, and prior victimization- "yes" selected most) except self-esteem. The juveniles' responses to the variable self-esteem varied slightly in reference to the answer selected the most. White and Hispanic juveniles both selected the response "often" the most as their answer choice whereas, "about half the time" was the most selected response for Blacks. When analyzing two of the three social bond variables (commitment to school- "agree" selected the most and involvement in pro-social activities- "yes" selected most), results for all racial groups' responses selected remained similar. The results for one of the measures of involvement in delinquency varied among the three racial groups. Involvement in delinquency was measured looking at: *property crimes committed* and *crimes against persons*. A majority (Whites = 72.6%, Blacks = 61.1%, & Hispanics 67.45) of the respondents for each group respectively was not involved in property crimes. However, most of the Whites (60.3%) and Hispanics (61.9%) respondents revealed they had not committed a crime against another person. Whereas for Blacks, a little more than half (52.5%) were involved in crimes against persons.

In assessing the results further, additional racial differences in the findings were revealed. For example, Blacks have a higher rate of prior contact with police than the other two racial groups (prior contact- Blacks = 32.7%, Whites = 25.8%, & Hispanics= 25.4%). Hispanics have the highest non-victimization rate of the three racial groups (not victimized- Hispanics 34.1%, Whites = 28.7%, & Blacks = 24.7%). Blacks have a higher rate of prior victimization than the other two racial groups (Blacks = 69.1%, Whites = 68.2%, & Hispanics 62.3%). Of the three groups, Blacks had the highest rate of involvement in *property crimes* (Blacks = 31.5%, Whites = 23.5%, & Hispanics = 25.9%). Although a majority of the respondents from all three groups were involved in *pro-social activities*, Blacks had the highest rate of involvement (Blacks = 78.4%, Whites = 74%, & Hispanics = 70.4%).

The results from the analysis using ANOVA provided additional insight about the attitudes of the juveniles toward the police. Only seven (race, age, gender, prior-contact, prior-victimization, involvement in delinquency, and involvement in pro-social activity) of the independent variables were able to be analyzed using the ANOVA technique. Racially, there is a statistically significant difference in attitudes towards police between Whites compared to Blacks and Whites compared to Hispanics. On the other hand, Blacks and Hispanics reported no statistically significant difference in attitudes. The bivariate results revealed that Whites indeed have a more positive attitude toward police than Blacks and Hispanics and that Hispanics' attitudes were more positive than Blacks based on mean scores. Younger teens for all three racial groups reported a higher mean score for attitudes toward police and therefore, have a more positive attitude toward police. When race and gender is taken into consideration, there is a statistically significant difference in the means of attitudes toward police for only Whites.

Nevertheless, for each racial group females reported higher mean scores than males pointing to the fact that females have a more positive attitude toward police.

In assessing race and prior contact with the police, for each racial group those without prior-contact with the police reported a more positive attitude toward the police. When race and prior victimization is taken into consideration, Hispanics were the only group that reported a statistically significant difference in the means of attitudes toward police. White and Hispanic juveniles with no prior victimization and Blacks with prior victimization reported a more positive attitude toward police. In looking at the measures of involvement in delinquency, juveniles for each racial group who have not committed a property crime and have not committed a crime against persons reported a higher mean score and have a more positive attitude toward police. In assessing pro-social activities for all racial groups, those involved in pro-social activities reported a higher mean score for attitudes toward police and have a more positive attitude toward police than those who are not involved.

Of the five independent variables (class, neighborhood context, and respect toward parental authority, self-esteem, and commitment to school) analyzed using correlations, only one of the variables (neighborhood context- both measures physical appearance and safety) revealed a negative relationship with juveniles' attitudes toward police. The negative relationships can be expressed as: when the physical appearance of one's neighborhood deteriorates (decreases) their attitude toward the police becomes more negative, and when the safety decreases in one's neighborhood, their attitude toward the police become more negative. Whereas on the other hand, as the juveniles' class status, respect toward parental authority, and commitment to school increase and self-esteem become more positive, their attitudes toward police are more positive.

While conducting further analysis, a series of multivariate analyses were conducted. Three linear regression models were developed specifically and race was recoded as a dichotomous variable to analyze the racial differences between Blacks versus Whites, Hispanics versus Whites, and Blacks versus Hispanics. Of the Demographic variables analyzed in Equation 1 (Black vs. White), the dichotomous race variable (BlackD), age, gender and class are statistically significant. From a racial perspective looking at Blacks compared to Whites, it is found that Whites have a more positive attitude toward the police than Blacks. With the addition of the personal experience variables (Equation 2), the dichotomous variable race (BlackD), age, class, respect for parental authority, and prior contact with the police was statistically significant. In Equation 3 that compares Blacks to Whites, the only variables found to be statistically significant was the dichotomous race variable (BlackD), age, commitment to school, and involvement in delinquency (both measures). In addition, the standard coefficient in Table Eight Equation 3 for commitment to school (.197) revealed that it had the largest effect on juveniles' attitudes toward the police when comparing Blacks to Whites. Also when looking at the comparison between Blacks versus Whites, only the dichotomous variable race (BlackD) along with age remains statistically significant even with the addition of the personal experience (Equation 2) and social bond variables (Equation 3).

From looking further at the analysis of Hispanics compared to Whites, age is the only variable that remains statistically significant throughout all three equations. Before the addition of the personal experience and social bond variables in Equations 2 and 3, all demographic variables were statistically significant (Equation 1). Analysis revealed that just as when compared to Blacks, Whites have a more positive attitude toward the police than Hispanics. Once the personal experience variables are taken into consideration, the only variables that are

statistically significant include: age, respect for parental authority, self-esteem, and prior contact with police. Equation 3 included all of the study's variables and those found to be statistically significant included: age, respect toward parental authority, prior contact with police, commitment to school, and both measures of involvement in delinquency (property crimes committed and crimes committed against persons), with commitment to school (.203) exerting the largest effect on juveniles attitudes toward the police.

In analyzing Blacks compared to Hispanics, just as with Hispanics compared to Whites and Blacks compared to Whites age is the only variable that remains statistically significant throughout all three equations. Hispanics have a more positive attitude toward the police than Blacks. With the addition of the personal experience variables, the dichotomous variable race (BlackHisD) remains statistically significant along with age, respect toward parental authority, self-esteem, and prior contact with police. When the same variables are included in Equation 3 along with the social bond variables, the variables that are statistically significant are age, respect toward parental authority, commitment to school, and both measures of involvement in delinquency (property crimes committed and crimes committed against persons). Just as with Hispanics compared to Whites, commitment to school (.300) exerted the largest effect on juveniles' attitudes toward the police. It is important to note that for each comparison group analyzed, Equation 3 does the best job in explaining and predicting juveniles' attitudes toward police than any of the other equations. Also, commitment to school in Equation 3 for each comparison group analyzed revealed that it has the largest effect on juveniles' attitudes toward the police than any other variable.

The last multivariate analysis performed analyzed each racial group separately. By analyzing each racial group separately, similarities or differences among the racial groups in



reference to the independent variables found to be statistically significant predictors of attitudes toward police could be revealed. Age, gender, and class were found to be statistically significant predictors of Whites attitudes toward the police. Once the personal experience variables were included, age and class remain statistically significant along with respect for parental authority and prior contact with police. With the addition of the social bond variables in analyzing Whites attitudes toward the police in Equation 3, two of the demographic variables (age and class) and one of the personal experience variables (prior contact) remained statistically significant. Of the social bond variables, both measures (at property crimes committed and crimes committed against persons) of involvement in delinquency were statistically significant. In addition, the standard coefficient in Table Eleven Equation 3 for age (-.197) revealed that age had the largest effect on White juveniles' attitudes.

From looking at the determinants of Black juveniles' attitudes toward the police, the only demographic variable found to be statistically significant in equation 1 is age. Once the personal experience variables are taken into consideration, age remain statistically significant. The only personal experience variable found to be statistically significant in Equation 2 is respect for parental authority. With the addition of the social bond variables in Equation 3, neither of the demographic variables (age, gender, and class) nor personal experience variables (neighborhood context, respect for parental authority, self-esteem, prior contact with police, and prior victimization) remained statistically significant. The social bond variables found to be statistically significant includes commitment to school and one of the measures of involvement in delinquency (property crimes committed). The standard coefficient in Equation 3 for commitment to school (.403) revealed that it had the largest effect on Black juveniles' attitudes toward the police.

The determinants of Hispanic juveniles' attitudes toward the police when assessing only the demographic variables show age and class are statistically significant. However, once the personal experience variables are added only age from equation 1 remains statistically significant. The variables respect for parental authority, self-esteem, prior contact, and prior victimization were found to be statistically significant. The standard regression coefficient for the variables found to be statistically significant reveal that respect for parental authority (.212) exerts the largest effect on Hispanic juveniles' attitudes toward the police. With the addition of the social bond variables, only the demographic variable age and two of the personal experience variables (one of the measures of neighborhood context- neighborhood safety and respect for parental authority) were statistically significant. Of the social bond variables, commitment to school was found to be statistically significant along with both measures of involvement in delinquency (property crimes committed and crimes committed against persons). In addition, the standard coefficient in Table Thirteen Equation 3 for commitment to school (.260) revealed that it had the largest effect on Hispanic juveniles' attitudes.

Further analysis of the results show that age is the only independent variable that remains statistically throughout all three equations for Whites and Hispanics. Hispanics reported the most number of independent variables that are statistically significant predictors of attitudes toward police followed by Whites and then Blacks. The variable commitment to school exerted the largest effect of all the independent variables found to be statistically significant on attitudes toward police for Blacks (Beta = .403) and Hispanics (Beta = .260). For Whites, the variable that exerted the largest effect was age (Beta = -.197). These results were based on an analysis of each racial group's equation 3 which took into consideration all the independent variables. Furthermore, equation 3 for each racial group reports the highest amount of variance explained

and therefore, does the best job in explaining and predicting what variables affect juveniles' attitudes toward police.

## **CHAPTER SIX**

### **CONCLUSION**

Many researchers have explored the attitudes of adults towards the police and then generalized these findings to youths. However, few studies have examined the attitudes juveniles hold toward the police and the consequences such attitudes have on the relationship between police and juveniles. More importantly, of the existing studies on the relationship between the public and the police, most have failed to assess the attitudes of minorities in more than one racial category. The emphasis of previous research on Black-White comparisons has left unanswered many questions about differences in minority groups' attitudes toward the police, especially between Latinos and African Americans (Martinez, 2007; Cheurprakobkit, 2000; Culver, 2004; and Correia 2010). In addition, relatively few studies have examined immigrants' perceptions of the criminal justice system or the police (Correia 2010). It is a known fact that in the United States, Hispanics/Latinos constitute the largest and fastest-growing minority population (Schaefer 2006). Therefore, no longer can both minority groups be combined to form one "non-White" group to be used for statistical analysis. In light of the limitations in existing literature -- that is, (1) the lack of relative attention to juveniles' attitudes toward the police, (2) Blacks and Hispanics in statistical analyses, and (3) inattention to Hispanic juveniles in scholarly research) - the present study examined factors that affect White, Black, and Hispanic juveniles' attitudes toward police to determine if similarities or differences exist. As a result, a study of this caliber adds much-needed information and new insights to the literature on this topic.

This study examined the determinants of attitudes of 1,686 students collected from 15 schools: 9 schools in Arizona, 1 in New Mexico, 3 in South Carolina, and 2 in Massachusetts.

Students participating resembled all students in their schools; that is, the sample demographics were similar to the school-level demographics (Esbensen, 2005). The data were collected from the students during 2004-2005 while researchers were evaluating an effort to reduce adolescent victimization entitled, “Outcome Evaluation of the Teens, Crime, and the Community/Community Works (TCC/CW) Training Program. This study used the data collected during the spring of 2005

In order to fully examine the attitudes of juveniles toward the police, variables suggested to be theoretically relevant were used employing univariate, bivariate, and multivariate statistical techniques. First, the frequency distributions of the five attitudinal items (the dependent variable- Attitudes toward Police) were examined to assess juveniles’ overall attitudes. A second set of frequency distributions were conducted on each racial group for all variables. Second, examinations of bivariate relationships between the dependent variable and the independent variables were assessed (using analysis of variance (ANOVA) and correlations techniques). Third, three linear regression models were developed specifically to analyze the racial differences in attitudes between Blacks versus Whites, Hispanics versus Whites, and Blacks versus Hispanics. Finally, the results of three multivariate analyses were presented separately for each racial group (Whites, Blacks, and Hispanics). In exploring attitudes towards the police using these different techniques, the analyses examined the dependent variable, “attitudes toward police.” The Independent variables included: *age, gender, class, neighborhood context, respect for parental authority, self- esteem, prior contact with police, prior victimization, commitment to school, involvement in delinquency, and involvement in pro-social activity*. In each multivariate analysis, three models analyzed three sets of independent and control variables: 1) socio-demographic variables, 2) personal experience variables, and 3) social bond variables.

One of the most critical findings resulting from an analysis of the five attitudinal measures (Dependent variable) was that, overall, juveniles expressed positive attitudes toward the police. This finding concurred with what Ren et al. (2005) found in their study: that the general public have positive attitudes. Univariate analysis affirmed that “agree” was the most commonly selected response by the teens when looking at the five separate measures of attitudes towards the police. This finding also supports one of the study’s hypothesis which states, (H6): overall, juveniles have a positive attitude toward the police.

This study examined the effects of the demographic variables such as race, gender, class, and age on attitudes toward the police. Prior research on race finds that Whites generally have more favorable attitudes toward the police (Cao, Frank, & Cullen, 1996; Fine, Freudenberg, Payne, Perkins, Smith, & Wanzer, 2003; Frank et al., 1996; Hurst & Frank, 2000; Hurst et al., 2000; Leiber et al., 1998; Peek et al., 1981; Smith & Hawkins, 1973; Albrecht & Green, 1977; Brown & Coulter, 1983; Campbell & Schuman, 1972; Correia, Reisig, & Lovrich, 1996; Davis, 1990; Decker, 1981; Decker & Smith, 1980; Erez, 1984; Flanagan & Vaughn, 1996; Jefferis, Kaminski, Holmes, & Hanley, 1997; Kaminski & Jefferis, 1998; Mastrofski et al., 1998; Murty et al., 1990; Peak et al., 1992; Reisig & Parks, 2000; Sampson & Jeglum-Bartusch, 1998; Scaglione & Condon, 1980; Skogan, 1978; Thomas & Hyman, 1977; Tuch & Weitzer, 1997; Walker, 1997; Webb & Marshall, 1995). When looking at minorities, Cheurprakobkit (2000) found that Blacks had less favorable attitudes toward the police than either Whites or English speaking and non-English speaking Hispanics. Based on this research, it was hypothesized that Black and Hispanic juveniles’ attitudes toward the police will be less positive when compared to Whites (H3) and Blacks will have a more negative ATP than Hispanics (H5). This study confirms what prior research has found and supports the hypotheses proposed earlier. In

addition, when Blacks were compared to Whites using linear regression, race remained statistically significant throughout all three equations. The same was not found when Hispanics were compared to Whites or Blacks were compared to Hispanics.

It was hypothesized that older juveniles will have a more negative attitude toward the police than younger juveniles (H9). The results from the ANOVA analysis revealed that for all three racial groups, younger juveniles have a more positive attitude toward police. More specifically, Whites and Hispanics juveniles' attitudes mirrored each other (reporting a statistically significant difference in ATP for juveniles under 12 years old and 13 years old and older). For Blacks however, there was no statistically significant difference in juveniles' attitudes by age. When race was used as a dichotomous variable and the three racial groups were compared, age was statistically significant. Also, age was statistically significant when each racial group was analyzed separately. The results validate the study's hypothesis and claims by prior research that age also appears to influence attitudes toward the police (Brown & Coulter, 1983; Cao, Frank, & Cullen, 1996; Chandek, 1999; Chermak, McGarrell, & Weiss, 2001; Correia, Reisig, & Lovrich, 1996; Huang & Vaughn, 1996; Jesilow et al., 1995; Kaminski & Jefferis, 1998; Koenig, 1980; Kusow, et al., 1997; Lasley, 1994; Marenin, 1983; Mastrofski, Parks, Reiss, & Worden, 1998; Murphy & Worrall, 1999; Murty, Roebuck, & Smith, 1990; Percy, 1980, 1986; Reisig & Correia, 1997; Reisig & Giacomazzi, 1998; Sampson & Jeglum-Bartusch, 1998; Schafer, Huebner, & Bynum, 2003; Smith & Hawkins, 1973; Thornton, 1975; Thurman & Reisig, 1996).

When assessing gender it was hypothesized that females will have a more positive attitude toward police than males (H12). Prior research, presents inconsistent findings on gender

and demands further examination. For example, there is an assertion women hold more positive views toward the police because their contact with the police is generally less antagonistic than that of men (Cao et al., 1996 & Taylor et al. (2001). On the other hand, there is a small body of research that found males have more positive attitudes toward the police (Brown & Coulter, 1983; Correia, Reising, & Lovrich, 1996; Gourley, 1954). The study's analyses revealed that females for each racial group have a more positive attitude toward the police than males. The present study finds that gender is statistically significant in determining attitudes toward police. More interesting however, the study reveals that it is only statistically significant for Whites and not for Blacks or Hispanics.

It was also hypothesized earlier that class would be a statistically significant predictor of attitudes toward police (H8) and that as one's class increases one's attitude toward the police would become more positive (H4). Researchers have highlighted the fact that lower socioeconomic status results in more negative attitudes toward the police (Brown and Coulter, 1983; Cao et al., 1996; Haughn and Vaughn, 1996; Marenin, 1983; Murty et al., 1990; Percy, 1980; Sampson and Jeglum-Bartusch, 1998; and Smith, Graham, and Adams, 1991). Taylor et al. (2001) concluded that much research shows that lower income minority groups have less favorable attitudes toward the police than do middle-income Whites. In the present study, class was found to be a statistically significant predictor of attitudes toward police for Whites and Hispanics only, therefore supporting the study's first hypothesis about class (H8). Additional results prove that there is a statistically significant ( $p = .000$  &  $r = .150$ ) relationship between class and attitudes. This finding concurs with previous research and supports this study's second hypothesis about class (H4), that as one class increases their attitude toward police becomes more positive.



The juveniles' personal experience variables looked at neighborhood context, respect for parental authority, self-esteem, prior contact with police, and prior victimization. When assessing neighborhood context, the present study used two measures neighborhood appearance and safety. Research shows that citizens' beliefs regarding whether the police are visible and effective in combating crime have an influence on public attitudes toward the police (Hurst & Frank, 2000). It is plausible that social disorder (e.g., noisy neighbors, loitering by rowdy teens) and physical disorder (e.g., graffiti, deteriorating property) send a message that law enforcement has lost control of or has consciously abandoned the community (e.g., Skogan, 1992), and this message affects attitudes toward the police (Cao et al., 1996). It was hypothesized that neighborhood appearance would be statistically significant in determining attitudes toward the police (H13). This study finds that neighborhood appearance was statistically significant in determining the attitudes of Hispanics only. The literature and the present study are in agreement on the issue of neighborhood appearance and the study's hypothesis relating to neighborhood appearance is supported. More interestingly, there is a statistically significant negative ( $p = .003$  &  $r = -.078$ ) relationship between appearance and attitudes toward the police. As a result, as the physical appearance of juveniles' neighborhood deteriorates (decreases) their attitudes toward the police become more negative.

It was hypothesized earlier that neighborhood safety would be statistically significant in determining juveniles' attitudes toward the police (H13). Prior research points out that as crime in a neighborhood increases, residents have less favorable attitudes toward the police (Cao et al., 1996; Hurst, 2007; Hurst & Frank, 2000; Hurst et al., 2005; Jesilow et al., 1995; Parker, Onyekwuluje, & Murty 1995; Reisig & Parks, 2000; & Weitzer & Tuch, 2005). The present study finds that neighborhood safety is not statistically significant in determining Whites' or

Blacks' attitudes toward police, but it is for Hispanics. The study confirms previous literature only as it relates to Hispanics. Further analyses show a statistically significant negative ( $p = .004$  &  $r = -.077$ ) relationship between the neighborhood safety and attitudes toward the police. Therefore, as the safety decreases in one's neighborhood, juveniles' attitudes toward police become more negative.

In the literature, there is very little information on the impact of respect toward parental authority on teenagers' attitudes toward the police. Researchers have found that juveniles who are strongly attached to their parents are less likely to engage in delinquent activities resulting in negative contact with police (Wright & Cullen, 2001). It was hypothesized earlier that respect toward parental authority would be statistically significant in determining juveniles' attitudes toward the police (H15). The present study finds that respect for parental authority affects attitudes toward the police for all three racial groups, as found in previous literature. There is a statistically significant positive ( $p = .000$  &  $r = .268$ ) relationship between respect for parental authority and attitudes toward police. Therefore, as juveniles' respect for parental authority increases their attitudes toward the police are more likely to be positive.

No prior research was found has been conducted on the effects of juveniles' self-esteem on attitudes toward police. It was hypothesized that self-esteem would be statistically significant in determining juveniles' attitudes toward the police (H11). The present study revealed that the variable self-esteem was statistically significant. However, the effect of self-esteem was only statistically significant for Hispanics. The variable self-esteem revealed that there is a statistically significant positive ( $p = .000$  &  $r = .229$ ) relationship between it and the dependent

variable. Therefore, as juveniles' self-esteem becomes more positive, their attitudes toward police become more positive as well.

In reference to prior contact with the police, it was hypothesized that juveniles reporting prior contact with police will have a negative attitude toward the police (H12). Hagan, Shedd, and Payne (2005) found that African American students were more likely than Latino or White students to have encounters with the police, while Latinos were more likely than other groups to respond negatively to these encounters. The present study reveals that prior contact with police is significantly related to attitudes toward police and concurs with previous literature; however, this was the case only for Whites and Hispanics. Also, Whites and Hispanics revealed a statistically significant difference in their attitudes toward police by race, if they had prior contact with police. Black juveniles did not report statistically different attitudes toward police if they had prior contact with police. Overall, however, analyses of each racial group revealed that those juveniles without prior contact with the police have a more positive attitude toward the police.

When it comes to prior victimization, it was hypothesized that juveniles reporting prior victimization will have a negative attitude toward the police (H14). Studies have found that individuals who have been victimized by criminal acts have less positive attitudes toward the police than those without similar experiences (Hurst & Frank, 2000; Smith & Hawkins, 1973; Payne & Gainey 2007; Preist & Carter, 1999, and Thurman & Reisig, 1996). The present study concurred with previous studies and supports the study's hypothesis by finding a statistically significant relationship between prior victimization and attitudes toward the police, but only for Hispanics. Looking at further analysis, there is no statistically significant difference in the attitudes toward police for those reporting prior-victimization and those without for both Whites

and Blacks. Both Whites and Hispanics groups reporting no prior-victimization have a more positive attitude toward police, however. Interestingly, Blacks revealed that those with prior victimization have a more positive attitude toward the police; this finding warrants further investigation.

The social bond variables analyzed were commitment to school, involvement in delinquency, and involvement in pro-social activities. Few existing studies have investigated the relationship between commitment to school and attitudes toward the police (Flexon, Lurigio, & Greenleaf, 2009). However, Agnew (2005) and Levy (2001) found that weak attachment to school and poor relationships with teachers could generalize to more global antisocial values and behaviors, creating hostile sentiments toward the police and other authority figures. It was hypothesized in the present study that commitment to school will be statistically significant in explaining juveniles' attitudes toward the police (H2). The study's results supports that commitment to school is statistically significant in predicting attitudes toward the police, but only for Blacks and Hispanics. In addition, commitment to school was found to be statistically significant for the three racial groups in predicting attitudes, when race was used as a dichotomous variable. As juveniles' commitment to school increases, their attitudes toward police are more likely to be positive.

Several studies assessing juvenile attitudes toward police have found that involvement in delinquent activities are directly correlated with negative attitudes toward the police (Chapman, 1956; Giordano, 1976; Leiber *et al.*, 1998; Cox & Falkenberg, 1987; Hurst & Frank, 2000; Leiber *et al.* 1998; & Jackson, 2002). This study measured involvement in delinquency by analyzing property crimes committed and crimes committed against other people. Taken

together, it was hypothesized that involvement in delinquency would be a statistically significant predictor of juveniles' attitudes toward police (H1). The multivariate analysis confirms this hypothesis for both measures of involvement in delinquency. Also for each racial group, juveniles who have not committed property crimes or crimes against other people have a more positive attitude toward police. Further analysis of crimes against persons show Whites and Hispanics reported a statistically significant difference in means of attitudes toward police when race and involvement in crimes against persons are taken into consideration. For Blacks, there is no statistically significant difference in mean attitudes toward police for those that have committed crimes against persons and those who have not.

No prior research was found on the relationship between involvement in pro-social activities and attitudes toward the police. However, it was hypothesized that juveniles involved in pro-social activities will have a positive attitude toward the police (H10). Study results do not lend support to this hypothesis. Involvement in pro-social activities was not found to be statistically significant in any of the multivariate analyses attitudes for any racial group. Whites were the only group to report a statistically significant difference in mean attitudes toward police when race and pro-social activities were taken into consideration.

There was a general hypothesis about the variables in the study. The hypothesis stated that race, prior contact with police, involvement in delinquency, commitment to school, parental authority, and self-esteem would explain the most variance of all variables included in analysis (H17). This hypothesis failed to be proved by any of the multivariate analyses performed. From a racial standpoint, the variables for each group that explained the most variance for attitudes toward the police varied (Whites: age, involvement in delinquency, class, and prior contact;

Blacks: commitment to school and property crimes committed; and Hispanics: commitment to school, age, involvement in delinquency, neighborhood safety, and respect for parental authority. The variation in statistically significant independent variables across race categories hint at the continued need for separate and comparative analyses of these different race categories.

This study employed two theories to explain juveniles' attitudes toward the police, a form of the conflict theory and then also social bond theory. It was hypothesized in reference to the conflict theory that Black and Hispanic juveniles' attitudes toward the police will be less positive when compared to Whites (H3) and that, as one's class increases, their attitude toward the police will become more positive (H4). Based on the conflict theory used in this study, police as agents of official social control target minorities to maintain race and class control and protect the hegemonic interests of dominant White society (Chambliss and Seidman 1982). The police function as a structure to ensure that those in power can retain their status and to minimize the potential threat from other groups (Chambliss & Seidman, 1982; Quinney, 1970; Turk, 1969; Vold, 1958). The less powerful, (lower-class persons and minorities, for example) are scrutinized and controlled much more frequently than others as agents of the state concentrate on protecting the resources and values of the more powerful. As a result, Blacks and Hispanics' attitudes toward the police are more negative than Whites because they are more likely to come into negative contact with the police. Multivariate analysis showed that Blacks and Hispanics' attitudes are less positive than Whites, therefore supporting the first hypothesis. Additional analyses show that Blacks have a higher rate of contact with the police than the other two groups. As it relates to H4, as one's class increases, their attitude toward the police becomes more positive. In additional analyses, class was found to only negatively affect Blacks attitudes and

not Hispanics when compared to Whites. Results finally show that, for both Hispanics and Whites, as their class increases that their attitudes toward police become more positive.

In utilizing the social bond theory (Hirschi, 1969) this study looked at two of the four components of the theory: commitment to conventional activities and involvement in delinquency. Commitment to conventional activities refers to someone's devotion to conventional activities, such as getting an education. Hirschi (1969) found that the higher a teen scored on school work, the less likely he/she was to have committed delinquent acts and the less likely he/she was to have been picked up by the police. It was hypothesized that commitment to school would be statistically significant in explaining attitudes toward police (H2). Results from the study supported this hypothesis but only as it relates to Blacks and Hispanics. Commitment to school was not found to be a statistically significant predictor of Whites attitudes toward the police. In regards to involvement in delinquency, Hirschi (1969) believed if people are spending their time engaged in some form of pro-social activity then they are not, by definition, spending their time engaged in antisocial activity (the latter increasing the chances of coming into contact with police). The results from the study's analyses give support to the first hypothesis (H1: Involvement in delinquency will be statistically significant in explaining juveniles' attitudes toward the police) in reference to involvement in delinquency. This finding applies to all three racial groups in part (only for property crimes committed in the case of Blacks however).

Finally, this study adds new insight to the literature on juveniles' attitudes toward the police. Unlike other studies, this project looked at independent variables that have not received much attention in previous research on the topic, such as juveniles' prior victimization and neighborhood characteristics, as noted by Hurst and Frank (2000). In addition, this project

updates the limited research that has been conducted that analyzes the effect of social institutions on juveniles' attitudes toward police. Specifically, this project adds and updates the literature as it relates to commitment to school and involvement in delinquent activity. Further, the project adds to the sparse knowledge on whether respect for parental authority affects minority juveniles' attitudes toward the police. In addition, this study analyzed mediating variables that have received little attention in prior research: self-esteem and involvement in pro-social activities. As a result, new information is added to our existing knowledge about juveniles' attitudes toward the police. More importantly, very little is known about minorities' attitudes toward the police, and specifically, whether what we know about factors that shape attitudinal similarities and differences between Whites and African Americans can be applied to Hispanics. This study begins to fill this void in our race-based knowledge.

Although there are many contributions of this study, there are limitations to it as well. The sample used for the study only includes the responses of students enrolled in the public schools where the surveys were administered. Therefore, students in private, detention, alternative schools, or students who may have dropped out of school are excluded from this study. Due to the locations where the sample was drawn, it is also not representative of students across the nations and national generalizations cannot be made. From a data perspective as well, the data used were not designed with my purpose in mind (i.e., determining the foundations of African American, Hispanic, and White juveniles' attitudes toward the police). The size of the sample is a limitation of the study as well. Specifically, the number of Blacks ( $n = 162$ ) in the study was low due to the locations of data was gathered collection. Since the study uses secondary data (i.e., collected by and for someone for another purpose), no new or differently measured variables could be created for this study. This study also has a limitation that has



plagued almost all other existing research on public attitudes toward the police: it examined citizen-related factors, such as citizens' demographic characteristics, experiences, and neighborhood contexts. No matter how complicated such studies may be, they tend to reveal only half of the picture. For example, they reveal the public or citizens' side of the story, while ignoring the other half of the picture: the police side. In addition, while some previous research and this current study did examine the role that police-citizen contacts play in shaping juveniles' attitudes of the police, many other factors, such as: officers' demeanor during police-citizen encounters, officers' perceptions of the public, police training for community policing (especially as it relates to dealing with minority communities), departmental policies, strategies for policing, and police culture were not included but need to be considered. No research project is complete, however. Putting aside these limitations, results of this the project will advance the literature on African American, Hispanic, and White juveniles' attitudes toward the police.

Future research on race and attitudes toward police should adopt my method of separating minority groups into distinct categories. By doing this, results show that there are very distinct differences in what affects Black and Hispanic juveniles' attitudes toward the police. Interestingly, based on this study's results one can draw the conclusion that there are glaring similarities between what affects Hispanic and White juveniles' attitudes toward the police but there is evidence that these groups are not the same either. An in-depth, multi-method analysis that examines both the mean differences in attitudes across racial categories and accesses the effect of race as an independent variable in linear regression models led to more nuanced findings on racial attitudes toward the police.

**REFERENCES**

- Agnew, R. (2005). *Juvenile delinquency Cause and control* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles: Roxbury.
- Albrecht, S., & Green M. (1977). Attitudes Toward the Police and the Larger Attitude Complex: Implications for Community Policing Relationships. *Criminology*, 15, 67-86.
- Apple, N. & O'Brien, D.J. (1983), ``Neighborhood Racial Composition and Residents' Evaluation of Police Performance'', *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 11, 76-84.
- Bayley, D.H. & Mendohlnson, I. (1969). *Minorities and the Police: Confrontation in America*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Biderman, A. D., Johnson, L. A., McIntyre, J., & Weir, A. W. (1967). *Field surveys I: Reports on the pilot study in the District of Columbia on victimization and attitudes toward law enforcement*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Binder, A., & Scharf, P. (1982). Deadly Force in Law Enforcement. *Crime & Delinquency*, 28, 1-23.
- Blumer, H. (1958). Race Prejudice as a Sense of Group Position. *Pacific Sociological Review*, 1, 3-7.
- Bobo, L., & Tuan, M. (2006). *Prejudice in Politics: Group Position, Public Opinion, and the Wisconsin Treaty Rights Dispute*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Boggs, S. & Galliher J. (1975). Evaluating the Police: A Comparison of Black and White Street and Household Respondents. *Social Problems*, 22, 393-406.
- Borrero, M. (2001). The Widening Mistrust between Youth and Police. *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Human Services*, 82, 399-408.

- Brandl, S., Frank, J., Worden, R., & Bynum, T. (1994). Global and Specific Attitudes Towards the Police: Disentangling the Relationship. *Justice Quarterly, 11*, 119-134.
- Brown, K., & Coulter, P. (1983). Subjective and Objective Measures of Police Service Delivery. *Public Administration Review, 43*, 50-8.
- Brick, B.T., Taylor, T.J., & Esbensen, F. (2009). *Juvenile Attitudes Toward the Police: The Importance of Subculture involvement and Community ties*. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 37*(5), 488-495.
- Brown, B., & Benedict, W.R. (2002). Perceptions of Police: Past Findings, Methodological Issues, Conceptual Issues and Policy Implications. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 25*(3), 543-578.
- Campbell, A., & Schuman, H. (1968). *Racial Attitudes in Fifteen American Cities*. National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. Supplemental Studies for the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Campbell, A., & Schuman, H. (1972). A Comparison of Black and White Attitudes and Experiences in the City. In C. Harr (Ed.) *The 3rd of innocence: a suburban reader* (pp. 97-110). Glenview IL: Scott Foresman.
- Cao, L., Frank, J., & Cullen, F. T. (1996). Race, Community Context and Confidence in the Police. *American Journal of Police, 15*(1), 3-22.
- Carter, D. L. (1983). Hispanic perception of police performance: An empirical assessment. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 13*, 487-500.
- Carter, D. L. (1985). Hispanic Interaction with the Criminal Justice System in Texas: Experiences, Attitudes, and Perceptions. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 11*, 213-227.
- Chapman, A.W. (1956), ``Attitudes Toward Legal Authorities by Juveniles'', *Sociology and*

*Social Research*, 40, 170-5.

Chambliss, W., & Seidman, R. (1971). *Law, order, and power*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Chambliss, W. & Seidman, R. (Eds.) (1982). *Law, Order, and Power*. (2nd ed.). MA: Addison-Wesley.

Chandek, M. (1999). Race, Expectations and Evaluations of Police Performance an Empirical Assessment. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*, 22, 675-95.

Chermak, S., McGarrell, E., & Weiss, A. (2001). Citizens' Perceptions of Aggressive Traffic Enforcement Strategies. *Justice Quarterly*, 18, 365-91.

Churprakobkit, S. (2000). Police-Citizen Contact and Police Performance Attitudinal Differences Between Hispanics and non-Hispanics. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 28, 325–336.

Cloward, R. & Ohlin, L. 1960. *Delinquency and Opportunity: A Theory of Delinquent Gangs*. New York: Free Press.

Cohen, A. 1955. *Delinquent Boys*. New York: Free press.

Correia, M. (2010). Determinants of Attitudes Toward Police of Latino Immigrants and non-Immigrants. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38, 99-107.

Correia, M., Reisig, M., & Lovrich, N. (1996). Public Perceptions of State Police: An Analysis of Individual-Level and Contextual Variables. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 24, 17-28.

Cox, T. C., & Falkenberg, S.D. (1987). Adolescents' Attitudes Toward Police: An Emphasis on Interactions Between the Delinquency Measures of Alcohol and Marijuana, Police Contacts and Attitudes. *American Journal of Police*, 6, 45-62.

Dahrendorf, R. (1958) "Toward a Theory of Social Conflict." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 2:

170-183.

Das, D. (1983). Conflict Views on Policing: An Evaluation. *American Journal of Police*, 3(1), 51-81.

Davis, J. (1990). A Comparison of Attitudes Toward the New York City Police. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 9, 80-87.

Decker, S. (1981). Citizens Attitude Towards the Police: The Difference Police Contacts makes. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 9(1), 80-87.

Decker, S., & Smith, R. (1980). Police Minority Recruitment: A Note on its Effectiveness in Improving Black Evaluations of the Police. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 8, 387-93.

Esbensen, Finn-Aage (2005). Outcome Evaluation of the Teens, Crime, and the Community/Community Works (TCC/CW) Training Program in Nine Cities Across Four States, 2004-2005. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research.

Ennis, P. H. (1967). *Field surveys II: Reports on the pilot study in the District of Columbia on victimization and attitudes toward law enforcement*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Erez, E. (1984). Self-Defined Desert and Citizens' Assessment of the Police. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 75, 1276-99.

Fine, M., Freudenberg, N., Payne, Y., Perkins, T., Smith, K., & Wanzer, K. (2003). "Anything can Happen with Police Around": Urban Youth Evaluate Strategies of Surveillance in Public Places. *Journal of Social Issues*, 59(1), 141-158.

Flanagan, T., & Vaughn, M. (1996). Public Opinion about Police use of Force. In *Police Violence* ed. W. Geller and H. Toch. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

- Flexon, J.L., Lurigio, A.J., & Greenleaf, R. G. (2009). Exploring the Dimension of Trust in the Police Among Chicago Juveniles. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 37, 180-189.
- Frank, J., Brandl, S. G., Cullen, F. T., & Stichman, A. (1996). Reassessing the Impact of Race on Citizen's Attitudes Toward the Police: A Research Note. *Justice Quarterly*, 13(2), 322-334.
- Giordano, P.C. (1976), ``The Sense of Injustice: An Analysis of Juveniles' Reactions to the Justice System'', *Criminology* 14, 93-112.
- Goldstein, H. (1977) *Policing a Free Society*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Griffiths, C. T., & Winfree, L. T. (1977). Adolescent Attitudes Toward the Police: A Survey of High School Students. In Theodore Ferdinand (Ed.), *Juvenile delinquency: Little brother grows up* (Chap. 5, pp. 77-99). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hagan, J., Shedd, C., & Payne, M. (2005). Race, Ethnicity, and Youth Perception of Criminal Injustice. *American Sociological Review*, 7, 381-407.
- Hahn, H. (1971). Ghetto Assessments of Police Perception and Authority. *Law and Society Review*, 5, 69-89.
- Healey, J. (2002). *Statistics: A Tool for Social Research*. 6<sup>th</sup> Ed. Belmont, CA. Wadsworth Press.
- Henderson, M., Cullen, F., Cao, L., Browning, S., & Kopachee, R. (1997). The Impact of Race on Perceptions of Criminal Injustice. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 25, 447-62.
- Hirschi, T. (1969). Causes of delinquency. *Attachment to parents Attachment to school* (Chaps. 6 & 7, pp. 84-134). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Horowitz, J. (2007). Making Every Encounter Count: Building Trust and Confidence in the Police. *National Institute of Justice Journal*. No. 256.
- Howell, S., Perry, H., & Vile, M. (2004). *Black Cities/White Cities: Evaluating the Police*.

- Police Behavior*, 26(1), 45-68.
- Huebner, B., Schafer, J., & Bynum, T. (2004). African American and White Perceptions of Police Services: Within- and Between-Group Variation. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 32, 123-135.
- Hurst, Y. G., & Frank, J. (2000). How Kids View Cops. The Nature of Juvenile Attitudes Toward the Police. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 28, 189-202.
- Hurst, Y., Frank, J., & Browning, S. (2000). The Attitudes of Juveniles Toward the Police. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategy and Management*, 23(1), 37-53.
- Hurst, Y., McDermott, J., & Thomas, D. (2005). The Attitudes of Girls Toward the Police: Differences by Race. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*, 28(4), 578-593.
- Hurst, Y. (2007). Juvenile Attitudes Toward the Police: An Examination of Rural Youth. *Criminal Justice Review*, 32(2), 121-141.
- Jackson, A. (2002). Police-School Resource Officers' and Students' Perception of the Police and Offending. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 25, 631 – 650.
- Jackson, P. (1986). Black Visibility, City Size, and Social Control. *Sociological Quarterly*, 27, 185-203.
- Jackson, P., & Carroll, L. (1981). Race and the War on Crime: The Sociopolitical Determinants of Municipal Police Expenditures in 90 non-Southern U.S. Cities. *American Sociological Review*, 46, 290-305.
- Jacobs, D., & Britt, D. (1979). Inequality and Police use of Deadly Force: An Empirical Assessment of a Conflict Hypothesis. *Social Problems*, 26, 403-412.

- Jefferis, E., Kaminski, R., Holmes, S., & Hanley, D. (1997). The Effect of Videotaped Arrest on Public Perceptions of Police and use of Force. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 25*, 381-95.
- Jesilow, J., Meyer, J., & Namazzi, N. (1995). Public Attitudes Toward the Police. *American Journal of Police, 14*(2), 67-88.
- Jones-Brown, D. (2000). Debunking the Myth of Officer Friendly: How African American Males Experience Community Policing. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 16*, 209-229.
- Kaminski, R., & Jefferis, E. (1998). The Effect of a Televised Violent Arrest on Public Perceptions of the Police: A Partial Test of Easton's Theoretical Framework. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management, 21*, 636-706.
- Kent, S., & Jacobs, D. (2005). Minority Threat and Police Strength from 1980 to 2000: A Fixed-Effects Analysis of Nonlinear and Interactive Effects in Large U.S. Cities. *Criminology, 43*, 731-760.
- Koenig, D.J. (1980). The Effect of Crime Victimization and Judicial or Police Contacts on Public Attitudes Toward the Local Police. *Journal of Police Science and Administration, 8*, 243-49.
- Lake, R.L. (2006). A Juvenile's Perspective: Juveniles' Attitudes Toward the Police. Master's Thesis. Eastern Michigan University.
- Lasley, J. R. (1994). The Impact of the Rodney King Incident on Citizen Attitudes Toward Police. *Policing & Society, 3*, 245-255.
- Leiber, M. J., Nalla, M. K., & Farnsworth, M. (1998). Explaining Juveniles' Attitudes Toward the Police. *Justice Quarterly, 15*(1), 151-173.
- Levy, K. (2001). The Relationship between Adolescent Attitudes Toward Authority, Self



- Concept, and Delinquency. *Adolescence*, 36, 333–346.
- Lewis, E., & Sullivan, T. (1979). Combating Crime and Citizen Attitudes: A Study of the Corresponding Reality. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 7, 71-79.
- Liska, A., Lawrence, J., & Benson, M. (1981). Perspectives on the Legal Order: The Capacity for Social Control. *American Journal of Sociology*, 87, 413-426.
- Lurigio, Arthur J., Richard G. Greenleaf, & Jamie L. Flexon. 2009. "The Effects of Race on Relationships with the Police: A Survey of African American and Latino Youths in Chicago." *Western Criminology Review*, 10(1), 29-41.
- Martsen, B.M., & Coleman, J.C. (1961). "Specificity of Attitudes Towards Parental and Non-Parental Authority Figures. *Journal of Individual Psychology*, 17, 96-101.
- Marx, K. (1963). *Early Writings*. Translated by T.B. Bottomore. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Mastrofski, S., Parks, R., Reiss, A., & Worden, R. (1998). Policing Neighborhoods: A Report from Indianapolis. NIJ Series, *Research Preview*.
- Miller, W.B. (1958). Lower Class Culture as a Generating Milieu of Gang Delinquency. *Journal of Social Issues*, 14, 5-19.
- Mills, C. (1956). *The Power Elite*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mosher, C. (2001). Predicting Drug Arrest Rates: Conflict and Social Disorganization Perspectives. *Crime & Delinquency*, 47, 84-104.
- Murty, K., Roebuck, J., & Smith, J. (1990). The Image of Police in Black Atlanta Communities. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 17, 250-57.
- Nelson, E.A., Eisenberg, N., & Carroll, J.L. (1982). The Structure of Adolescents' Attitudes Towards Law and Crime. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*. 140, 47-58.
- Nihart, T., Lersch, K., Sellers, C., & Mieczkowski, T. (2005). Kids, Cops, Parents and Teachers:

- Exploring, Juvenile Attitudes Toward Authority Figures. *Western Criminology Review*, 6, 79–88.
- Nofziger, S., & Williams, L. (2005). Perceptions of Police and Safety in a Small Town. *Police Quarterly*, 8(2), 248-270.
- Orr, M., & West, D. (2007). Citizen Evaluations of Local Police: Personal Experience or Symbolic Attitudes? *Administration and Society*, 38(6), 649-668.
- Puzzanchera C. (2009). Juvenile Arrests 2007. Juvenile Justice Bulletin. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention; Available from URL: [www.ncjrs.gov](http://www.ncjrs.gov).
- Parker, K., Onyekwuluje, A., & Murty, K. (1995). African Americans' Attitudes Toward Local Police: A Multivariate Analysis. *Journal of Black Studies*, 25, 396-409.
- Payne, B., & Gainey, R. (2007). Attitudes about Police and Neighborhood Safety in Disadvantaged Neighborhoods: The Influence of Criminal Victimization and Perceptions of Drug Problems. *Criminal Justice Review*, 32(2), 142-155.
- Peek, C. W., Lowe, G. D., & Alston, J. P. (1981). Race and Attitudes Toward Local Police: Another Look. *Journal of Black Studies*, 11(3), 361-374.
- Percy, S. L. (1986). In Defense of Citizen Evaluations as Performance Measures. *Urban Affairs Quarterly*, 22, 66-83.
- Percy, S. (1980). Response Time and Citizen Evaluation of Police. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 8, 75-86.
- Piliavin, I., & Briar, S. (1964). Police Encounters with Juveniles. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 70(2), 206-214.
- Piquero, A., Fagan, J., Mulvey, E., Steinberg, L., & Odgers, C. (2005). Developmental

- Trajectories of Legal Socialization among Serious Adolescent Offenders. *Criminology*, 96, 267–298.
- President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice (1967). Task Force Report: The Police. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Priest, T., & Brown-Carter, D. (1999). Evaluations of Police Performance in an African American Sample. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 27(5), 457-465.
- Quinney, R. (1970). *The Social Reality of Crime*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Reisig, M., & Correia, M. (1997). Public Evaluations of Police Performance: An Analysis Across Three Levels of Policing. *Policing an International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*, 20(2), 311-25.
- Reisig, M., & Giacomazzi, A. (1998). Citizen Perceptions of Community Policing: Are Attitudes Toward the Police Important? *Policing: An International Journal of Strategies and Management*, 21(3), 547-61.
- Reisig, M., & Parks, R. (2000). Experience, Quality of Life and Neighborhood Context: A Hierarchical Analysis of Satisfaction with the Police. *Justice Quarterly*, 17: 607-29.
- Sampson, R., & Jeglum-Bartusch, D. (1999). Attitudes Toward Crime, Police, and the Law: Individual and Neighborhood Differences. *NIJ Series*, June, 1999. Research Preview.
- Scaglione, R., & Condon, R. (1980). Determinants of Attitudes Toward City Police. *Criminology*, 17, 485-94.
- Schafer, J., Huebner, B., & Bynum, T. (2003). Citizen Perceptions of Police Services: Race, Neighborhood Context, and Community Policing. *Police Quarterly*, 6(4), 440-468.
- Schuck, A., & Rosenbaum, D. (2005). Global and Neighborhood Attitudes Toward the Police:

- Differentiation by Race, Ethnicity and Type of Contact. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 21(4), 391-418.
- Skogan, W. (1978). Citizen Satisfaction with Police Services: Individual and Contextual Effects. *Police Studies Journal*, 8, 469-479.
- Skogan, W. 2006. "Asymmetry in the Impact of Encounters with Police." *Policing & Society*, 16, 99-126.
- Skogan, W. (1992): *Disorder and Decline: Crime and the Spiral of Decay in American Neighborhoods*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Smith, D., Graham, N., & Adams, B. (1991). Minorities and the Police: Attitudinal and Behavioral Questions. In M. Lynch & E. Patterson (Eds). *Race and Criminal Justice* New York: Harrow and Heston.
- Smith, P. E., & Hawkins, R. O. (1973). Victimization, Types of Citizen-Police Contacts, and Attitudes Toward the Police. *Law and Society Review*, 8(1), 135-152.
- Sorensen, J., Marquart, J., & Brock, D. (1993). Factors Related to Killings of Felons by Police Officers: A Test of the Community Violence and Conflict Hypotheses. *Justice Quarterly*, 10, 417-440.
- Stoutland, S. (2001). The Multiple Dimensions of Trust in Resident/Police Relations in Boston. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 38(3), 226-256.
- Stucky, T. (2005). Local Politics and Police Strength. *Justice Quarterly*, 22, 139-169.
- Sullivan, P., Dunham, R. G., & Alpert, G. P. (1987). Attitudes Structures of Different Ethnic and Age Groups Concerning Police. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 78(1), 177-196.
- Taylor, T. J., Turner, K. B., Esbensen, F. A., & Winfree, Jr., L. T. (2001). Coppin' an Attitude.

- Attitudinal Differences Among Juveniles Toward Police. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 29(4), 501-521.
- Thomas, C., & Hyman, J. (1977). Perception of Crime, Fear of Victimization, and Public Perceptions of Police Performance. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 5, 305-17.
- Thurman, Q., Giacomazzi, A., & Bogen, P. (1993). Research Note: Cops, Kids, and Community Policing: An Assessment of a Community Policing Demonstration Project. *Crime and Delinquency*, 39(4), 554-64.
- Thurman, Q., & Reisig, M. (1996). Community-Oriented Research in an Era of Community Policing. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 39(5), 570-86.
- Tuch, S., & Weitzer, R. (1997). The Polls: Racial Differences in Attitudes Toward the Police. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 61, 642-64.
- Turk, A. (1969). *Criminality and Legal Order*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Vold, G. (1958). *Theoretical criminology*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Walker, S. (1997). Complaints Against the Police: A Focus Group Study of Citizen Perceptions, Goals and Expectations. *Criminal Justice Review*, 22, 207-26.
- Webb, V., & Marshall, C. (1995). The Relative Importance of Race and Ethnicity on Citizen Attitudes Toward the Police. *American Journal of Police*, 14(2), 45-66.
- Weitzer, R., & Tuch, S. (2004). Reforming the Police: Racial Differences in Public Support for Change. *Criminology*, 42, 391-416.
- Weitzer, R., & Tuch, S. (2005) Determinants of Public Satisfaction with the Police. *Police Quarterly*, 8(3), 279-97.
- Wright, J., & Cullen, F. (2001). Parental Efficacy and Delinquent Behavior: Do Control and

Support Matter? *Criminology*, 39, 677–705.

Yuning Wu, Ivan Y. Sun & Ruth A. Triplett (2009): Race, Class or Neighborhood Context:  
Which Matters More in Measuring Satisfaction with Police? *Justice Quarterly*, 26:1,  
125-156.

Zeit, L. (1965). Survey of Negro Attitudes Toward the Law. *Rutgers Law Review*, 19,  
288-316.

**ABSTRACT****A JUVENILE PERSPECTIVE: WHAT AFFECTS ATTITUDES OF AFRICAN AMERICAN, HISPANIC, AND WHITE YOUTH TOWARD THE POLICE.**

by

**RODNEY LAMON LAKE****August 2013****Advisor:** Dr. Heather Dillaway**Major:** Sociology**Degree:** Doctor of Philosophy

Race is one of the most powerful variables explaining the public's attitudes toward the police. The majority of studies on race and attitudes toward the police have explored differences between African Americans and Whites. The emphasis of previous research on Black-White comparisons has left unanswered many questions about minority group differences in attitudes toward the police, especially differences between Latinos and African Americans. With the usage of secondary data ("Outcome Evaluation of the Teens, Crime, and the Community/Community Works (TCC/CW) Training Program in Nine Cities across Four States, 2004-2005), this study determined which independent variables (race, age, gender, class, self esteem, prior victimization, contact with police, neighborhood context, parental authority, commitment to school, involvement in delinquent activity, and involvement on pro-social activities) affected African American, Hispanic, and White juveniles' attitudes toward the police. To assess how well these variables predict the attitudes of these three groups, a dependent variable (attitudes toward police) was created from a composite of five attitudinal questions. The results from this study will be significant because it will: (1) add and update the literature on this topic, (2) determine whether there are similarities or differences in overall attitudes toward police

and whether there are similarities or differences in what affects the attitudes of minorities (specifically, African Americans and Hispanics) toward police, and (3) will add an analysis of the attitudes of Hispanics, one of the largest and fastest growing minority populations in the U.S.



### **AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL STATEMENT**

Rodney Lamon Lake is a formal graduate of Alabama State University and Eastern Michigan University. At the end of August 2013, his educational achievements will also include a doctoral degree from Wayne State University. He gained teaching experience from Wayne State University, Monroe County Community College, and Henry Ford Community College. Rodney Lake has received various awards which include: Honorable Discharge from the US Army, King, Chavez, Parks Fellowship, Graduate Teaching Assistantship, and several academic honors. Presently, Rodney Lake has accepted a full-time faculty position at Hawkeye Community College in Waterloo, IA which begins in Fall 2013.