



Bridgewater State University

## Virtual Commons - Bridgewater State University

---

Honors Program Theses and Projects

Undergraduate Honors Program

---

12-18-2015

### Police Contacts and Attitudes Toward Police: A Study of Race and Policing

Gary Portway

Follow this and additional works at: [https://vc.bridgew.edu/honors\\_proj](https://vc.bridgew.edu/honors_proj)



Part of the [Criminology Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Portway, Gary. (2015). Police Contacts and Attitudes Toward Police: A Study of Race and Policing. In *BSU Honors Program Theses and Projects*. Item 123. Available at: [https://vc.bridgew.edu/honors\\_proj/123](https://vc.bridgew.edu/honors_proj/123)  
Copyright © 2015 Gary Portway

This item is available as part of Virtual Commons, the open-access institutional repository of Bridgewater State University, Bridgewater, Massachusetts.

Police Contacts and Attitudes Toward Police: A Study of Race and Policing

Gary Portway

Submitted in Partial Completion of the  
Requirements for Departmental Honors in Criminal Justice

Bridgewater State University

December 18, 2015

Dr. Jennifer Hartsfield, Thesis Director  
Dr. Mia Ortiz, Committee Member  
Dr. Wendy Wright, Committee Member

## Abstract

The way in which police officers engage with general society is often under meticulous watch by countless amounts of citizens. The United States – at an unprecedented point in regards to technological advancement and education – expedites such meticulous watch in a way that it often becomes noticeable criticism. Strategies of policing such as New York City’s “stop-and-frisk” policy have ignited much criticism of police, and have caused the need for many general improvements to the way in which police facilitate. Since the structure of policing often shifts based on changes within general society, it has become a common standard that facets of policing must match the highest degree of ethics in which citizens of the United States have adopted. This study and research is concerned if there is any disproportionality among the history of police contacts for Bridgewater State University students.

To reach meaningful conclusions about this topic, this paper will be comprised of original data on the subject of police-citizen interactions, as well as a review and discussion on the respective research & literature. The original work produced in this research involves a questionnaire that was passed out to 250 Bridgewater State University students in 2015. The questionnaire’s content is designed in a way to best gauge the respective police contact that each respondent has had. This data was analyzed after collection with SPSS (statistical software) in order to better interpret the results. The respective research and literature on this particular subject is comprised of statistics & data, theoretical perspectives, news stories, and other academic work.

## Chapter 1: Introduction

**General Statement of the Problem.** In the United States, there are hundreds of thousands of police officers that are sworn under oath to protect society (Walker & Katz, 2013). Police officers, the government agents (under oath) that facilitate and protect the law against unlawful deviants, are granted an immense amount of power in comparison to the average citizen. Therefore, there is a great disparity between the intentions of the law and the actual facilitation of the law when police officers do not utilize their powers correctly and ethically. The number of police officers and the amount of power that police officers have can embroil meticulous watch from society due to the fear of the misuse of power (Walker & Katz, 2013). Such a misuse of power is dangerous for the general community, as well as society (Cartledge & Dukes, 2008; Gabbidon & Greene, 2013; Lee & Barro, 1993; Lee & Ransom, 2011).

In a society where inherent trust is placed upon sworn officers of the law: there needs to be careful speculation about the practices of those officers, as malpractice by such officers can be austere in consequences. Careful and ethical speculation of police officers is necessary, as the nature of their jobs do not formally and technically require them to recognize a compliant or crime (Walker & Katz, 2013). Careful and ethical speculation of police officers is also necessary because whole departments are not sanctioned if they do not report crimes to nationally-based police reports such as the Uniform Crime Report (Walker & Katz, 2013).

Within the past several years, society has begun reexamining police contacts due to speculation that some officers operate under a guise that belies a sense of prejudice in the form of racism (Department of Justice, 2015; Ridgeway, 2009). The variables of race and ethnicity have been examined in many research articles pertaining to police mistreatment (Department of Justice, 2015; New York City Liberties Union, 2012; New York City Police Department, 2014; Ridgeway, 2009). There are some findings that some police officers have engaged with citizens differently per the race and ethnicity of the citizen instead of for criminal-related reasons (Department of Justice, 2015; New York City Liberties Union, 2012; New York City Police Department, 2014; Ridgeway, 2009). According to the federal court case of *Floyd, et al. v. City of New York* (commonly referred to as *Floyd*), this even occurred in large cities like New York City, as there was a disproportionate number of minorities involved with police contacts. Age was also looked at in the case of *Floyd*. Age is another essential variable to look at when analyzing and assessing police contacts, because age may influence and alter the discretion of police officers (New York City Police Department, 2014; Walker & Katz, 2013). This was iterated in *Floyd*: a few years ago in the early 2010's, larger amounts of younger people in New York City had more contact with police than older people.

According to various media outlets, several people have lost their lives due to police officers who operated outside of the realm of the law in such unethical ways as mentioned in *Floyd* (Barajas, 2015; Clarke & Lett, 2014; Department of Justice, 2015; Goldstein & Santora, 2014; Ortiz 2015; Wihbey, 2015). Despite the deaths of several citizens (of a minority) at the hands of police within the past several years – there is still research that implies that it is only a small number of police officers that act in such a way (Durose & Langton, 2013; Marcin, 2014;

Ridgeway, 2009; Tooley, Montana, Linkenbach, Lande, & Lande, 2009). Although there is research supporting the notion that the majority of police officers act within reason, the findings of the Department of Justice (2015) and New York Police Department (2014) elicit a question - do police contacts actually differ by race and ethnicity, or could this be something else, like a set of stories dramatized by the media in order to garner viewership (Deggans, 2014)?

Although low in number of occurrences, actions of police misconduct can have a profound impact on citizens because the actions can be extremely dangerous, unconstitutional, or counterproductive towards a safe society (Department of Justice, 2015; Fagan & Davies, 2000; Kerner et al., 1968; Lee & Barro, 1993; Maxson et al., 2003; Merton, 1948; New York City Police Department, 2014). Therefore, it is essential to recognize and rectify any instances of police misconduct. Particularly, this is also why it is essential to find out if police contacts actually differ by and race and ethnicity.

Policing that is unconstitutional and unethical is detrimental to society, even if the consequences of such actions do not transpire right away (Lee & Barro, 1993). According to Walker & Katz (2013) racial profiling - the practice of targeting people by their race and ethnicity by police - is nothing new to society. Racial profiling is a cause for concern today because it has occurred recently in cities like Ferguson, Missouri and New York City, New York (Department of Justice, 2015; New York Police Department, 2014). The issue of racial profiling has also been brought to the courts, most notably in the recent case dealing with the racial profiling in New York (*Floyd, et al. v. City of New York*, 2013). *Floyd* highlighted the alarming

statistics that in 2013 in New York City, about 104,000 blacks were stopped out of a total of 191,812 people for a proactive police strategy known as “stop-and-frisk” (New York Police Department, 2014). In these particular cities that facilitate racial profiling in their stop-and-frisk tactics, people were caused public embarrassment, fees, and time to be taken out of their days because of the profiling and subsequent court dates (Department of Justice, 2015). For example, in 2007, a woman in Ferguson, MO illegally parked her car and she had to then spend six days and jail and pay over a thousand dollars in related fees (Department of Justice, 2015). Ultimately, racial profiling transcends past the principle of “just” civil liberties because the damages to individuals and the communities affected can exceed a simple “stop-and-frisk” (Kerner et al., 1968; Lee & Barro, 1993). However, racial profiling has led - in some instances - to the decrease in illegal guns circulation and overall contraband on the streets (New York Police Department, 2014). Although one would have to extrapolate about the possession of such weapons, such unethical practices have proven to help reduce their quantity on the streets (New York Police Department, 2014). To note, though, Bump (2014) reported that the crimes in New York City were not affected by the cease of such proactive policing measures, thus reaffirming the notion that such policies are counterproductive almost entirely (ethically and from a criminological point of view).

In *Floyd*, there was a general precedent set that unethical, proactive measures of policing (such as the policies previously found in New York City) are not only counterintuitive, but detrimental to society. While nobody since *Floyd* has indirectly supported the notion of “racial profiling” in proactive policing, there is a cause of concern about unknown departments still operating under such measures (like how the police department of Ferguson, MO was prior to the

Department of Justice investigation in 2015). Unequivocally, this ambiguity calls for more research to be done on the subject, a notion alluded to by Pollock (2014).

As the cities of New York and Ferguson have shown, if practices of police contact differing by race/ethnicity do not stop in this country, then thousands of innocent people may be subject to unnecessary criminal procedures (Bump, 2014). If that is the case then such people may become subject to court fees, public embarrassment, disenfranchisement, and in the rarest of occasions that could transpire - death (Clarke & Lett, 2014; Department of Justice, 2015). By addressing the issue, a large amount of people (extrapolated from the large volume of people who were racially profiled by the New York Police Department) could very well be living a life of normalcy instead of a life in which one would be subject to unethical and unconstitutional behaviors (*Floyd, et al. v. City of New York*, 2013). Unequivocally, the very laws and constitution of the United States uphold a guarantee of the former, not the latter.

**Study's Focus.** This study is characterized and focused on the question regarding police contact varying based on a person's race or ethnicity. Despite the large focus on this general issue over time, there are many topics within this respective issue that have yet to be examined and elaborated on. One example of this is gauging how the general public feels about policing (and if their racist or non-racist contact with police has shaped their opinions about police) via a longitudinal method of research (Pollock, 2014). Finding this out is important for two reasons. One, as Kerner et al. (1968) discovered, previous police contact can significantly impact future police-citizen relations. Secondly, as Pollock (2014) states, comparing police-citizen interactions



across different, changing societies can make the comparisons invalid. In order to combat this, more research should be done on the subject at a more consistent rate. Therefore, by doing a related study in any time frame, one would contribute to satisfying such a necessity. Evidently, this study will give a snapshot of the current police-citizen interactions in southeastern Massachusetts.

This study features primary data (collected via a college age population) and secondary data (via various academic sources). When looking at police contact, there are many variables that lie within the perception of the citizen(s) involved (Walker & Katz, 2013). Positive and negative perceptions of police can influence the actions of police, as well as other actions of citizens (Kerner et al., 1968; Walker & Katz, 2013). Therefore, it is important to understand and collect the opinions of citizens who have interacted with police. In relation to the issues of police misconduct due to the influence of the respective citizens' racial/ethnicity: it is particularly essential to understand how citizens react and perceive the police. This is essential because citizens may perceive the police officers' actions differently than other citizens or differently from the respective police (Clarke & Lett, 2014). The idea that citizens may perceive the actions of police officers differently (than other citizens or police officers) also influences the goals of this respective study, which is ultimately to add to the police-citizen literature.

The goal of this research is to inform the general community and the academic community about how essential ethical police contacts are. Additionally, another goal of this research is to better differentiate how the vicarious and empirical experiences of citizens (in regards to police

contact) influence other citizens, as well as police. By informing the general community and the academic community about the aforementioned goals, this research will help facilitate progressive reform within the world of policing.

This research was facilitated by a questionnaire that was be handed out to certain students based on a random sample (as provided by the function of “random.org”). The questionnaire is comprised of questions asking the students about their contacts with police (especially their most recent contact with police). After participation of all of the classes that agreed to this study, the results were analyzed via SPSS (statistical software) in order to better interpret the results.

This research may be limited by certain factors that mainly include issues with the research subjects. Since college aged students are being handed a questionnaire, this particular study could be impacted by students not showing up to class on the day in which the questionnaire is handed out. Furthermore, the characteristics of the student population of Bridgewater State University might cause certain tendencies that would not happen among an equally diverse population.

This thesis will be organized by chapters and subchapters. The chapters of the thesis are the general parts that designate different components of a working thesis: The six chapters of the thesis include: Chapter 1: Introduction, Chapter 2: Literature Review, Chapter 3: Methods,

Chapter 4: Analysis (Results), Chapter 5: Discussion, and Chapter 6: Conclusion. The various subchapters are organized based on components of the various chapters.

## **Recent Cases**

**Recent Events.** This study is timely because of a slew of recent events. The basis behind the deaths of Michael Brown, Eric Garner, and Freddie Gray have all been tied to unconstitutional actions according to many citizens and news outlets (Barajas, 2015; Clarke & Lett, 2014; Department of Justice, 2015; Goldstein & Santora, 2014; Ortiz, 2015; Wihbey, 2015).

In less than a year, multiple instances of questionable police-citizen interactions (in regards to the respective police operating on potentially racist principles) happened:

**The Death of Eric Garner.** On July 17<sup>th</sup>, 2014, Eric Garner was captured on a cellphone video camera arguing with some officers of the New York City Police Department, also referred to as the NYPD (Goldstein & Santora, 2014). The officers were accusing Garner of selling untaxed cigarettes, but Mr. Garner thought that he was being harassed (Goldstein & Santora, 2014). In an effort to subdue Garner, one officer wrapped an arm around Garner's neck and brought him to the ground (Goldstein & Santora, 2014). This move is deemed a "chokehold", a move that has been banned by the NYPD for almost twenty years (Goldstein & Santora, 2014).

On video, Eric Garner can be heard saying “I can’t breathe” (Goldstein & Santora, 2014). The respective medical examiner who did the autopsy of Eric Garner did associate his death with his several health issues (e.g., asthma), but the death was ultimately deemed a “homicide” (Goldstein & Santora, 2014).

Although the respective police officers reacted to Garner’s protest to being arrested in a logical fashion, the one officer who choked Garner can be viewed as an example of why police officers need to act within their own boundaries. That officer did not act within his own boundaries when he used a banned tactic, and it evidently helped facilitate the death of Eric Garner, a man who was selling untaxed cigarettes.

**The Death of Michael Brown.** Unarmed black teenager Michael Brown was killed in August 2014 by a white police officer named Darren Wilson (Clarke & Lett, 2014). There are conflicting accounts on how this transpired. Wilson’s account claims that he was responding to a call that led him to eventually react to an attack from Michael Brown. A friend of Michael Brown claimed that the officer was being assertive and that caused Michael Brown to try and defend himself. Some accounts say that Wilson was being hostile and was yelling expletives at Brown and his friend; other accounts say that Wilson tried approaching the suspects (Michael Brown and his friend) in a calm, collected manner (Clarke & Lett, 2014). Wilson claimed that Brown tried to take his gun, and this eventually led to the altercation which led Wilson to try and defend himself (by shooting Brown) from a charging Michael Brown (Clarke & Lett, 2014). To the contrary, other reports state that instead of “charging”, Brown was starting to surrender but got shot in the process (Clarke & Lett, 2014).

Regardless of Michael Brown's race, this story involves a question of if a police officer acted outside of his legal responsibility and granted power. Although that is only one prospective viewpoint of the story, Michael Brown is dead and cannot tell his personal side of the story. In the story of Michael Brown's death, it will forever remain a question if unethical policing eventually led to the death of Michael Brown. Beyond the issue of following police procedures and ethics (regardless of the reason for the shooting), this particular incident alludes to questions that Deggans (2014) wishes the national media would truly address - why are young black males the ones who end up in such unfortunate situations? This question alludes to other topics of concern revolving around race and if this incident originally stemmed from racially profiling.

**The Death of Walter Scott.** In April of 2015, police officer Michael Slager fired eight times at Walter Scott (Ortiz, 2015). According to Slager, the suspect took his stun gun (Ortiz, 2015). However, in a video shot by a bystander, Scott was not seen taking Slager's stun gun (Ortiz, 2015). According to the Scott family attorney, Walter Scott may have ran because he owed child support and did not want to possibly face jail time (Ortiz, 2015). In other words, there was no prior indication of violence incoming from Walter Scott that would have prompted Slager to act so drastically (Ortiz, 2015). Slager was arrested shortly after the shooting (Ortiz, 2015). As in the case of Eric Garner and Michael Brown, the officer in this case may or may not have overacted to the situation. Nonetheless, the death of Walter Scott is tantamount to the stories of Eric Garner and Michael Brown because it very well could have been prevented if Slager had followed logical, ethical protocol when handling the situation. Furthermore, this particular story

is tantamount to the stories of Garner and Brown because Walter Scott was an African American male, just like Garner and Brown.

**The Death of Freddie Gray.** In April 2015, Freddie Gray (a 25 year old black male) sustained a fatal spinal injury while in the custody of police (Barajas, 2015). His death was ruled a homicide by the official autopsy report, like Eric Garner's death at the hands of police (Barajas, 2015; Goldstein & Santora, 2014). On April 12<sup>th</sup>, Freddie Gray ran from police after making eye contact with them (Barajas, 2015). After surrendering and being handcuffed, Gray requested an inhaler because he could not breathe, and this request was not met (Barajas, 2015). When the transport vehicle arrived to bring Gray to central booking, he was put into the vehicle without a seatbelt and placed on his stomach (Barajas, 2015). After suffering injuries during the transport, Gray's medical necessities were not treated - despite Gray seeking medical attention (Barajas, 2015). On April 19, 2015, Freddie Gray died (Barajas, 2015). After the deaths of Michael Brown and Eric Garner in 2014, and the death of Walter Scott in April of 2015 - the question ensues, why have there been multiple instances of black males dying while in the hands of police officers? Additionally, what were the events that transpired that made Gray pass away? Unlike Brown, Garner, and Scott, Freddie Gray did not immediately die during the police contact.

With regards to police operations, Tooley (2009) states that the general police community does not want the death of citizens to happen. Tooley's findings are parallel to Ridgeway's (2009) findings of when he investigated unethical police behavior - the majority of police

officers facilitate their powers in an ethical manner. Still, though, what is it that makes those outliers commit such unlawful acts? As Pollock (2014) strives to investigate, this question needs to be elaborated on. There is a well-established problem, as iterated by James Comey, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) when he spoke about the topic of police contacts that occur due to a citizen's race and ethnicity. In his address in 2015, Director Comey claimed that there is something inside all law enforcement officers that makes them take certain mental shortcuts during police-citizen interactions (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2015). These shortcuts evade a true ethical systematic evaluation needed and required by the law (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2015). In order to better understand this notion as alluded to by Director Comey, and in order to address this issue, there should be more research done on the subject (as Pollock also alludes to in his 2014 journal article).

### **Significance of the Thesis**

Police are entrusted with enforcing the laws of society. When police enforce these laws with bias or tainted perception, society's safety becomes threatened. One of the most common police biases is based on race and ethnicity (*Floyd, et al. v. City of New York, et al*). Over the past twenty years, much attention has been paid to the topic of police contact (*Floyd, et al. v. City of New York, et al*). There is much research on police contact (based on race/ethnicity) that demonstrates a disparity among race and ethnicity via police contacts (Center for Constitutional Rights, n.d.; ; *Floyd, et al. v. City of New York, et al*; New York Civil Liberties Union, 2012; New York Police Department, 2014; The New York Times, 1999; Ridgeway, 2009; Walker & Katz, 2013). Meanwhile, some organizations (like the New York Civil Liberties Union) feel and

believe that police contact differs by race and ethnicity (New York Civil Liberties Union, 2012). An effective way to gauge this matter is through collecting the experience of citizens who have had contact with police (Durose & Eith, 2011; Durose & Langton, 2013). Recording one's experience with police is essential in determining if the police acted unjustly based on racist endeavors or beliefs (Durose & Eith, 2011; Durose & Langton, 2013). Therefore, recording and analyzing data of the police contacts in the form of a thesis will shed more light on the conversation of police contacts.

The issue of race and ethnicity being driving factors behind police discretion is so prevalent, (according to some media outlets) that it is often a centerpiece story (The New York Times, 1999). Many media outlets focus on these types of issues because they have a lot of weight to them. The topic of police contact is not exclusive to the United States; other countries around the world (and their media outlets) focus on the topic of police contact, as well (Peck, 2015). Since police engage with all members of the community, the topic of police contact is a universally-relative topic for every citizen (Wihbey, 2015). Society can become a more dangerous place when citizens react negatively to police-citizen interactions, so there is strong movement towards reforming policing to prevent such behavior (*Floyd, et al. v. City of New York, et al*, 2013; Kerner et al., 1968). Specifically, research needs to be completed in regards to the intersection of race & age, and if there is any difference among those variables when it comes to police contact with citizens. Because as Donders, Correll, & Wittenbrink (2008) state, race (and ethnicity) as a measuring variable is superficial and unreliable, so although such a notion should be measured, it is currently deemed to be logically deleterious to citizens. Furthermore, as



Bump's 2014 report alludes to about the New York Police Department's 2013 "stop-and-frisk data": there is no noticeable correlation between crime and race within New York City, which is a finding that further drives the need to best determine if police misconduct (due to racist principles) is systematic or not.

Police contact that is derived from proactive policing measures can fail to address long-term issues within communities that are socioeconomically-driven and not based on race (*Floyd, et al v. City of New York et al*, 2013). Much of these disproportionate police contacts have been facilitated by cases such as *Terry v. Ohio* (1968) and *Whren v. U.S.* (1996). Both court rulings have granted police officers immense power, and thus, more opportunity for unethical discretion. These types of court rulings grant police a substantial amount of power over citizens (Harris, 1999). Although this power can be logically and ethically justified, it does not prevent biased contact (Harris, 1999).

There have been many court cases that have contested the facilitation of *Terry v. Ohio* and extensions of *Terry* (e.g., *Whren*) such as *Floyd et al. v. City of New York, et al* (2013). The conflicting interpretation and facilitation of aggressive police contacts is further catalyzed by research that supports the effectiveness of such practices in reducing and deterring crime (Godown, 2009). Although some of these practices may be justified on legal grounds, they are ultimately unconstitutional, superficial, and ebbed in philosophy. When faced with such churlish

endeavors, citizens may respond with equally hostile actions (Kerner et al., 1968; Wihbey, 2015).

**Assumptions.** Although unbiased in the pursuit of true academic integrity, this study will assume several facts and notions. Specifically, this study assumes that the questionnaire that will be administered for the sake of collecting data is collectively truthful and truly representative of the opinions and experiences of those who respond to it. Second, this study assumes that all respondents of the questionnaire fully understand each and every question asked.

In regards to the population of this study, it is assumed that those who responded to the questionnaire are representative of the Bridgewater State University population. This study also assumes that no respondents divulge any information about the questionnaire prior to it being completed and handed into the Honors Program at Bridgewater State University.

Although unbiased in academic nature itself, this study assumes that the words of the various sources used are ones that are truthful and just as unbiased. The study will also assume that the data produced and the correlations interpreted are mathematically correct and factual.

**Definition of Terms.** Throughout the study, there will be several terms used that might not be known to those outside this respective field of academia. In regards to policing, “police contact” is any interaction that a citizen has with police (Walker & Katz, 2013). “Racial

profiling” is a form of proactive policing in which the “officer” particularly targets a citizen (in regards to criminal action) based on their race and ethnicity (Walker & Katz, 2013). “Stop-and-frisk” is a method of proactive policing in which the officer stops a person (either on the street or in a vehicle) and proceeds to frisk them to look for illegal contraband (Walker & Katz, 2013). On a related note, “street stops” are when police officers stop a person or persons in the street (but not in a vehicle), and “traffic stops” are when police officers stop a person or persons who are in a vehicle (Walker & Katz, 2013).

## Chapter 2: Literature Review

### **Racial Profiling**

**How Terry v. Ohio Led to the Events of Today.** Court rulings and established laws have set the precedence for how police officers engage with society. The basis of police contact that might include disparity can be traced back to the rights granted by *Terry v. Ohio*. *Terry v. Ohio* is a case that was brought to the attention of the Supreme Court. John Terry was stopped and frisked by a police officer who thought that Terry was going to rob a store. The officer did not follow protocol of only being allowed to ask Terry some questions because the officer feared that Terry had a weapon (which he did).

The court ruling granted police officers the right to stop and frisk a citizen if there is suspicion or a reason to believe that there is a crime related to that person. A justification of this

ruling is that it will only really be used if an officer truly believes there is crime afoot. Stopping and frisking is a tactic that allows police officers the chance to physically check the “outline” of one’s body in order to see if they have any weapons or illegal contrabands (Walker & Katz, 2013). The stop and frisk method of policing is promoted as a proactive component of policing that has supporters, as it reduces weapons and illegal contraband on the streets (New York Police Department, 2014). When stopping-and-frisking, a police officer generally exercises a high degree of discretion. The discretion within this type of scenario carries the potential for racist contact with citizens. If an officer decides to target a citizen because of their race or ethnicity, then that citizen is most likely defenseless and is subject to the police officer’s requests. Legislature supports that this basic right of a police officer helps stop crime, but it is not constitutional (*Floyd, et al. v. City of New York, et al*). Although granting police officers power is necessary for the safety of general society, it does not create a safeguard against racist police contacts. The unconstitutionality within such a common, proactive action of police contact stems from racial profiling. Racial profiling is not a new concept in police contacts, as it has been around since the inception of policing (Walker & Katz, 2013). Some literature and research opposing unethical and unconstitutional police contacts has gone forth to build upon more ethical, appropriate policies and practices (New York Civil Liberties Union, 2012; Ridgeway, 2009). Nonetheless, meticulous speculation (as represented by the large amount of related studies) has appeared since the *Terry v. Ohio* case (The New York Times, 1999).

*Terry v. Ohio* did not protect citizens against unlawful behavior that stems from unjustified reasoning and discretion. There are two notable cases that held rulings that countered

the meandering scope of *Terry v. Ohio*. The first case is *Daniels, et al. v. the City of New York* (also referred to as *Daniels*). *Daniels* was a lawsuit filed in 1999 against the city of New York and the NYPD. The accusation by the Center for Constitutional Rights (CCR) brought New York and the NYPD to court for racial profiling in conjunction with unlawful stop-and-frisks. Specifically, the CCR was bringing New York and the NYPD to court due to the death of an innocent man (Amadou Diallo) that was caused by the NYPD's "Street Crimes Unit". In the case, the CCR displayed statistics that showed that there was a substantially insignificant amount of stop-and-frisks that did not end in an arrest (*Daniels, et al. v. the City of New York, 1999*). The court affirmed that racial profiling - even in an effort for a good cause (such as stopping crime) - is unconstitutional (*Daniels, et al. v. the City of New York, 1999*). The court required the NYPD to reinforce their relations with the community via public education (*Daniels, et al. v. the City of New York, 1999*). The court also granted a settlement for the respective parties. Most notably, the NYPD was required to adopt an anti-racial-profiling policy. In this policy, the auditing of stop-and-frisks became required (*Daniels, et al. v. the City of New York, 1999*). The CCR was granted access to these audits, as a result of *Daniels*.

About a decade later, *Daniels* and *Terry* resulted in *Floyd, et al. v. City of New York, et al.* The lawsuit was an extension of *Daniels*, as the CCR (among other plaintiffs) claimed that the defendants (primarily the NYPD) were not abiding by the rulings of *Daniels*. Specifically, several plaintiffs claimed that they were unduly stopped-and-frisked. Following those respective stop-and-frisks, the proper documentation was not filled out (although *Daniels* required the NYPD to do so in certain instances). Although each individual plaintiff involved in this case was

not found to be stopped-and-frisked upon race, the respective judge (Shira A. Scheindlin) deemed the NYPD to have seemingly been indifferent and tenacious in their methodology despite *Daniels*. Due to this, *Floyd* went on for another two years because of various investigations. After two years, Judge Scheindlin ruled that the NYPD had violated both the fourth and fourteenth amendment by stopping-and-frisking in a discriminatory way (*Floyd, et al. v. City of New York, et al.*, 2013).

**General Racial Profiling.** Racial profiling (the act of targeting, anticipating, or suspecting a person to have done a certain action based on a person's physical appearance or behavior) is not a new concept for general society (Walker & Katz, 2013). This type of mind set is preconceived and typically lacks support in contemporary society (Bump, 2014; Harris, 1999). Although unethical, racial profiling can work in theory (under certain circumstances as prompted by the findings of *Terry*), but it is commonly deemed to be done without necessary regard to integrity and ethics (Harris, 1999). By targeting a certain population doing certain actions, eventually, the sought out people will be caught (perhaps guilty) due the presence of underlying societal factors that may affect certain cohorts of races (Harris, 1997; Harris, 1999).

Racial profiling may serve as a replacement for addressing the underlying societal factors that Harris (1997; 1999) believes affects certain cohorts of communities. For example, after the terrorist attacks on the United States in 2001, there was attention drawn towards people of the Islamic faith and also toward Arab-Americans. This was because the people who committed the

terrorist attacks in 2001 were Middle Eastern and of the Islamic faith. Since this attack was unprecedented, it would make logical sense that the closest lead for prevention (without specific knowledge of who exactly would commit such crimes) would be to consider the next potential terrorists to fit a similar profile to the original attackers. With an “ideal” profile in mind, using racial profiling to target people of that “ideal” profile would hypothetically bring in the desired results. Evidently, this practice is unethical and relies on - not only a large volume of people to be successful - but an “ideal” profile to look out for (Harris, 1997; New York Police Department, 2014). Nonetheless, this type of practice has persisted throughout modern history because it delivers some extent of desired results (e.g., some aspects of the “stop-and-frisk” policy of New York City). However, these “results” do not come without severe ethical violations and other adverse effects (*Floyd et al. v. City of New York, et al*, 2013; Lee & Barro, 1993). A showcase of this, can be seen by looking at the “war on drugs” (Harris, 1999).

**War on Drugs.** In order to fully articulate on the present state of police-citizen interactions, it is essential to understand the underlying factors that affect communities (Harris, 1997). Harris (1997) attributes the current status of those adversely affected during police contact to be affected by the “war on drugs”, an effort during Ronald Regan’s presidency to combat drug smuggling and the commerce of illegal drugs. During Ronald Regan’s presidency, he and George Bush Sr. helped create a task force in southern Florida to combat drug smuggling (Harris, 1999). Harris (1999) believes that this initiative helped facilitate the racial profiling of the late 20<sup>th</sup> century, which can also be extrapolated into contemporary society.

In an effort to help combat the commerce of illegal drugs, the Florida Department of Highway safety and Motor Vehicles issued a set of guidelines that labeled the common characteristics of drug couriers. Within the guidelines, there were cautionary warnings that the suggested troopers who enforcing the task force's operations to be on the lookout for certain traits, actions, or possessions (Harris, 1999). The findings of *Floyd* and the Department of Justice (2015) found that certain policing communities also operated on such principles as those in Florida during Reagan's presidency. Within the Florida plan: traits, actions, or possessions included "rental cars", disobedience for traffic laws, ethnic groups that are commonly associated with the trade of drugs, and drivers that wore lots of gold (Harris, 1999). Similarly, the Department of Justice's 2015 investigation into the Ferguson, MO Police Department found similar "targeted groups".

During the late 20<sup>th</sup> century, the inundation of crack cocaine into many cities (e.g., New York and Chicago) prompted similar protocols to be put into place in an effort to eliminate the amount of drugs on the streets, especially within the inner-cities (Harris, 1999). Since crack cocaine was a cheaper version of cocaine, many people of a poor socioeconomic status had been buying (Harris, 1999). According to Harris (1999), such arrests were eventually made up of minorities because the laws unfairly weighted crack cocaine (a poor person's drug) and cocaine power (a rich person's drug). In 1999, Harris reported that blacks constituted 13 percent of United States drug users, but 37 percent of people arrested on drug charges. Ultimately, such statistics that were catalyzed by the "war on drugs" policy during Reagan's presidency also were representative within America during the late 1990's, as well as in contemporary society (Harris, 1997; Harris, 1999; *Whren v. U.S.*,1996).



## **Police Contacts by Race/Ethnicity**

According to *Floyd*, within the past century, racial profiling has been a particular troubling facet of policing. *Floyd* brought attention to a “policing epidemic” in which street stops, traffic stops, and general disproportionality among police-citizen interactions were alarming due to the influx of minority-police interactions compared to white American-police interactions.

**Street Stops.** According to *Floyd*, stop-and-frisk is a large vehicle for racial profiling, and is often sued during street stops. Street stops are common among police departments that use proactive tactics of policing (Walker & Katz, 2013). The concept and strategy of “stop-and-frisk” is derived from the findings of *Terry v. Ohio* 1968, which established a police officer’s right to stop and frisk somebody if they are somehow related (e.g., suspected of theft) to a crime. *Terry* set a precedent that when there is prospect of a crime: a police officer has a right to stop and frisk somebody involved. Additionally, an officer may search for a weapon if there is the prospect of physical harm.

*People v. De Bour* 1976 resulted in four different types of criteria that would tighten the scope of *Terry v. Ohio*’s findings. The findings of *People v. De Bour* limit the amount of power that a police officer has from the result of *Terry v. Ohio*. However, the criteria established from *People v. De Bour* (1976) did not nullify the amount of power police hold when initiating and justifying a frisk search (they could lie about why they stopped and frisked somebody). The

battle to tighten the scope of *Terry v. Ohio*'s (1968) findings would be a gradual process, as there were many trials and cases in order to get where we are today. Ultimately, today, *Daniels, et al. v. the City of New York* (2003) requires documentation of stop-and-frisks, and *Floyd, et al. v. City of New York* (2013) deemed the stop-and-frisk methodology to combat crime to be unconstitutional and in need of immediate revision.

Regardless of the style of policing, police officers have been engaging with citizens on the streets since the inception of policing (Walker & Katz, 2013). Therefore, many citizens end up interacting with police officers while they are not in motor vehicles (Walker & Katz, 2013). This is perhaps why that, in the past twenty years, one of the United States' biggest police departments (the New York City Police Department) has been under heavy scrutiny for using racial profiling in some of their proactive methods to reduce crime (Walker & Katz, 2013). Similar policies were used in Philadelphia and Chicago, and like in New York, those policies resulted in the respective police departments being sued in court (*Bailey v. City of Philadelphia*, 2011; *Hall et al. v. City of Chicago*, 2012). As alluded to by Harris (1999) such policing should be analyzed due to its large scale and large volume of police-citizen interactions.

An example of Harris' (1999) notion is illuminated by the "stop-and-frisk" proactive policing strategy that was invented and implemented by William Bratton, ex-police commissioner of New York. This strategy involved tactics that strove to tackle a large crime problem by addressing citizens on the streets and in vehicles. According to the NYPD's statistics from 2014, hundreds of thousands of people in New York had been stopped and frisked under

Bratton's established policy (New York Police Department, 2014). Those people include those on the streets, as well as traffic stops.

**Modern Day Street Stops Evolving from New York City's Stop-and-Frisk Strategy.** Prior to the findings of *Daniels* (2003) and *Floyd* (2013), there was a lot of attrition in order to bring justice and peace to those adversely affected by the stop-and-frisk policies of New York City. The inception of the policy came in 1994. In 1994, the commissioner of the New York Police Department (William Bratton) implemented the "stop-and-frisk" methodology as a proactive means to reduce crime. Despite the program's overwhelming success in reducing major crimes, it raised tensions between police and the communities of New York due to unconstitutional and unregulated practices. As Kerner et al. (1968) alludes to, an overaggressive police-community relationship can result in the exacerbation of social problems.

Kerner et al.'s (1968) notion about overaggressive police presence appeared right, because whether or not Bratton admitted to it, the "COMPSTAT" system used by Bratton and his colleagues to reallocate funds and resources to troubled areas, ultimately resulted in many citizens' rights being violated. The COMPSTAT program's rationale was based on William Bratton's support for the "broken windows theory", a theory supporting the need to stop "small crime" in order to stop "larger crimes". During the inception of Bratton's commissioner position, there were many troubled areas, so the program directed many resources (including officers) to these areas, which subsequently unfairly targeted poorer people (WNYC Newsroom, 2012).

However, despite Kerner et al.'s (1968) notion being correct (as supported by *Floyd*), the COMPSTAT and stop-and-frisk duality had positive effects. After a few years since implementing the strategy, Bratton's initiative showed success in reducing crime (WNYC Newsroom, 2012). By targeting small crimes, Bratton was able to reduce large crimes. The numbers of violent crimes, murder, burglary, property crimes, and assault were almost cut in half between the years of 1990-2000 (Disaster Center, n.d.). However, as it would come out a few years after the deemed label of "success", the program and implementation of many policies were viewed as philosophical unethical. Nonetheless, as of 2014, Bratton still stands by his methods in his endeavor to fight crime (Isquith, 2014).

The death of Amadou Diallo brought forth much speculation about the ethical reasoning used in Bratton's fight against crime, and proactive policing measures in general. Diallo was shot and killed by four undercover police officers in 1999 because Diallo "fit" a description for a suspect who committed rape (Reaves, 2000). When approached and asked to identify himself, Diallo reached into his pocket (Reaves, 2000). The four officers believed Diallo to be reaching for a gun and fired 41 shots from their respective weapons, killing him (Reaves, 2000). The respective program used by the NYPD in this scenario garnered much attention that was diverted to Bratton's other programs, as well. Diallo's death was tragic, and while his death is not exactly like that of Freddie Gray, Walter Scott, Michael Brown, and Eric Garner, all of their deaths did result from some sort of iteration of proactive policing.

In response to Diallo's death, Eliot Spitzer launched a case study into the stop-and-frisk policy of New York, in an effort to see if the stops were indeed justified or not (The New York

Times, 1999). Spitzer's results found that there was disproportionality between the races of citizens stopped (WNYC Newsroom, 2012). Four years after Diallo's death, the NYPD was told to develop anti-racial profiling procedures that satisfied the requirements established by the United States and New York City constitutions (Center for Constitutional Rights, n.d.). *Daniels, et al. v. the City of New York* further required that documentation was a requirement for every stop and frisk. Despite this progression of civil rights, the issue of "stop-and-frisk" remained in New York until recently, as supported by the New York Police Department's 2013 stop-and-frisk data and as ended by *Floyd* (New York Police Department, 2014).

Still a concerning topic despite the result of *Daniels*, other groups and people continued to look into the facilitation of proactive policing by the NYPD. Gelman, Fagan, & Kiss (2005) of Columbia University found that there were more blacks and Latinos stopped (and frisked) in comparison to whites between the years of 1999 to 2004. In the years to come, there seemed to be more and more parties and groups joining in on researching (as well as questioning) the stop-and-frisk policy of the NYPD. Without much significant reform since *Daniels, et al. v. the City of New York*, there was a growing call to reform the NYPD's stop-and-frisk program. In 2007, the City Council Speaker (at the time), Christine Quinn had her own battle with the NYPD and their stop-and-frisk program. She criticized the NYPD for not releasing the data of stop-and-frisks to the public. It was a legal obligation of the NYPD to release such information, as just documenting it did not solidify a sense of ethical behavior (Hennelly, 2007).

Evidently, because of Christine Quinn's condemnation of the NYPD's lack of transparency in 2008, the New York Civil Liberties Union (NYCLU) were granted access to the

stop-and-frisk data that was originally only available to the “Research and Development” (RAND) group and the University of Michigan (Hennelly, 2008). The NYCLU found that there have been an increasing number of stop-and-frisks (New York City Liberties Union, 2012) despite the precedents set by *Daniels*. This finding was proven to be important because stop-and-frisks had ramifications on minor crime (that was not intended to be targeted in the later years of stop-and-frisks in New York City) like the possession of marijuana (Chang, 2011). About 140 people a day were being arrested for possession of marijuana because of the stop-and-frisk policy (Chang, 2011). Such a number is profound because it costs about \$60,000 annually for New York to host an inmate yearly (Clear, Cole, Reisig, & Petrosino, 2014), so a lot of money was being spent in New York City on those who had possession of marijuana.

Such a finding like that of Chang’s (2011) led to further change in “street stop” history. Later in 2008, a judge ruled that the NYPD had to turn over all of their respective stop-and-frisk data when a charge was brought upon the people stopped-and-frisked (WNYC Newsroom, 2012). Also researching this issue was Greg Ridgeway of (RAND), who found in 2009 that only a small number of NYPD officers had a tendency to stop-and-frisk minorities in disparaging amounts (Ridgeway, 2009). Eventually, the tenacity of NYCLU and other people (like Greg Ridgeway) led Governor David Paterson (New York Governor at the time) to sign a bill in 2010 that prohibited the NYPD from having undisclosed information regarding people stopped (but not frisked).

Despite the newly created transparency between the NYPD and society, the rate of street stops as well as the lack of unequivocal transparency was still troubling (WNYC Newsroom,

2012). Therefore, in the year 2012, there was a lot of political focus on the stop-and-frisk policy of the NYPD. Many critics of the policy believed the policy to be useful, but extremely limited because it was facilitated in an unethical and unconstitutional way (WNYC Newsroom, 2012).

One major issue with the stop-and-frisk policy (according to critics) was the communication involved in the process (WYNC Newsroom, 2012). The common viewpoint against not communicating about the general process and the data was that if there was nothing wrong with the process, then there was nothing to hide. As Kerner et al. found in 1968, the reality of a lack of communication further incited citizens to resent the police, making matters worse (WNYC Newsroom, 2012; Kerner et al., 1968).

William Bratton's successor, Police Commissioner Raymond Kelly approached the negative criticism of the stop-and-frisk policy in the 2010's with a forward-thinking attitude, as he worked with such critics to establish warning systems for officers who receive complaints. Additionally, he sought programs that expanded community relations. Nonetheless, Commissioner Kelly's improvements were not apt enough. In 2012, it was reported that most of the weapon seizures by the NYPD happened outside of locations with the highest volume of stop-and-frisks - a report that proved how ineffective the policy was (Chang, 2012). The NYPD's power with the stop-and-frisk policy was also reduced by a law suit filed by the NYCLU. The NYCLU filed this law suit because the NYPD's "Clean Hallways" program (a program used to arrest people trespassing and living in privately-owned buildings) was found to be unethical and unjustified (Turkewitz, 2012). In response, the Brooklyn District Attorney's Office stopped

prosecuting people who were arrested under the guise of this program (unless there was a warrant).

The many fronts put forth against the NYPD's stop-and-frisk policy seemed to finally be making significant progress in 2013. The policy made its appearance in a federal court. In *Floyd, et al. v. City of New York, et al*, Judge Scheindlin deemed the practice "unconstitutional". She called for a trial program of having five precincts wear body cameras while officers were on duty. Scheindlin also required the department to try new programs to reach out to the community. The NYPD agreed to these remedial changes in early 2014. However, throughout the year of 2014, the police union tried intervening with the case. As of the end of October 2014, the motion was denied, and the trial is still ongoing.

**Philadelphia.** In 2011, *Bailey v. City of Philadelphia* was a court case in which the Philadelphia Police Department (PPD) was alleged to have been conducting traffic stops based on a person's race. Similar to the results of the New York City Civil Liberties Union's push against the NYPD (as reported by Hennelly in 2008), the court of *Bailey v. City of Philadelphia* (2011) ruled that the PPD had to create an electronic database for more detailed stop and frisk data. James (2015) reports that data from 2011 showed that 50 percent of stop and frisks in Philadelphia did not have reasonable suspicion.

**Chicago.** The result of *Hall et al. v. City of Chicago* (2012) has similar results of *Floyd, et al. v. City of New York, et al* (2013) and *Bailey v. City of Philadelphia* (2011) in the sense that the Chicago Police Department (CPD) has had to update certain policies regarding their stop and



frisk procedures. Specifically, *Hall* (2012) called for Chicago to particularly identify and document “investigatory stops” and gang-related investigatory stops (James, 2015). Prior to *Hall* (2012), the information required by the CPD was not specific enough for stop-and-frisk data to be analyzed (James, 2015). James (2015) also reports that such data (prior to the results of *Hall*) was hard to quantify and analyze because it was not entered into an electronic database.

Despite the impact causing *Hall* and *Bailey, Floyd* and its causations comprise larger societal issues, which allude to potential issues regarding proactive policing methods (Barajas, 2015; Clarke & Lett, 2014; Goldstein & Santora, 2014; Ortiz, 2015). Therefore, understanding the NYPD’s (2014) 2013 stop-and-frisk data is important in understanding the specific mentality of police officers who engage in questionable, unethical contact with citizens (Newport 2014).

**New York.** Police contact differing by the race and ethnicity of the citizens involved is seemingly a real issue contemporary society (Newport, 2014). Many research endeavors (such as David A. Harris’ famous article in 1999 known as “Driving While Black”) projects have commenced in an effort to mitigate and eliminate this social ills directly or indirectly caused by negative police experiences that affects (in some way) every person (as every person engages with police at one point or another). A huge driving force behind such changes has resulted from the battle against racial profiling used in the stop-and-frisk polices of New York. The NYPD’s size and scope of policing reiterate a notion of David Harris’ (1999) that large-scaled operations of this sort should be researched and watched.

One of the largest police departments in the United States (New York Police Department) has displayed an overwhelming amount of disparity in their proactive policing methods over the previous decade (Walker & Katz, 2013). Using a sample size of about 191,000 people stopped-and-frisked by the NYPD, the difference of treatment that minorities receive from police officers can be clearly seen (NYPD, 2014). The sample size of 191,000 citizens is drawn from data collected on NYPD's "stop-and-frisk" policy.

Of those 191,000 citizens stopped by police - blacks were stopped about five times as much as whites (NYPD, 2014). However, about the same percentage of contraband was confiscated from blacks as pretty much every other race (NYPD, 2014). An issue with a proactive policy such as NYPD's "stop-and-frisk policy" is that it will eventually find trouble due to the amount of input from the program. If a police officer focuses on a particular area of his or her beat, then he or she will eventually find contraband. Likewise, if a police officer focuses on trying to seek out crime, then he or she may fail to actually reduce such crime for the long-term (Walker, & Katz, 2013).

Such an instance is displayed if the breadwinner of a family makes money through crime and illegal means. If no suitable, legal job opportunity is present while the breadwinner of a family is arrested by police - another person within that family might resort to such illegal means in order to provide the necessities for his or her family (Harris, 1997). Logically, this person will eventually be arrested as well, and then a cycle will begin. The cycle will continue without stop unless police officers attempt to fix the long-term issues within these respective areas (Kerner et al., 1968; Pollock, 2014). Ultimately, the stop-and-frisk policy of New York did address the

needs of the community by (in a sense) making the communities a little safer; however, it also fueled negative tension between the police and citizens.

The NYPD's statistics regarding police contact (2014) displays that they had a philosophy of a large input of stops equating to a large output of successful stops. This is an issue because some statistics that are categorized by race may skew the statistics while failing to recognize actual correlations. For example, the number of stop-and-frisks done on blacks is about five times the amount done to whites (NYPD, 2014). When some statistics (e.g., arrests) represent a higher number due to the "input" (attempts at stopping and frisking), then that number is superficial (Bump, 2014). Therefore, it would be more efficient to look at the percentage of data, rather than the numbers (Pollock, 2014).

Many categories presented by the NYPD's stop-and-frisk data (2014) fail to prove that minorities have a greater percentage of contraband or weapons on them. In addition, the NYPD's 2014 stop-and-frisk data displays that there are categories in which whites have a higher percentage than minorities (e.g., 2.3% of whites were found to have a knife or another cutting instrument on them; blacks had 1.2%). The NYPD's 2014 data also shows that whites and some minority groups had similar numbers in some categories (e.g., 2 blacks were found to have machine guns on them during a stop-and-frisk; 1 white). On a related note, the low recording in some categories does not record as to why a statistic might be the case (e.g., why did only three people have machine guns on them?)

Out of about 104,000 blacks stopped, only 12 of them had rifles on them (New York Police Department, 2014). Now while these rifles could transpire into “murder” and other types of crime, there is no statistical evidence that supports that those people were going to use the rifles for crime. Although, it is essential that these types of situations are prevented for the safety of the community, it must be done in an ethical, progressive way, or else there will be adverse effects in society (Kerner et al., 1968; Lee & Barro, 1993). It is also essential for the NYPD to answer to such findings like the 12 blacks having rifles because it is unclear as to what those rifles were intended for, how the NYPD handled those particular situations, and how the NYPD were able to find such rifles. After all, if only 12 blacks stopped-and-frisked out of about 104,000 had rifles on them - they are rare instances, so the data alone does not paint a vivid picture of explanation. If such findings were so statistically small, then how truly effective is the modern day “street stop” in the form of “stop-and-frisk”? Furthermore, how effective is this general policy, as not all of those “stopped-and-frisked” were just in the form of a street stop but in the form of traffic stops, as well.

**Stop-and-Frisk Gone; “Crime is Still Down”.** In December of 2014, Phillip Bump of The Washington Post reported several findings that allude to the ineffectiveness of New York’s stop-and-frisk policy. These findings are strongly based on the dramatic change in stop-and-frisks: in 2011 there was a documented 685,724 and just 38,456 through the first three quarters of 2014, according to the New York Civil Liberties Union (as reported by Bump, 2014). Moreover, according to the NYPD and New York State (as reported by Bump, 2014) the amount of property crime and violent crimes stayed the same when comparing 2011 (many stop-and-frisks) and 2014 (a significantly less amount of stop-and-frisks). The NYPD and New York State

also created a figure that demonstrates an elaboration on such figures (as reported by Bump, 2014) through graphing the change in crime rates versus the usage of stop-and-frisk. In that figure, the rate of stop-and-frisk displays no consistent correlation with the rates of violent crime and property crime (Bump, 2014). In some years, violent and property crimes decreased with the increase of stop-and-frisks; yet in other years, such crimes increase alongside the increase in stop-and-frisks (Bump, 2014). Most notably however, this particular figure demonstrates that with a 60% decrease in stop-and-frisks during the 2012-2013 periods, the rate of violent and property crimes decreased.

Since the stop-and-frisk methodology of street stop policing has garnered so much attention via various research groups and news outlets (Hennelly, 2007; Hennelly, 2008; Isquith, 2014; NYCLU, 2012; The New York Times, 1999; Ridgeway, 2009; Turkewitz, 2012; WNYC Newsroom, 2012), it is essential to look at traffic stops, the cousin to the street stop (Walker & Katz, 2013). Among the various stop-and-frisks recorded in data, traffic stops are incorporated into those data sets (New York Police Department, 2014). Since there is no distinguishable difference between the two different types of stops (in regards to the modern “stop-and-frisk” and the findings of stop-and-frisk statistics), it is equally as essential to understand the history of modern-day traffic stops as to how understand the history of modern-day street stops. By understanding the history of traffic stops, it is easier to gauge the true essence of the modern “stop-and-frisk” (Department of Justice, 2015). This can be done by exclusively looking at the famous works of David Harris, a man who investigated the history of proactive policing and the war on drugs. Harris’ 1997 and 1999 works (respectively) on traffic stops is a concise way of

reconciling the congruent nature of the results produced by the traffic stops and street stops in cities like New York and Ferguson.

### **Traffic Stops**

**“Driving While Black” 1997.** There can be similar comparisons to the “war on drug” policy implemented by Regan in Florida during the 1980’s and the reality of possible racial profiling in the 1990’s (Harris, 1997). At the inception of such a reality is *Terry*, the admission for police officers to search and frisk citizens based on criminal suspicions. In 1996, *Whren v. U.S.* further enhanced police “power” in a post-*Terry* world.

In *Whren* (1996), two African-American males were stopped by a police officer because they had an unusual stop at a stop sign, alongside a turn without a signal, and an illogical burst of speed after the turn. After pursuit from a police officer, the officer stopped the vehicle; searched it, and then found the passenger to have a bag of cocaine in each of his hands. The Supreme Court ruled that police officers were allowed a greater amount of discretion when stopping motorists. Moreover, the Supreme Court thus allowed police officers “probable cause” after stopping a vehicle because of a traffic violation. This court ruling was famous by David Harris’ 1997 article titled “Driving While Black and All Other Traffic Offenses: The Supreme Court and Pretextual Traffic Stops”. Harris (1997) argued that this court ruling allowed racial profiling to be a distinct possibility, similar of that of Regan’s “war on drugs” policy in Florida during the 1980’s. The result of *Whren* has further implications, according to Harris, in regards to the status of policing in highways during the late 1990’s (Harris, 1999).

**“Driving While Black” 1999.** Not even a year after Harris’ famous “Driving While Black” article, came a ‘sequel’ article: “Driving While Black: Racial Profiling on Our Nation’s Highways” (1999). Harris wrote this article in response to an event in which a Black veteran and his son encountered in 1998. Sergeant (in the U.S. Army) Rossano Gerald and his son (Gregory) were stopped on two occasions in the span of 30 minutes on an August day in 1998. The second stop lasted over two hours and featured unethical behavior from the state troopers that stopped the Geraldts. Besides the duration of the stop, the Geraldts were placed into a car that was closed and had fans on that were blowing hot air. The Geraldts were threatened that the dog would attack if there was an attempt of escape. After an hour, the state troopers that stopped the Geraldts turned off the dash cam on the patrol vehicle.

Harris (1999) attributes this stop to be an act of racial profiling. Harris (1999) believes that racial profiling had become a major issue because of the government’s “war on drugs”. Harris’ (1999) perspective is that the war on drugs specifically indicates attention to be directed towards minorities. Harris (1999) writes that minorities appear to have an abnormal rate of contraband and drugs on them because they are stopped more often than other races. This finding is congruent to the statistics provided by the New York Police Department in 2013, statistics that were deemed to be as a result of an “unconstitutional practice” (*Floyd, et al., v. City of New York*, 2013). Since minorities are stopped more (according to Harris’ 1999 article and *Floyd*) - there are more minorities that are “prosecuted, convicted, and jailed”. There are some noticeable similarities between Harris’ writings (1997; 1999) that correlate with the recent events of today in which minorities were wrongly treated by police. Such events feature clear injustice (as

alluded to by the conclusions of the Department of Justice's 2015 investigation of the police department in Ferguson, MO) of the types of groups that Harris (1999) describes, as well as several deaths of people (e.g., Michael Brown) who fit the description of Harris' work in 1999. This is alarming because although Harris' noted work is from 1997 and 1999 respectively - there are still events that have happened within the past year that fit the warnings and notions that Harris (1999) describes. These notions by Harris (particularly that certain races are targeted by certain police officers more often than others) can be divided into different categories that all have a mutual attribute of police contacts differing by race and ethnicity. Among such attributes lie police contact that transcends just street stops and traffic stops, as seen by the Department of Justice's (2015) investigation into the Ferguson, Missouri Police Department.

### **Other Police Contact**

**Ferguson Department of Justice Report.** In response to Michael Brown's death, the Department of Justice launched a federal probe into the Ferguson, Missouri Police Department and their respective court system (Department of Justice, 2015). The report served as a means of looking into the prospect of racial disparity. There is a large amount of African Americans in Ferguson, so the investigation had an apt sample size in order to draw meaningful conclusions. About two-thirds of the people who live in Ferguson are African American (Department of Justice, 2015).

Of the African American population, the Department of Justice (DOJ) discovered many different significant findings. Most notably, the DOJ discovered that African Americans comprised of 85% of the stops by the Ferguson Police Department (FPD); 90% of FPD's



citations and from 2012 to 2014, 93% of FPD's arrests (Department of Justice, 2015). Other notable findings extend to the court's actions. According to the Department of Justice's 2015 report, a single case of a missed, late, or partial payment of a fine could be punishable by jail time. Moreover, 95% of the people held at Ferguson jail for longer than two days were African American (Department of Justice, 2015). In the most extreme case, a woman who parked her car illegally in 2007 had to spend six days in jail and have to pay over \$1,000 (Department of Justice, 2015). On a related note, African Americans are 68% less likely to have their cases dismissed in municipal court (Department of Justice, 2015). In relation to the stop-and-frisk statistics produced by the NYPD (2014), the Department of Justice (2015) calculated a notable finding in regards to contraband. The Department of Justice (2015) found that despite being twice as likely (in comparison to white drivers) to be searched during vehicles stops, African Americans were 26% less likely to be found in possession of contraband. The percentage of people found with contraband according to the NYPD's stop-and-frisk 2014 data displayed little to no difference among percentages of different races (NYPD, 2014).

In relation to fines, the Department of Justice (2015) determined that these were used "almost exclusively" as threats (of incarceration) to prompt payment. Among African Americans, 92% of the population had an arrest warrants issued to them (Department of Justice, 2015). 96% of African Americans were arrested during traffic stops (85% of the African American population had been subject to a vehicle stop) because there was an outstanding warrant for their arrest (Department of Justice, 2015). Ultimately, the Department of Justice concluded (in regards to the fines) that the law enforcement practice in Ferguson was shaped by a focus on revenue and not by the safety needs of the public (Department of Justice, 2015).

Among the findings not relating to stops and fines, the statistics found by the Department of Justice were just as alarming as those relating to fines (Department of Justice, 2015). Between 2012 and 2014, “all 14 of those cases [resisting arrest], the person arrested was black” (Department of Justice, 2015). Moreover, all 14 canine-bite incidents involved African Americans (Department of Justice, 2015). Most notably, the FPD struck an unarmed 14 year old African American while he was lying on the ground in conjunction with using a dog to attack him because he was waiting for his friends in an abandoned house (Department of Justice, 2015). Among African Americans, 88% of them were involved in documented cases of “use of force” (Department of Justice, 2015). Ultimately, the Department of Justice (2015) determined that the disparities that occur are due to “unlawful bias” and “stereotypes of African Americans. With such a large scope affected a select population, the question is raised – how else can police officers adversely affect their respective communities if they are not ethically protecting them?

**Other Potential Disparities.** When it comes to disparity and treatment (as well as discrimination): there is a cause of concern because of the amount of power that police have (Harris, 1997; Lee & Barro, 1993; Kerner et al. 1968). The substantial findings of the NYPD’s stop-and-frisk program (that led to *Floyd*) have raised a particular concern about how police treat citizens. While race and ethnicity is the keystone of that concern according to various sources like Gelman et al. (2005) and the Department of Justice (2015), there is still question as to how police generally deal with people in accordance to their respective categorical features besides race and ethnicity (e.g., if they have a mental disability or not).

Police officers are often the peace makers within the government, as they can be called upon at any time to deal with social arguments and disagreements, so it is also essential to understand how they generally are acting with certain populations besides with the topic issue of them dealing with minorities in certain communities (Walker & Katz, 2013). Police officers are also commonly called upon to handle special populations: the homeless, those who have a mental illness, and those who have HIV/AIDS. Police officers are trained specifically on how to properly deal with the different needs that these special populations may hold (Walker & Katz, 2013). The typical standard for a police academy is usually six months, and one topic within that academy is the focus on special populations. Unfortunately, the resources for police to deal with situations regarding these populations are limited (Marcin, 2014; Spivak & Thomas, 2013; Walker & Katz, 2013). Also, the education taught about these populations in these academies can be forgotten without refresher courses. Therefore, police officers generally face challenges when dealing with special populations. Luckily, many agencies work with respective professionals (e.g., hospitals) in order to properly engage with such populations (Walker & Katz, 2013).

In 2013, Spivak & Thomas conducted a study in Australia order to better gauge how police officers interact with citizens who have are intellectually disabled, an attribute of the special populations that police commonly deal with. As Spivak & Thomas (2013) have found: the police officers in their research were able to communicate effectively with the special population of people who have an intellectual disability - but with more personal, effective

strategies - they can deal with such persons more successfully. These findings are generally congruent with the police officers in America (Walker & Katz, 2013).

Despite the general comparison between American police officers and Australian police officers, among the findings of Spivak & Thomas (2013), there is an interesting comparison of the NYPD and their previous proactive agenda (that was tamed by *Daniels* and *Floyd*) and other departments' strategies when compared to the respective Australian cohort in Spivak & Thomas' (2013) study.

In Spivak & Thomas' (2013) study, an Australian cohort of police officers and their relationship with the intellectually disabled was gauged. The findings were that the officers were generally successful in their contacts (Spivak & Thomas, 2013). This is an interesting notion to compare to the infamous NYPD and one of the most highlighted components of them dealing with the special population of the homeless. The NYPD once had a program that focused on eliminating the number of homeless people who dwelled in privately-owned buildings called the "Operation Clean Halls" (also known as the "Traffic Affidavit Program"). The program also focused on eliminating drug usage and dealing from the buildings. Prior to the program's disbandment, there were about 3,895 participants (Turkewitz, 2012). If a building owner signed an affidavit, then the police were then permitted to check the building upon their discretion. Like the stop-and-frisk policy, this program received heavy criticism for its unethical facilitation. The NYCLU filed a law suit against the program in an effort to end it, and won in the sense that the Brooklyn district attorney's office began a precedent of not trying people arrested in such a program unless the police had a specific warrant (Turkewitz, 2012). This program seemed to just

displace the homeless people, rather than deal with them effectively like the Australian police officers in Spivak & Thomas' 2013 study. To further illuminate the potential ills of police-citizen interactions of the NYPD, it is best to look at how other police departments in America deal with the homeless. By doing so, it will become more clear as to what makes a police department successful and ethical and what does not.

Based off of Steve Marcin's article (2014) in the "Federal Bureau of Investigation's Law Enforcement Bulletin", the general number of police departments have the correct will and approach to dealing with the homeless, but they are limited in resources (unlike faith-funded programs or non-profit organizations). However, with resources, police departments (like the Anaheim, California Police Department) have been able to properly address the different needs of the homeless population in ethical manners (Marcin, 2014). Being one of the largest police departments in the country, one could extrapolate based on Marcin's (2014) report(of the community approach's success of the Anaheim Police Department) that if "Operation Clean Halls" took a different approach, maybe so many homeless people wouldn't have been displaced or arrested.

There appears to be a trend that the NYPD's actions of the past two decades are not only questionable, but not totally representative of the total police population (further underscoring the necessity for more data and statistics on the status of policing and police-citizen relations). Unlike some of the proactive programs of the NYPD, the Anaheim Police Department (APD) have taken a community approach that seeks to effectively deal with issues among the homeless, and not just displace them. Although the NYPD has made strides in changing the negative

implications of their proactive policing strategies, the question still remains if the NYPD is a small minority among police departments that have individuals that facilitate on unjustified and unethical means.

In the instances of *Hall*, *Bailey*, and *Floyd*, all of the cases involved a substantial amount of research and dialogue from the public (with regards to ethical and unethical policing). Likewise, the Anaheim Police Department's community approach to dealing with the homeless also showcases the necessity of working with the community, in order to make society a safer and equal place (Marcin, 2014; Toomey et al., 2009). What prompts these dialogues and the safeguards provided by the government is the United States Constitution – the backbone of the United States of America.

## **Legal Issues**

### **Constructional Amendments**

The structure of freedom in the United States is prompted by the United States Constitution (History.com, n.d.). Although originally written centuries ago, the potency of the Constitution remains as a dynamic guideline in which the United States laws are governed and in which society's ethics are based on (History.com, n.d.). Therefore, in order to best understand the police-citizen relationship, it is essential to understand the constitutions of the United States.

The fundamental rights granted by the Constitution are often the focus of many citizens when it comes to police interactions (Walker & Katz, 2013). Since the police represent the law -

and are supposed to embody works like the Constitution - if an officer were to violate such an essential part of society (e.g., by being racist in discretionary decisions), then the law loses its integrity (Toomey et al., 2009). This notion is congruent with the findings of Kerner et al. (1968) that found that when police officers do not ethically exact the law, then citizens can become less responsible and more violent in reaction. Furthermore, if such power government agents such as police officers do not follow the laws, then there is the fear that their power can amass to tyrannical proportions (History.com, n.d.). When the constitution is not enforced, people are at risk of harm (Department of Justice, 2015). For example, Freddie Gray died of injuries to the spinal cord after being placed into custody of police (Barajas, 2015). Gray's death illuminates the necessity for police to correctly enforce the law. Although many amendments focus on the structures of federal and state powers, many of the amendments are centralized individual rights and safeguards from the government (History.com, n.d.). However, in the instance of police misconduct, people can become susceptible to danger (e.g., Freddie Gray). There are many different types of amendments in which citizens hold themselves to – and hold police officers accountable for facilitating ethically and properly (Miller et al., 2004).

**First Amendment.** The first amendment of the United States Constitution has several functions that are relative to policing and police-citizen interactions (U.S. Const. amend. I). With hundreds of thousands of police officers that protect such rights, it can be a common test for police officers to fully uphold the array of respective rights granted by the fundamental promises of these three functions (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2015). A very feature of the first amendment is the freedom of speech. The freedom of speech allows the citizens of the United

States to say whatever they wish, so long as it does not cause danger and panic to other people (*Schneck v. United States*, 1919).

Police officers often have to use great discretion when trying to balance their roles of upholding such a right and the role of keeping the community safe (Walker & Katz, 2013). When police officers do not even afford a hint of this right, police officers can face opposition from citizens (Maxson et al., 2003; Kerner et al. 1968). When police officers do not afford a hint of this right, then people (e.g., Freddie Gray) can end up being unjustly and unfairly killed (Barajas, 2015). Freddie Gray's personal story and recollection of events will never be heard because he was killed during the events that transpired in April of 2015 (Barajas, 2015).

The functions of the freedom of the press and the right to peaceably assemble are functions that allow the citizens to oppose "easy targets" such as police officers who have many responsibilities to uphold and facilitate, making their jobs sometimes difficult to achieve (Toomey et al., 2009; Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2015). The freedom of the press can be viewed as an extension of the freedom of speech, just in different forms, such as newspapers (U.S. Const. amend. I). Another function of the first amendment is the right to peaceably assemble (U.S. Const. amend. I). In regards to police-citizen interactions – this amendment allows citizens the opportunity to protest and denounce governmental affairs and actions. Such instances can work successfully and safely (e.g., Martin Luther King Jr.'s peaceful, non-violent protests), but they can also be the exemplary catalyst for violence, police brutality, and a loss of integrity in many facets (Walker & Katz, 2013). Nonetheless, they are granted to every citizen of the United States (U.S. Const. amend. I). However, for police officers (who are also imperfect



human beings like other citizens) they can be major stressors because the facilitation of such functions of these amendments do not always go smoothly (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2015; Inzlicht, 2011). Thus, police officers are tasked with the hard responsibility of allowing people such rights, all the while trying to ultimately protect the general community (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2015). Nonetheless, it is their job to do so (Toomey et al., 2009). This unequivocally involves the ability for police officers to do their job without prejudice, something the “Reconstruction Amendments” safeguard against.

**Reconstruction Amendments.** After the conclusion of the Civil Wars, the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments were implemented to establish equality regardless of one’s race (U.S. Const. amend. XIII, XIV, XV). These amendments are referred to as the “Reconstruction Amendments”. The first of the Reconstruction amendments is the thirteenth amendment. This amendment directly abolished slavery and involuntary servitude (U.S. Const. amend. XIII). Despite its seemingly irrelevant qualities to today’s slavery-free United States, this amendment is the legal fortification of “equality” in the United States (U.S. Const. amend. XIII). When a police officer behaves based on a citizen’s race and ethnicity, they are, in a sense violating what this amendment stands for – equal freedom for all. When freedom is not equal amongst citizens of society, then some citizens are at risk of being harmed (e.g., the death of Michael Brown, as reported by Clarke & Lett’s (2014) explanation of the court proceedings and testimonies). Therefore, it is essential for police officers to do their job well without prejudice (Toomey et al., 2009; Kerner et al., 1968). As the Department of Justice (2015) found, Michael Brown was not the only citizen not granted these basic rights, as other citizens of Ferguson, MO were also not granted such rights. In conjunction with a partial violation of the thirteenth

amendment, Michael Brown and the people of Ferguson, MO were also not treated properly under the safeguard of the fourteenth amendment.

Although the fourteenth amendment was originally implemented as a safeguard for ex-slaves to be considered full-time citizens (being able to benefit from every law, just like every other citizen), it is still relevant today (U.S. Const. amend. XIV). This amendment illustrates equal freedom by allowing each and every person the same rights, even criminals and deviant citizens. Therefore, even if a person is provoking other citizens in a malicious way, they are protected under this amendment to be treated fairly and justly (U.S. Const. amend. XIV). This creates another tough balance for police officers (Maxson et al., 2003; Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2015). This is especially the case because in the case of exercising first amendment rights against police actions – there might be a lot of hostility towards police (Maxson et al., 2003). Nonetheless, each and every police officer should respect every citizen in the same regard (Tooley et al., 2009; Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2015). When they do not, and when they operate on racist principles like some of the officers of the Ferguson Police Department did – then the horrific circumstances of slavery are extended, as people like Michael Brown are unfairly killed (Clarke & Lett, 2014; Department of Justice, 2015).

The fifteenth amendment reinforces the thirteenth and the fourteenth amendment by prohibiting the government (federal and state) from denying a citizen the right to vote based on that citizen's race and ethnicity (U.S. Const. amend. XV). This amendment grants those power the right to partake in giving their individual input and say into the actions of the government (U.S. Const. amend. XV). Therefore, the government deems all citizens apt for such a duty

despite their race and ethnicity. This is the case, of course, unless a person is disenfranchised by being wrongly incarcerated. In Ferguson, MO, although not every person arrested ended up being disenfranchised due to the criminal justice system, their liberties and promise of safety under a lawful life were taken away by the Ferguson Police Department (Department of Justice, 2015). When people act upon racist motives or agendas like the Ferguson Police Department was found to be acting upon – they are metaphorically damaging this given right ignorance (Department of Justice, 2015). When governmental agents (e.g., police officers) pry away at this right by acting on racist motives, then they are almost directly prying away at unequivocal rights, like the right to vote (Department of Justice, 2015). Other extensions of rights have been adversely affected and not granted by various police departments (like in Ferguson or in New York City); these denied rights are safeguarded by other amendments that are not the first amendment or the Reconstruction Amendments.

**Other Amendments.** There are other amendments that may arise when looking at police-citizen interactions besides the first amendment and the Reconstruction Amendments (Department of Justice, 2015). Some of these laws may not come up in court cases or everyday life as much as the previous mentioned amendments, but they are still essential to understanding the police-citizen dynamic (Maxson et al., 2003). The second, third, and fourth amendments epitomize this; while the sixth, eighth, nineteenth, and twenty-sixth, amendments may indirectly be tied in with police-citizen interactions.

In regards to limiting the power of governmental agents such as police officers, the second and third amendments directly address related concerns (U.S. Const. amend. II, IV). The

second amendment of the United States protects the rights of allowing citizens to bear arms (U.S. Const. amend. II). In contemporary society, this amendment may be seemingly irrelevant, but it is not because of the nature of some unlawful police officers (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2015; Gelman et al., 2005; Ridgeway, 2009).

When looking at police officers and the Second Amendment, it is important to note that most police officers use their firearms on duty an average of 0-1 times (Walker & Katz, 2013). Consequently, any outlier indicates that an officer shot their weapon more than one time. The reasons for an officer deciding to fire their weapon more than one time over the longevity of their career can be profound: perhaps it saved a person's life from a criminal or perhaps it was used to shoot and kill an 18 year old teenager who was shoplifting (Clarke & Lett, 2014). Police officers with weapons can dispel delinquent, deviant criminals who pose a threat to the community (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2015). Meanwhile, in the instances of deviant police officers, a firearm can mitigate the chances of corruption from being facilitated (Clarke & Lett, 2015). Therefore, the second amendment is still relevant in today's society, as police officers are allowed to carry firearms.

The third amendment also places restraint on governmental agents (U.S. Const. amend. III). Although the origins of the third amendment are derived from the American Revolutionary War, they can still serve a purpose in today's society due to the nature of police officers having power (Tooley et al., 2009). The third amendment prohibits the quartering of soldiers (or governmental agents) in a citizen's time during peacetime (U.S. Const. amend. III). Essentially, this protects all citizens from unduly aggressive police officers that violate privacy and the

protection of a home (like in the instances as reported in 2012 by WNYC Newsroom when New York Police officers ended up stopping and frisking some of the same innocent people over and over again).

The third amendment is further supplemented by the fourth amendment. The fourth amendment prohibits any unreasonable search and seizures without probable cause or a specific warrant (U.S. Const. amend. IV). The third and fourth amendment in conjunction create embedded rights through a place of residency – a realm of privacy and security. Nonetheless, by itself, the fourth amendment limits the actions of police officers in particular (U.S. Const. amend. IV). In particular this is the fundamental amendment that prohibits unreasonable *Terry* stop-and-frisks (like many of those in New York, as deemed in *Floyd*). To further create an extension of this amendment, there is a general systematic method for police officers to search people that generally involves judicially-approved warrants (Walker & Katz, 2013). In regards to police-citizen relations, this can protect citizens (as seen by the Brooklyn District Attorney’s Office when they stopped prosecuting those arrested in New York City’s “Operation Clean Hallways”). Ultimately, this amendment is a necessity in a society that relies on policing from governmental agents such as police officers (Maxson et al., 2003). Evidently, the fourth amendment (U.S. Const. amend. IV) grants citizens the chance to have a right of privacy, while it grants police officers and other respective governmental agents the opportunity to deal with activities prompted by probable cause (e.g., a police officer seeing illegal drugs in a person’s motor vehicle).

The structure of the United States Constitution is the type of structure that helps provide civility and equality for all citizens (History.com, n.d.). However, when people are tasked to enforce this structure – and do so unethically and unjustly – then society can be at risk of harm (Tooley et al., 2009; Maxson et al., 2003; Kerner et al., 1968). Actions of racism and those of related disparity from police slowly catalyze the degradation of the governing structure that protects every American citizen – the United States Constitution (U.S. Const. amend. XIII, XIV, XV). Through actions of unjust, unfair, or racist principles – the Constitution loses its potency in being a safeguard (Kerner et al., 1968). In the instances of murder and homicide, the rights given to every citizen via the constitution are nullified, as that person cannot exercise their rights. For example, the granted rights of Walter Scott were forfeited when he was shot and killed by a police officer (Ortiz, 2015). The rights granted by the amendments are metaphorically an item that enables citizens’ voice and the ability to pursue progress; police officers – who are ultimately citizens – should not take this right from other citizens (Tooley et al., 2009; Maxson et al., 2003). Understanding police operations, its history, and exemplary cases of misconduct can elaborate on understanding the state of policing. Therefore, by understanding other laws and policies, the world of policing and the police-citizen dynamic can be easier to understand.

### **Other Laws and Policies**

**Tennessee v. Garner.** In 1985, the Supreme Court ruled, under the fourth amendment, that a law enforcement agent cannot use deadly force to stop a suspect that has taken flight unless there is probable cause to use deadly force (to prevent escape). This ruling amended the “freeing felon rule”, which permitted the use of force (e.g., deadly force) against somebody who is suspected felon, and is fleeing (*Tennessee v. Garner*, 1985). Particularly, the probable cause

must be the belief (to the officer) that the fleeing suspect poses a significant threat of serious physical injury or death to the officers or others (*Tennessee v. Garner*, 1985). This court case was brought to the Supreme Court after a 1974 shooting in which two police officers in Memphis, TN responded to a burglary call (*Tennessee v. Garner*, 1985). When one of the officers found a fleeing suspect named Edward Garner (notably unarmed) trying to climb a fence, the officer shot at Garner because the officer felt like he was going to escape (*Tennessee v. Garner*, 1985). A burglarized purse and ten dollars were found on Edward Garner after he was taken to a hospital (in which he died at) due to a bullet striking the back of his head (*Tennessee v. Garner*, 1985).

Edward Garner's situation has strong relations to the death of Michael Brown. Like Garner, Michael Brown was unarmed when he was shot at by a pursuing police officer (*Tennessee v. Garner*, 1985; Clarke & Lett, 2014). In Justice O'Connor's dissent, she provided her belief that Edward Garner only ran because he felt like he was in imminent danger (*Tennessee v. Garner*, 1985). Moreover, Justice O'Connor believes that police officers must consider a case and situation holistically, even in moments where a quick decision (i.e., trying to stop a suspect) is required (*Tennessee v. Garner*, 1985). Justice O'Connor's dissent appears especially relevant to the actions of Darren Wilson. Like Garner, Michael Brown allegedly only stole a small amount of goods from a liquor store (*Tennessee v. Garner*, 1985; Clarke & Lett, 2014). Unlike Garner, however, Michael Brown allegedly stopped running and was in the process of surrendering when he was shot (*Tennessee v. Garner*, 1985; Clarke & Lett, 2014). When understanding the story of such injustice is not possible (e.g., when the victim cannot speak

about the events), then turning to theoretical perspectives can prove to be a beneficial framework to look through, as it helps articulate how certain events transpired.

## **Theories**

A framework used to answer such societal issues and questions is through the application of using theories (McShane & Williams III, 2008). Theories provide the framework needed to analyze complex issues within society; a way to systematically approach problems in an ordinal, logical fashion (McShane & Williams III, 2008). When looking at the instances of several deaths of people that fit under similar categories, using theories can help begin the process of why it is happening, and what to do to stop it (McShane & Williams III, 2008).

Although abstract in content, applying criminological theories about actors in the criminal justice system and law-breaking deviants of society can be beneficial way to understand existing facts (McShane & Williams III, 2008). Using current, proven theories as an application and framework to question the criminal justice system has proved to be a very reliable strategy, as many policies of today have been implemented because of underlying theories (McShane & Williams III, 2008). In social sciences, theories exist as tentative answers to many common questions regarding certain events and behaviors (McShane & Williams III, 2008). To explain such events and behaviors, theories are often interdisciplinary (e.g., a criminological theory may have psychological and chemistry components to it). Criminology theories specifically try and answer questions regarding the making and enforcing of criminal law, as well as criminal and deviant behavior (McShane & Williams III, 2008). Such theories can be assessed at the macro



and micro levels; both levels are interdepartmental, like many components of the criminal justice system. In order for a theory to be useful and meaningful, it must have: scope; be testable by evidence that is repeatable and objective; and it must be open to empirical falsification (McShane & Williams III, 2008). Combining multiple theories to arrive at a practical solution or notion is a worthwhile endeavor, especially when analyzing a multi-faceted topic such as disparity among police contacts. The multiple variables of this topic make using and fusing multiple theories together a requirement in order to best understand the essence of the topic. In particular: the colonial model theory, subcultural theory, social disorganization theory and broken windows theory can all be used to not only explain the behavior of police, but the rationale behind why police may operate in an unethical way (such as operating via racist attitudes).

**Colonial Model Theory.** To fully understand current events, it is essential to understand previous events. Logically, previous events are what indirectly and directly influence current events. A theoretical framework that compasses the discipline of history and criminology is the “colonial model theory” (also referred to as the “colonial model”). The colonial model explains economic and social disparity during eras of colonial and imperial rule (Staples, 1975). In relation to criminology (as applied by Robert Staples), the colonial model strives to explain disparity between races in areas such as policing. The colonial model attributes the mistreatment of African Americans and other minorities (post-slavery) in modern society to the original implementation of slavery. Staple’s framework of the colonial model attributes general mistreatment of people not in a majority class of society (social class) to a failure to assimilate into “white culture” (generally, people of a white skin color are of the majority of classes into the United States). These notions are congruent with those of Lee & Barro (1993) and Harris (1997;

1999). Both parties of authors attribute the failure for some minorities to rise up in society and the economy because they have been tied down by social issues endured by their ancestors. Specifically, the main reason for the inability to “assimilate”, according to this model, revolves around conditions of poverty, something David Harris alludes to in his “Driving While Black” articles (Wolfgang & Cohen, 1970; Harris, 1997, Harris, 1999).

Racial disparities in arrests and imprisonment can be attributed to the framework of the colonial model theory, originally developed by Frantz Fanon. Fanon’ work focused on examining the relationship between blacks and whites during the colonial era of the United States. (Staples, 1975). According to Staples (Staples, 1975), Fanon articulated a notion that claimed that the majority group (the colonizers) was able to manipulate large groups of people due to the majority group’s ability to enforce and create laws. Staples took this framework and used historical context in an effort to explain modern social inequality. Staples (1975) claims that the colonial model theory is applicable even today in modern society because of the high incarceration rate of African Americans, something that has persisted since 1975 and exists in the 21<sup>st</sup> century (Department of Justice, 2015). Staples (1975) attributes the inequality of African Americans (in particular) to their socioeconomic status. In conjunction, the educational attainment of males and females both directly influence the status of family size and GDP growth (Barro & Lee, 1993), so Staple’s application can be translated into explaining Barro & Lee’s international findings (1993) that some particular minorities have been adversely affected (in regards to educational attainment by the mistreatment of their ancestors).

Staples (1975) attributes the mistreatment of African Americans in a post-slavery America to their political and cultural identity, not to their genetic identity. Historically, the group in majority in the modern United States have identified of some variation of Caucasian. After the abolition of slavery, the law makers and enforcers set up a political system in which the economic prosperity fueled by slavery was to be almost retained, at the expense of ex-slaves (Staples, 1975; Gabbidon, Greene, & Young, 2002). An example of this is that 40 years after slavery was abolished, police officers - according to Staples - were of the dominant group were responsible for 54% of African American deaths in southern United States (Myrdal, 1944). Gradually over time, some of these laws may have been amended, but ultimately – they have not been amended enough in a way in which African Americans can receive true equality (Staples, 1975; Gabbidon et al., 2002). In conjunction with the inability of educational attainment and other theories – African Americans face many obstacles in achieving the standard norm of success in the United States (Staples, 1975; Gabbidon et al., 2002; Barro & Lee, 1993; Lee & Ransom, 2011).

Education is a necessity for every child in the United States; therefore, it is an essential variable when looking at crime (Lee & Barro, 1993). A person's subculture can really be shaped by the type of education they receive, as well as how they approach their education (and if it is reinforced). In today's society, it is becoming more and more imperative to continue on with education after high school. To get to such a point, there is usually a necessity to do well in high school. However, Lee & Ransom (2011) found that only 6% of African American and Native Americans score "at or above proficient" in mathematics; 8% of Latino American males do as such. Such statistics are further reflected by Lee & Ransom's (2011) findings that only 18% of

Hispanic American males and only 26% of African American males hold an associate's degree or higher. Without an education post-high school, the prospect of jobs is significantly reduced, and there is less of a prospect for a salary that will provide a family the "average" life. Lee & Ransom's (2011) findings are also alarming because Lee & Barro (1993) found that educational attainment can impact men and women differently.

To elaborate on the findings of Lee & Barro (1993): they found that women with less education typically have larger families. Alone, this finding is not significant enough to depict the colonial model's significance to this study. However, Lee & Barro (1993) also found that men with less education typically contribute less to the economy (findings that are congruent with Harris, 1997). In conjunction, males with less education who marry women with less education are more likely to be poor because the men (who make less money) have to provide for more people (resulting from the findings regarding women) than the average person (Lee & Barro, 1993). According to Staples (1975), African Americans face inequality and hardships because they are led to a life of a crime resulting from their socioeconomic status. Therefore, couples with less education (according to Lee & Barro, 1993) are more likely to be of a poor socioeconomic status; thus (according to (Staples, 1975), they are more likely to commit crime.

Such a circumstance as men of color underachieving in school can be attributed to the past. Although hundreds of years ago (or a century old when talking about the struggle for some European people to assimilate into the United States), the history of the United States can explain why some people who face troubles with money and educational attainment – resort to crime

(Staples, 1975). The colonial model states that when groups of people are forced to assimilate (e.g., slavery), their transition between blending cultures is not smooth, and cultural identity may be lost of the group that was forced to assimilate (Staples, 1975). Meanwhile, some ethnic groups such as German or Italian Americans ended up being fully assimilated and accepted into the mainstream culture within a century of mass-immigration (Gabbidon & Greene, 2013). From today's standards, this is apparent as it is very hard to find instances in which German or Italian Americans are discriminated against (New York Police Department, 2014; Department of Justice, 2015).

When comparing the German Americans and Italian Americans along with people of color (e.g., African Americans), there is a large disparity in terms of how smooth "assimilation went". Although German Americans and Italian Americans were faced with harsh labor after their arrival (in mass) to America, they were able to assimilate into the mainstream culture on their own accord. On the other hand, the African Americans that were brought to America as slaves were never given the chance to assimilate; they were forced into a subordinate role within society for economic gains (Lee & Barro, 1993; Staples, 1975). The surplus of slaves available for little-to-no cost catalyzed even more opportunities for the majority culture in the United States to expand. This created an even larger gap between slaves and people of the majority. While members of the dominant group of society were able to focus on educational attainment, people of color were not, as they were focusing on surviving in a horrible scenario.

Unfortunately, the large duration of time it took to reach abolition created a large gap in many facets of society (e.g., level of education). Post-slavery also provided a large gap between people of the majority group and people who were ex-slaves because the many people of the majority group did not want to give up the prosperity they achieved during the slavery era. Many laws like the Jim Crow laws and the convict-lease system enabled the best chance of prosperity for the majority group, as the expense of ex-slavery groups being only one “notch” in the societal hierarchy above slaves (Staples, 1975). By the time that these types of “laws” were also abolished, the white ethnic groups had fully assimilated into the majority culture. Therefore, there seemed to be two groups: whites and people of color (those affected by slavery and the ramifications of slavery). Thus, there was a long period of lag when it came to African Americans reaching the standards set by these groups of people who faced little to no opposition in collective progression (e.g., in education).

Unable to compete economically and socially, people of color could very well have been forced to lead a life of devious behavior (e.g., physical altercation) in order to try and make the “status quo” of living in America (Staples, 1975; Lee & Barro, 1993). This deviant behavior eventually led many people of color to crime, as it was the best profitable means that also enabled “revenge” against those who discriminated against them (Staples, 1975). This type of behavior ultimately fueled an “us vs. them” mentality between people of color and the dominant group (generally White people). There are police officers in contemporary society who only recognize this particular construct (in a sense), and police based on it (Department of Justice, 2015; Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2015). The failure to recognize why such a construct might exist can be a key component as to why there is unjustified and unconstitutional policing.

With less positive ambitions, there have been ineffective strategies to counteract the “us vs. them mentality” that has developed particularly between the police and people of color (Marcin, 2014). An example of this is “affirmative action” strategies have been implemented to counteract the gap of facets in which people of color may face (according to the colonial model). Like affirmative action strategies, focusing on policing people of color may work in some instances, but it does not ultimately address the issues of the past, as explained using the colonial model; thus, those issues do not get solved and ultimately only add more fuel to the “us vs them” vicious cycle that may exist between police and people of color.

**Subcultural Theory Perspective.** The subcultural theory (developed by Albert Cohen in 1955) is a theoretical perspective that unifies sociological perspectives and deviancy. In regards to studying unethical and malicious police contact, this theory can be used in conjunction with the colonial model theory and the broken windows theory to depict a picture of the current state of being that citizens that may be in. The conjunction of these theories also may explain how some police officers have developed a skewed, unjustified sense of perception when it comes to policing citizens (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2015).

Despite the content, success, and respective developments of a society – that society has general standards in which the citizens from that society strive to achieve. In the United States, after World War II, there was a surge of economic prosperity and a breadth of consumerism. In turn, many people (striving for solidarity and success) developed a very uniform society. However, not every type of person conformed. Cohen researched this phenomena in his book

*Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang* (1955). Cohen attributes teenage gang members to be the exemplary people for his theory because they are at “psychological deviant stage” in their lives (1955). Cohen also attributes the deviant life of the teenagers to their failure to reach the general norms of society (Cohen, 1955). This notion is congruent with the colonial model perspective and the findings of Lee & Barro (1993). Regardless of race, the oppressed people who do not reach many norms may look to crime and deviancy (Lee & Barro, 1993). According to Cohen (1955), many of the gang members studied could not achieve the same amount of success that members of the middle-class achieved. Therefore, while trying to be a “normal” person in a very “normalized” age proved to be a very daunting reality. Subsequently, like-minded individuals developed new cultures during this time in an effort to fit in, and to succeed on merits that they found more fitting to their personalities and skill sets (Cohen, 1955).

In relation to the colonial model theory, many citizens who have had relatives and ancestors that have faced consistent discrimination (that created cultural lag among them and the general members of society) also suffered in some way, despite a difference in generations or time. In particular, many African Americans and Hispanics have faced trouble with achieving the norm standard in facets of society such as annual income and educational attainment (Gabbidon & Greene, 2013). The implications from the colonial model theory display a daunting onset for such people to mitigate, navigate, and overcome. This daunting onset is further influenced by law enforcement officials that do not help dispel such social ills, but instead, focus on displacing and temporarily eliminating problems. The troubling onset is influenced even further by law enforcement officials that operate on unethical, unconstitutional, and racist perceptions.



Police contacts aside, Cohen's subcultural theory in conjunction with the colonial model theory can explain as to why many minorities stop striving for the general norms (that many whites can achieve, as they are the typical majority). According to the colonial model theory, those affected by horrible societal events such as slavery have been unable to "catch up" to the general norms of modern society. There is less of an interest to reach such norms because many of these people are not given fair chances to achieve such norms. Instead, people create priorities and goals that differ from the general norm (Cohen, 1955).

In many cases, there is a trend that minorities do not achieve the status quo needed in financial regards (Lee & Barro, 1993). There are also some trends in which minorities do not have the family structure that is usually a very large help for reaching and achieving generally desirable social norms (Lee & Barro, 1993). In conjunction, there is a very harsh reality for the people in these situations. To overcome it, many of these people strive to make money; unfortunately, without a true stake in education, the prospect of reaching status quo in society via the "median" income for people in contemporary society is harder to achieve (Gabbidon & Greene, 2013). Therefore, such people turn to crime to make money. While turning to crime, many problems worsen (e.g., being in danger of incarceration or being harmed). However, many of these people under such circumstances endure such a life because it is manageable for them, and worthwhile for them to survive in a society where they have limited chances to achieve the general norms. Some police officers are uneducated about such variables and realities, so they go off using their general discretion. Unfortunately, the general reality is that there are more

minorities in this harsh situation than whites; police officers do not consider why or try and remedy why in some circumstances (Harris, 1999). Instead, they try to displace the issues that arise without finding a true, progressive solution. Some police officers rely on such superficial judgement because they deem it effective or convenient (Ridgeway, 2009; NYPD, 2014; Harris, 1999), without considering the underlying variables that cause such harsh circumstances. These underlying variables are not race-specific; however, as the colonial model theory states: the failure for descendants of minorities (who were treated or lived a harsh life) to transpire past such obstacles is limited. Thus, some police officers inaccurately attribute crime to be correlated with race as a biological issue, rather than a product of multiple factors and variables including the ramifications of the United States' dark history.

**Broken Windows Theory and Social Disorganization Theory Implications.** George Kelling and James Wilson year strove to explain why crimes continue to progressively get worse in “bad” or “troubled” (high crime rates) neighborhoods. These neighborhoods have often prompted police activity to commence. According to the colonial model theory and the subcultural theory in conjunction – these neighborhoods are products of individuals who may not have aspirations to maintain the general norm of living in an unscathed (physically speaking) neighborhood, often without broken windows. In 1982, Kelling and Wilson developed the “broken windows theory”: physical deterioration and disorder within a neighborhood will lead to further deterioration, disorder, and crime. This theory is extremely relevant to the content of police who facilitate by racist means because the broken windows theory is a very large influence on proactive policing methods (e.g., the “stop-and-frisk” policy of New York City). Kelling and Wilson (1982) believed that police officers (typically) or other proactive members of

a community could stop this snowball effect by monitoring the conditions of a neighborhood. Ultimately, an abandoned building by itself is not an influencer of crime (Shaw & McKay, 1969). However, in conjunction with social factors (i.e., feeling included to project anger, and projecting the anger by vandalizing the abandoned building) the building might become a haven or an outlet for delinquent activity (Shaw & McKay, 1969). According to the “stop-and-frisk” implementer, William Bratton, large crime is representative of a bunch of little crimes (WNYC Newsroom, 2012).

For example, if two kids are throwing a baseball back and forth to each other, but the ball is overthrown and breaks a window, then the window of the building can further prompt more delinquent activity if it is not fixed (Kelling and Wilson, 1982). Or, in Bratton’s eyes, an example of the broken windows theory could be: a local gang might try to steal from a rival gang because the rival gang vandalized a car of the member in the local gang. The theft would not occur without the vandalized car happening. In conjunction with the colonial model theory, the broken windows theory and the social disorganization theory indicate that these windows may not be fixed immediately.

In the hypothetical situation given above, if the window is not fixed, it will be susceptible to more delinquent acts (Kelling and Wilson, 1982). The one broken window might transpire into ten broken windows which may eventually transpire into a haven for drug deals. The building that once had one broken window could potentially become a dangerous place filled with criminal activity. Likewise, the rival gang and the local gang might not cease their acts on one

another without trying to “one-up” the other. According to the social disorganization theory and the colonial model theory, these types of situations would hypothetically occur in low-cost areas, as that is where large groups of people live (Harris, 1997; Lee & Barro, 1993). Subsequently, the subcultural theory and the social disorganization theory would indicate that the large groups of people would likely result in a greater chance of such building structures being ruined and not fixed.

While in the process of decline: police officers try and stop such decline through means that are typically either proactive or community-based (Walker & Katz, 2013). Generally - with racist mindsets and perceptions - police officers might specifically seek to engage with certain people. Proactive means (i.e., stop and frisk policies) might result in a reduction of immediate crime, but it may result in an unsolved long-term issue (Walker & Katz, 2013). Ultimately, engaging such situations (such as physically declining neighborhoods) requires persistence and dedication from police officers, as the issues at hand are deeper than just a few broken windows on a few buildings (Harris, 1997; Staples, 1975).

**Social Learning Theory Perspective.** According to psychologist Albert Bandura, learning is a cognitive process (not a total behavioral process) of gradual internalization that results from one’s environment, not one’s genetics (Bandura, 1977). Moreover, “learning” does not necessarily transpire into “behavioral change”. Bandura (1977) theorizes that one’s environment, cognition, and behavior all influence one another (Bandura calls this influence “reciprocal determinism”). This “learning” can occur empirically in the form of observation or from being taught (Bandura, 1977). Learning can occur vicariously, too, according to Bandura:

by the observation of punishments and rewards (Bandura, 1977). Such vicarious observation has been coined as “vicarious reinforcement” (Bandura, 1977). Bandura (1977) theorizes that when a person is exhibiting “good behavior” (behavior that is law-abiding), then that person is “self-regulating”. Certain influences and situations may cause a person to suppress “self-regulation”, and may influence them to engage in criminal behavior (Bandura, 1977). Based on Bandura’s theory, it would make logical sense that many of the socioeconomic issues that people face are simply learned, internalized “reactions”. Moreover, proactive policing measures (e.g., stop and frisk) displace the people who have learned criminal behaviors, without teaching them how to circumnavigate and overcome persistent issues (e.g., not making enough money).

The social learning theory is micro-leveled in essence, but it can explain multiple actors within the criminal justice system. In a topical sense, the social learning theory can both explain the behavior of both deviant (of the law) citizens and deviant (of the law) police officers. Deviant citizens display behavior that has been internalized, or prompted by a lack of self-regulation. Deviant citizens who engage in criminal activity have learned some sort of reasoning for committing a criminal act, or maintaining a lifestyle with criminal activity. A criminal act is very possible when reciprocal determinism is present. For example, if a criminal wants to rob an innocent person: there needs to be certain factors involved that had to be learned. One, a person needs to have certain motivation to commit such an act (e.g., be motivated to try and make money because they learned that robbing people can make money). If the behavior of robbing somebody is cognitively acceptable (in the sense that the person will do it), then that person might be interested in doing it (if other factors are involved). Next, a person has to cognitively

recognize the proper environment to rob somebody. According to Bandura's theory, it seems like a person would be less likely to rob somebody in a crowded area in broad day light because that would hinder their potential success. Meanwhile, an environment more suitable for such behavior would be in a dark alleyway). If the person cognitively recognizes an opportunity and cognitively knows how to do it, then may very well attempt to rob somebody.

In regards to police, the social learning theory can explain as to how corruption spreads in a police department. Unique to police, there are several factors that inherently influence them to become corrupted. One major factor is their secretive subculture, commonly exclusive to only law enforcement agents (Walker & Katz, 2013). In a negative environment (full of corruption), the public may not have an idea about such behavior, as it is kept secret. This potentially exclusive environment can make correcting such behavior more difficult (Walker & Katz, 2013). For an officer not corrupted, but surrounded by corruption, there can be a lot of pressure on the officer to violate their oath, according to Bandura's theory.

According to the social learning theory, people learn behaviors that reinforce positive rewards and they learn which behaviors garner negative punishments. When a police officer is not corrupt, but is surrounded by corrupted officers, they feel trapped due to the exclusion of the police subculture (Walker & Katz, 2013). Peer pressure and blackmailing may influence an officer to corrupt his or herself like his or her fellow officers. Or, such an officer may be influenced by superiors. In order to achieve a certain goal or reward, an officer may follow suit with the other officers who are corrupt.

Police officers, powerful government agents, can create more suitable environments for crime through unconstitutional acts. In a sense, the secretive nature of police officers can really facilitate corruption under the right circumstances, according to Bandura's circumstances. For example, about 75% of a particular department is corrupt, and 25% are not. However, the 25% that are not are of the lowest rank and file in the department. The 25% are afraid to tell on the 75% because they have been threatened. They are also scared to tell on the 75% because they know that they will face a lot of adversity within the confined, non-transparent police subculture that they are a part of. In turn, many officers of the 25% (i.e., 10%) decide to join the other officers. After receiving much praise and rewards from their corrupted actions, another 5% join the 10% that become corrupt. 5% of the remaining 10% of the law-abiding officers try and tell other people about the 90% of the department's officers who are corrupt. Although an investigation launches, the 90% of officers blackmail the 5% in such a way that they are unable to move vertically (promotion) or horizontally (transfer to another station). Instead, they are stuck with the corrupt officers and the 5% of officers who are not corrupt. Seeing what was done with the 5% who tried to tell on the majority of the department, the 5% of "uncorrupt" officers who did not tell on the majority of the department succumb out of fear and become corrupt. Not having any other options, the 5% of officers who tried telling other people about the corruption issue either quit or also succumb to the corruption themselves.

**Research Relating to Theoretical Thinking about Stereotypes.** According to Donders, Correll, & Wittenbrink, (2008), there has been research conducted into finding out why people are prejudice, especially towards blacks. The Black "stereotype" (according to Donders, Correll, & Wittenbrink) has a relation to "threat" or "danger" (2008). Donders, Correll, & Wittenbrink

(2008) attribute this perception in dangerous situations to how stress-responding detections for a person are generated of “greater importance” when there is a danger or threat. Donders Corell, & Wittenbrink (2008) also note that this type of detection is not the same as “general prejudice”. “Dangerous stimuli” catch the attention of people quicker and it prompt a longer span of attention to be drawn to it (Donders et al., 2008). Donders and her colleagues (2008) note that these two processes can happen concurrently.

In regards to the recent police-citizen violence (Goldstein & Santora, 2014; Clarke & Lett, 2014; Ortiz, 2015), the study of Donders and her colleagues (2008) certainly does not condone unauthorized and unethical police behavior, but it does help develop a dialogue that can help find a solution for remedying any dangerous police-citizen interactions. Such research is consummate with current Federal Bureau of Investigation’s words from a speech in 2015, “Although the research may be unsettling, it is what we do next that matters most” (FBI 2015). Racial profiling has been a topical issue within policing for centuries, so anything of any sort to help create dialogue can be essential in fortifying police-citizen interactions as good, beneficial interactions. However, Donders and her colleagues (2008) do allude to this perceptual bias as being somewhat *natural*. Although – if true – this proposed notion may unsettling, it is still a step towards understanding what makes certain police contacts go ethically out of bounds. Recognizing the imperfection of human nature is paradoxical in a sense because many people have adapted past it (e.g., medicine), yet, many people struggle with the imperfections. Furthermore, this study begs the question about what biological changes can be made in an effort to reduce “*natural*” biases. Ultimately, there needs to be more research done on this subject in



order to better gauge how general society can approach such notions such as racism being a natural part of being human.

**The Self-Fulfilling Prophecy.** In 1948, sociologist Robert K. Merton coined and articulated the term “self-fulfilling prophecy”. A self-fulfilling prophecy is a prediction that either – directly or indirectly – causes itself to become true in the sense that the respective belief and corresponding behavior begin to correlate (Merton, 1948). After declaration of an untrue or false belief (via a prediction), the behavior may eventually become real, as this declaration can sufficiently influence the “false” prediction to become true (Merton, 1948). Merton’s theory has serious implications for criminals and non-criminals alike, especially when regards to police-citizen interactions.

The self-fulfilling prophecy could hypothetically be applied to the death of Eric Garner, based on the disparity shown by the NYPD in accordance to their statistics produced in 2014 regarding 2013’s stop-and-frisks. Although not quite factual, the train of thought that the self-fulfilling prophecy produces can be applied to Eric Garner in an effort to better illuminate how self-fulfilling prophecy can be troublesome during police-citizen interactions. For example, in the case of Eric Garner, he began trying to free himself out of a police officer’s grasp after he was being restrained (Goldstein & Santora, 2014). That action seemingly prompted a police officer to put Eric Garner in a chokehold in an effort to bring him down to the ground (Goldstein & Santora, 2014). Evidentially, this chokehold is what ended Eric Garner’s life (Goldstein & Santora, 2014). What if Eric Garner’s actions were prompted by statistics such as the NYPD’s 2013 stop-and-frisk statistics that show a large volume of African Americans being stopped-and-

frisked (NYPD, 2014). To elaborate, what if Eric Garner (hypothetically aware of such statistics) tried to restrain police because he felt like he was unfairly being targeted? Consequently, in order to restrain the police, Eric Garner would have had to “resist arrest”, which is a criminal action. Evidentially in this hypothetical scenario, Eric Garner’s attempt at dispelling a “prophecy” (trying to fight against an unfair arrest) is what fulfilled it (him resisting arrest; a criminal action). Ultimately, this hypothetical scenario may never been tested in a sense, as Eric Garner died on the day that he was choked – Eric Garner will never be able to explain his side of the story (Goldstein & Santora, 2014). The self-fulfilling prophecy developed by Merton (1948) helps raise the question of how many police-citizen interactions go wrong based on pre-established social ills (such as the disparity shown by NYPD’s stop-and-frisk data produced in 2014).

In conjunction, various types of theories can help produce a unique, effective framework to formulate solutions for societal issues, especially those relating to social sciences (McShane & Williams III, 2008). In regards to finding out why certain people (Goldstein & Santora, 2014; Clarke & Lett, 2014; Department of Justice, 2015; Ortiz, 2015; Barajas, 2015) are under the extreme event of police misconduct, there needs to be research produced, as the media is not always reliable in providing the impartial truth (Deggans, 2014), nor are most police officers acting in such a way (Tooley, Montana, Linkenbach, Lande, & Lande, 2009; Ridgeway, 2009). Statistics and events can become the content of the framework presented by theories. Using statistics to provide the ability for application (of theories) can be beneficial as statistics can be used as a way of describing events within society. In relation to the recent cases of injustice of African Americans (Goldstein & Santora, 2014; Clarke & Lett, 2014; Department of Justice,

2015; Ortiz, 2015; Barajas, 2015), the statistics produced by the NYPD (2014) can be an ample set of content used to describe the recent injustices, as similar injustices occurred via the “stop-and-frisk” policies of multiple cities (Ridgeway, 2009; *Bailey v. City of Philadelphia*, 2011; *Hall et al. v. City of Chicago*, 2012, NYPD, 2014).

## **Public Perception of the Police**

**Police-Public Contacts Survey.** In an effort to gauge how the public feels about their interactions with the police (and to better determine how the public feels about the police), there are multiple reports that survey citizens. One of the largest of these surveys is the Police-Public Contact Survey, also known as the PPCS (Durose & Eith, 2011; Durose & Langton, 2013). Every three years since 1996 the PPCS discusses the characteristics of people who have had contact with police (Durose & Eith, 2011; Durose & Langton, 2013). The PPCS is a part of the National Crime Victimization Survey, also known as the NCVS (Durose & Eith, 2011; Durose & Langton, 2013).

The findings of the PPCS can better depict the state of police-citizen relations without the hype of the media and the extreme outlier cases that make the news (Deggans, 2014). Due to the recent events regarding police-citizen interactions, it is essential to compare a time period that is still relevant to today; yet, a time period before such events happened (Pollock, 2014). This is the case in an effort to see if the state of policing is truly as bad as the extreme outlier cases make it seem. A good instance to use as a gauge are the years 2008 and 2011 (Respectively, the PPCS

analysis for the years were released in years closer to 2015), as this thesis has been written in 2015 (Pollock, 2014).

In 2008, nearly 60,000 residents who were 16 or older responded to this survey (Durose & Eith, 2011). It was estimated that over 40 million U.S. residents who were about 16 or older had contact with police in 2008 (Durose & Eith, 2011). However, about only five million of those people had face-to-face contact with police in 2008 (Durose & Eith, 2011). This finding does not seem similar to the New York Police Department's 2013 stop-and-frisk data or the Department of Justice's 2015 findings about the Ferguson, MO Police Department. In the NYPD's case, there are not any relative data sets that compare the stop-and-frisk data to the amount of faceless police contacts. More research should be done on this particular subject in order to better gauge how proactive and helpful the NYPD has been in that sort of policing. In regards to Ferguson, MO, the majority of police contact highlighted happened face-to-face (Department of Justice, 2015); this raises yet another research question: does more face-to-contact indicate a higher level of unethical behavior from police?

Only 10% of the 5 million people who had face-to-face contact with police believed that the police treated them unfairly (Durose & Eith, 2011). A similar trend is found in 2008 when looking at police contacts initiated via traffic stops: 85% of people stopped by police believed that stopped them for a legitimate reason (Durose & Eith, 2011). According to *Floyd*, this finding might elevate the seriousness of the stop-and-frisk policy that existed in New York, because the general nature of the stops was deemed "unconstitutional". Unlike the disproportionate statistics found by the Department of Justice (2015) and the statistics provided by the New York Police

Department (2014), there was only a few point differences between stops for males and females; blacks, whites, and Hispanic drivers (Durose & Eith, 2011). Further inviting the idea of more research is the finding that: of the 1.4% people who faced forced from police in 2008, 74% of them believed the force to be excessive (Durose & Eith, 2011). According to Durose & Eith (2011) about 50,000 Americans felt that police officers used excessive force against them; meanwhile, if the *Floyd* found the general enactment of stop-and-frisk to be unconstitutional, then how many of those citizens involved felt violated? Besides New York, only Ferguson, MO, has displayed such a high volume of dissatisfaction due to excessive force; thus, it is important to keep investigating this topic and the general PPCS in order to gain the best idea of where the status of policing is currently at, and what can be done to improve it (Department of Justice, 2015).

There are some noticeable differences between the Bureau of Justice Statistics findings in 2013 (data from 2011) in comparison with the data from 2008. About 63 million people were stopped in 2011 in comparison to about 60 in 2011 (Durose & Eith, 2011; Durose & Langton, 2013). Nineteen percent of street or traffic stops included a stop and frisk. Despite similar percentages of overall stops for race and ethnicity (as well as belief in “legitimate stops” in comparison to 2008), White drivers were searched at lower rates than both Hispanic and black drivers (Durose & Langton, 2013). Similar to the people who faced forced from police in 2008, the majority of people stopped and frisked did not believe that the police at justification to do so.

What is to explain this phenomena? Aside from the racial profiling and high-volume of NYPD’s stop-and-frisk and the outlier, dangerous cops of recent events – why are such statistics

still representative of the underlying notion that there is inequality afoot when it comes to police-citizen contacts? Are many policies outdated and in need of tuning, like according to the court case of *Floyd*? Is the education of police officers not thorough enough, as partially alluded to by Walker & Katz (2013)? All the remaining questions aside, there needs to be more research done on the subject, because there is not enough research (as Pollock mentions in his 2014 journal on this very topic). Particularly, there needs to be a greater focus on people who are between the ages of 16-30, as they seem to be a group that has been greatly affected by police (New York Police Department, 2014; Department of Justice, 2015). On a related note, there needs to be an understanding of how influential people and outlets (like the news media) influence such age groups (Maxson et al., 2003).

**The Media-Police-Public Intersection.** The media, the police, and the public all intertwine and influence one another (Deggans, 2014; Tooley et al., 2009; Maxson, Hennigan, & Sloane, 2003; Miller et al., 2004). Therefore, when looking at the prospect of police misconduct and how the public responds to such behavior, it is essential to research and elaborate on all three of the parties involved (the media, the police, and the public). Even in instances where interaction seems to be just two out of the three groups, the third group can be influencing those two groups decisions and thoughts (Miller et al., 2004). Understanding the nature and current status of any one of these groups (i.e., through Gallup polls) can be essential to understanding the state of the other groups (Tooley et al., 2009; Maxson et al., 2003).

**Lack of Scope.** The Media often plays a role in influencing the public's perception, especially in regard to how certain police officers operate (Tooley et al., 2009; Deggans, 2014). Deggans (2014) thinks this is sort of an issue, because, the national media is not "having the right conversations". Deggans attributes short segments, target audiences of media outlets, and guests on the show needing conflict for their own business, as being a fundamental issue with national media outlets (Deggans, 2014). Instead of finding concrete and meaningful solutions, many news media coverages turn into a debate for the sake of "winning an argument", or presenting stories in a way that garners the most views (Deggans, 2014). Deggans believes that better coverage from the industry – one without such a focus on "its own priorities" – is needed to better inform the public, and to develop more meaningful progress (Deggans, 2014).

**A Systematic, Unfortunate Reality.** According to Tooley et al. 2009, police officers believe that the profession of policing is represented in the media in a way that "reflects and creates a real public sentiment". Tooley et al. (2009) explains that the systematic process in which police investigate and follow certain policies is done in an effort to eliminate the interference of other processes (i.e., external investigations). The findings of such review are not released until the other processes (i.e., external investigations) are completed (Tooley et al., 2009). Subsequently, it is normal for police departments to not discuss much of such investigations for a lengthy period of time, like in the Freddie Gray case (Barajas, 2015). In the interim, the media has to present the story (regarding such reviews and investigations); yet, they only have access to a limited amount of information (Tooley et al., 2009). Prior to the ruling of Freddie Gray's death of a homicide, it took about two weeks for this conclusion to be reached (Barajas, 2015). Ultimately, during such an interim, the story will come from members of the

public who are most impacted, while the police systematically review and investigate (Tooley et al., 2009). Until the lengthy review process of the police department is completed, the story can become very one-sided for a long period of time, as the police can only present limited information (Tooley et al., 2009). However, Tooley et al. 2009 claim that this is not a battle (the media versus the police) that should be fought; both parties (the media and the police) most likely entered their profession in an effort “to positive difference in their world”. Tooley et al. 2009 believe that police organizations need to work better with the media in an effort to reduce the skewness that arise from the media. Tooley et al. 2009 also believe that the real day-to-day police-citizen interactions can help accumulate and present an authentic image of police officers.

**The Need for Public Support.** Collectively, police are concerned about how the media influences attitudes toward them (Maxson et al., 2003; Tooley et al. 2009). Maxson et al. 2003 conducted a survey among Los Angeles residents in an effort to discover what influences their opinions on police. Maxson et al. (2003) attributes the importance of police conducting similar research to their surveys to the need of fostering police-community partnerships that are specifically tailored to respective community concerns.

Garnering public acceptance is essential for police for several reasons, according to Maxson et al. (2003). One reason is that the acceptance from the public is “essential to maintain public order” and for effective policing (Maxson et al. 2003). A working police-citizen relationship better helps protect the public (Miller et al. 2004). Another reason is that police funding is maintained and expanded by the public’s support (Maxson et al. 2003; Department of



Justice, 2015). More helpful resources (i.e., body cameras) can be brought to police departments with more funding. Also, establishing a good public opinion for police departments is beneficial because it can help better facilitate local police activities, as well as to establish police-community partnerships (Maxson et al. 2003). Fostering a good police-community relationship can help reduce crime and better protect the public, so maintaining a good image as police officers is imperative (Maxson et al. 2003; Walker & Katz, 2013).

Some police officers attribute highly publicized incidents as the reasons for widespread negative views of the police (Maxson et al., 2003). However, this study only found that one-third of respondents surveyed declared that they were most influenced by mass media (Maxson et al., 2003). The majority (two-thirds of respondents) reported that their views of police resulted from personal experience and vicarious experiences of others (Maxson et al., 2003). These results are more similar to the findings of Tooley et al. 2009. However, Maxson et al. 2003 found results that disagree with the proposed thoughts in Tooley et al. 2009: residents most influenced by the mass media did not report less favorable opinions of the police than those most influenced by personal experience.

**Vicarious Experiences Count.** Miller, Davis, Henderson, Markovic, and Ortiz, (2004) sought out in their 2004 research to answer if the police's treatment of citizens impact a broader network of people (i.e., family and neighbors), and if the media's portrayal of the police is a deciding factor of the public's opinion of police. Miller et al. (2004) addressed such questions by focusing on multiple sources within five New York City precincts: "consumer satisfaction"

surveys of people who have had voluntary contact with police, monthly public opinion surveys of the police, and news coverage of the police. Miller et al. (2004) found that citizens had positive and stable opinions of the police over time, in the absence of dynamic changes in police policy or scandals presented by the media. Furthermore, without the presence of huge scandals, the public were not generally swayed in their opinions of the police (Miller et al., 2004). Huge scandals such as the abuse of Rodney King are the type of events that sway public opinion (Miller et al., 2004). Miller et al. 2004 has a commensurate finding with Tooley et al. 2009 that claims that direct police contact influences people's opinions of the police. People who have family and friends who have had negative contacts have less confidence in police (Miller et al., 2004). However, people with positive experiences (or friends and family) are not associated with noticeable higher levels of confidence in the police (Miller et al., 2004).

Miller et al. (2004) found differences of public opinions depending on the precincts surveyed. The economic status and racial and ethnic composition of a precinct are two variables that can explain the variations (Miller et al., 2004). Miller et al. (2004) found that the precinct with the most positive views of the police was also the precinct with the highest proportion of white residents, fewest reports of negative police contact, and the greatest proportion of homeowners. This finding (of Miller et al., 2004) has implications that Harris' (1999) explanation of concentrated, proactive policing within certain neighborhoods based on demographics and Deggans notions about target audience and media influence can be possible at the same time. In conjunction, Miller et al., 2004, Deggans (2014), and Harris (1999) illuminate that poorer socioeconomic neighborhoods typically view police in a more negative view.

Furthermore, the breakdown of influence found by Maxson et al. (2003) would further imply the importance of socioeconomic status in a neighborhood's general perception of police.

**Implications from Gallup Polls.** The accumulative findings of Miller et al. (2004) and Maxson et al. (2003), along with the notions of Deggans (2014) and Harris (1999) are supported by multiple Gallup review polls presented by Frank Newport (2014), in light of Michael Brown's death in 2014. Between 2011-2014, multiple aggregate surveys from Gallup found that whites have reported 59% of confidence in police while blacks have reported 37% confidence in police (Newport, 2014). Gallup data from 2013-2013 found 59% of whites to say the honesty and ethics of police officers to be high or very high, while only 45% of blacks thought that the honesty and ethics of police to be high or very high. Meanwhile, one Gallup poll's results consisted of the accumulative findings and notions of the parties earlier, as well as the stop-and-frisk data from the NYPD (produced in 2014). To elaborate, more young black males were the subject of stop-and-frisks in New York City 2013 than any other age demographic or race younger black males. The young black males that were interviewed in 2013 are more likely to report having being treated unfairly in comparison to older black men and women (Newport, 2014). Also, Gallup discovered findings in their poll presented in the summer of 2013 to be consummate with the findings of Miller et al. 2004 and Harris' (1999) notions: 80% of whites said that the high incarceration rate among black men is attributed to something other than discrimination; about 50% of blacks felt discrimination to be the cause (Newport, 2014). Harris (1999) implies that large proactive policing measures (i.e., NYPD, 2014's stop-and-frisk data) can be unconstitutional; Miller et al. 2004 suggest that such discrimination can influence the opinions of other people – beyond those involved in such negative contacts. Ultimately, proactive policing

practices that demonstrated unfair values and ethics such as NYPD's stop-and-frisk, can vicariously impact many people, and they can explain the large gaps found in the presented Gallup polls (NYPD, 2014; Ridgeway, 2009; Harris, 1999; Newport, 2014; *Floyd et al. v. City of New York, et al*, 2013).

**Hypotheses.** In order to add to the existing criminal justice research on police contacts, there is a call for quantitative data (Pollock, 2014). Quantitative data was collected in the form of primary data. Primary data can better illustrate the current state of police-citizen interactions in the United States. Specifically, it was anticipated that the primary data collected would lead to similar findings such as Durose & Langton (2013) and Ridgeway (2009), as well as Kerner et al. (1968) and Newport (2014). Race and ethnicity were hypothesized to slightly differ in the police contacts of the respondents - a hypothesis similar to that of Greg Ridgeway's 2009 investigation of a similar question and also similar to the findings of Durose & Langton (2013) in the 2013 PPCS. Durose & Langton (2013) found small traces of disproportionate police contact when comparing the stops (street stops and traffic stops) of non-whites with whites. Therefore, the initial hypotheses of this research are that the number of street stops and traffic stops for non-whites would be greater than the street stops and traffic stops for whites (the notion regarding street stops represents this study's first hypothesis and the notion regarding traffic stops represents the second hypothesis).

This study's third hypothesis is predicated on the findings of Kerner et al. (1968) which found that citizens are more likely to act negatively toward police if they are treated negatively.

Evidently, because of this study's first and second hypothesis, a third hypothesis that could be extrapolated is that there citizens will view the police less favorably if they are treated negatively by police. Evidently, in conjunction with this study's first two hypotheses, the third hypothesis of this study is that non-white college students (college age students make up the sample) will have a more negative attitude toward police when compared to white students. To note, this hypothesis is also influenced by Newport's (2014) report of a Gallup poll that displayed that blacks trust police less than Whites do. If non-whites trust police less, then they would be less inclined to initiate contact with them and seek assistance (as alluded to by the findings of Kerner et al., 1968).

Like the third hypothesis, the fourth hypothesis of this study is extrapolated from the findings of Kerner et al. (1968). Additionally, this hypothesis is supported by findings such as Durose and Langton (2013). The fourth hypothesis of this study is that contact (in the form of street stops or traffic stops) decreases positive attitudes toward police. Street stops and traffic stops are pretty frequent among police-citizen interactions, and those interactions can leave the citizen discontent with the contact's events and the officer(s) involve (Durose & Langton, 2013). Evidently, according to Kerner et al. (1968) and Durose & Langton (2013), street stops and traffic stops can influence citizens to have more negative attitudes toward police.

## Chapter 3: Methods

### Methodology

**General Overview.** The concern of this thesis (and the current research of the thesis) is predicated on two questions. The first question of this research sought to understand if police contact differs by race and ethnicity. The second question this research sought to better answer is if the respective police contact (differing by race and ethnicity or not) influences subsequent citizen perceptions and interactions with police.

As evidenced by the chapters thus far, there is an unequivocal call for more data to be done on this relative subject (Ridgeway, 2009; Department of Justice 2015; New York Police Department, 2014; Pollock, 2014; Kerner et al., 1968). In some incidents of police misconduct, tendencies of certain races and ethnicities of the citizens involved have been recorded (New York Police Department, 2014; Department of Justice, 2015). However, it is unclear if these tendencies are static in nature and representative of all police contacts in the United States, because only a small amount of police officers have been suspected or sanctioned for acting in such a way (Ridgeway, 2009; Durose & Langton, 2013). Due to media coverage, these seemingly rare incidents may appear to give a perception of “commonness” that might not truly exist; therefore, it is imperative to do further research on this subject by further recording and analyzing the experiences of citizens (Pollock, 2014; Deggans, 2014). Furthermore, it is also essential to do more research on this subject because the perceptions of citizen perceptions on police can influence and determine further police-citizen interactions (Kerner et al., 1968; Pollock, 2014). This chapter of the thesis will discuss the methodology used in regards to the sample, the measure used for the purpose of assessing and analyzing the two research questions of this study, and the respective variables of the methodology.

**Research Setting and Sample.** This study used a random sample of 250 Bridgewater State University students matriculated in the fall semester of 2015. Through this research, data was collected via responded questionnaires. It is traditional in criminal justice academia for research to be conducted via questionnaires (Miller et al., 2004; Durose & Eith, 2011; Durose & Langton, 2013).

Out of 2,103 classes offered by Bridgewater State University, 50 of them were randomly selected with the help of a website “random.org”, a website with a random number generator application (therefore, the classes selected were chosen by “random sample”). A random sample was determined to be the best method of choosing classes because of its unbiased nature and for its attribute of being able to equally consider a population for selection. After the 50 classes were randomly chosen, the respective professors of those classes were contacted via email and were asked if they were willing to have their class participate in this study. Each email briefly explained this study’s research and why this research was being conducted. Over the course of six weeks, 13 classes were administered the questionnaire. In those 13 classes, 250 students voluntarily responded to the questionnaire.

**Instruments Used.** The instrument used for this thesis was replicated and based on the “Police-Public Contact Survey”. The PPCS is a supplement to the National Crime Victimization Survey that seeks to gauge how people 16 and older engage with police and why they do (Durose & Eith, 2011; Durose & Langton, 2013). Every three years, the PPCS is conducted by the Bureau

of Justice Statistics at the conclusion of the yearly National Crime Victimization Survey (Durose & Eith, 2011; Durose & Langton, 2013). The PPCS is comprised of different sections of questions that generally seek out the “details” of the respondents’ most recent contact with police (Durose & Eith, 2011; Durose & Langton, 2013). Like the replicated product that is this thesis, the PPCS breaks these “details” down into certain groups on the questionnaire: general questions (e.g., respondents’ age), general police-related questions (e.g., the amount of times the respective respondents had contact with police), specific questions related to the respondents’ most recent contact with police (street stops, traffic stops, or voluntary contacts), and also a section dedicated to the respondents’ perceptions of police (e.g., gauging how honest the respondents think police generally are).

Although this thesis’ methodology is replicated mainly on that of the PPCS: this thesis differs from the PPCS because the PPCS is conducted via personal interviews; meanwhile, this thesis is done by administering a questionnaire (a questionnaire that received approval of the Institutional Review Board at Bridgewater State University in 2015).

An introduction and explanation of this research was given to each chosen class prior to the administration of the questionnaires. After administration of the questionnaires, the respondents did not converse about the questionnaire. This was advantageous because it allowed the respondents to develop their own unbiased opinions and responses, and also because it allowed them the opportunity to best understand the questionnaire and the related research process. Afterwards, the responses were stored in a secure cabinet located in the Criminal Justice



Department at Bridgewater State University. Over the six week period, the questionnaires and their responses were entered into SPSS.

By using the large student population at Bridgewater State University, 250 student responses were collected. The goal of garnering responses to the questionnaire was to add to the existing police-citizen literature by better understanding an unexplored population (college aged students) and a generally underreported topic that needs more timely data on a more consistent basis (Pollock, 2014).

**Demographics.** Three of the most pertinent characteristics of the 250 student responses (3 questionnaires were left blank, leaving an “N” of 247) are age, race, and gender. 246 respondents answered the questionnaire with their age (in years). The minimum age was 17 and the maximum age was 59 (range = 42). The mean (M) of ages (in years) is 21.1585 with a standard deviation (SD) of 4.16341. All 247 non-blank (in its entirety) questionnaires responded when asked what they identified for their race(s). “White” was the most commonly identified race (198) and “Middle Eastern, Arabic & “Native American, Alaskan, Pacific Islander” was the least with only two each, respectively. For gender, 248 non-blank (in its entirety) questionnaires responded when asked what they identified with. “Male” was the most identified response with 135 responses; meanwhile, “other” was the least identified response with only one.

Table 1  
*Identified Race and Gender of Respondents*

Characteristic	n	%
Identified Race <sup>1 2</sup>		
Asian	4	.16%
Black or African American	24	9.7%
Hispanic, Latino	14	5.6%
Middle Eastern, Arabic	2	.8%
Native American, Alaskan, Pacific Islander	2	.8%
White	198	80.1%
Other	8	3.2%
Gender		
Male	135	54.6%
Female	112	45.3%
Other	1	.4%

<sup>1</sup> = N for Identified Race = 252 and not 247 because 5 respondents identified with two races.

<sup>2</sup> = Total percentages might not add up to 100.00% because of rounding

Table 2  
*Mean and Standard Deviation of the Age of Respondents (years)*

Characteristic	M	SD
Age at time of survey (years)	21.1585	4.16341

**Variables.** In this study, there are four different hypotheses. Each hypothesis is characterized by an independent variable (a variable that does not depend on another variable) and a dependent variable (existence of the respective dependent variable depends on the attributes of another variable). Each dependent variable in this study's hypotheses is determined and influenced by the independent variables in the hypotheses. To note, these types of variables relate to this study's two research questions.

*Dependent Variable of H1: Street stops.* This was defined as answers to the question “Has your most recent police contact within the past 12 months been a street stop (refer to the text in the parenthesis above for a better explanation of what a street stop is)” with possible responses being 0 = no and 1 = yes. Out of 250 respondents (3 questionnaires were left blank), 30 respondents (12% of respondents) answered “yes” to this question (M=.5660, SD=.50036).

*Dependent Variable of H2: Traffic stops.* This was defined as answers to the question “Has your most recent police contact (within the past 12 months) been a traffic stop” with possible responses being 0 = no and 1 = yes. Out of 250 respondents (3 questionnaires were left blank), 72 respondents (28.8% of respondents) answered “yes” to this question (M=.8780, SD=.32924).

*Dependent Variable for H3 and H4: Attitude toward police.* Respondents were asked the following questions: “How much do you respect the police”, “How confident are you in your local police to protect you”, and the question “Do you believe that the police in the United States (as a whole, excluding outliers)”. Possible responses to these questions ranged on two respective scales (1-8 for the first two questions and 1-7 for the third question). The last two possible answers for each of the three questions were answer choices of “no opinion” (second to last option) and “don’t know” (last option). Originally, the other possible answers to these questions ranged from the lower numbers (e.g., 1) indicating of a more positive attitude toward police and higher numbers (e.g., 6) indicating more negative attitudes toward police. However, each question was recoded so higher numbers (e.g., 6) reflected positive attitudes toward police and lower numbers (e.g., 1) reflected negative attitudes toward police. The three items were added together to create the scale (titled “attitude”) of attitude toward police, and 189 respondents out of 250 (3 questionnaires were left blank, resulting in 247 total responses) responded to all three of the original questions.

The new scale for those that responded to all three questions ranged from 3 to 17 (M=12.3439, SD=2.94149). In order to validate the relation between the three items (the three questions), a measure called the “Cronbach’s Alpha” was used. The Cronbach’s Alpha measure is used to determine how close a set of items relate to one another. The closer the “Cronbach’s Alpha” number is to 1.00, the more consistent the items are to one another. The Cronbach’s Alpha for this scale was .813 – suggesting that the three items have a high consistency with one another.

*Independent Variable for H1, H2, and H3: Race.* Respondents were asked which race(s) they identified with by the question “Which of the following best represents your race” (respective answer choices: 1 = Asian, 2 = Black or African American, 3 = Hispanic, Latino, 4 = Middle Eastern, Arabic, 5 = Native American, Pacific Islander, 6 = White, 7 = Other). This variable was recoded into a dichotomous variable where 0 = non-white and 1 = white (as showcased – with the reclassification of “Black or African American” and “Hispanic, Latino” due to their small numbers in this study - in Durose & Langton’s 2013 PPCS study). Out of 250 respondents (3 questionnaires were left blank), 52 respondents (20.8% of respondents) fell into the non-white category and 195 (80.2% of respondents) fell into the white category.

*Independent Variable for H4: Contact.* “Contact” was created by adding two variables together (streets stops and traffic stops). The result is a variable that is dichotomous with 0 indicating non-“contact” (the newly created definition; the two combined variables) with police in the last 12 months and 1 indicating that an individual experienced a street stop or a traffic stop. 153 respondents (61.2%) answered 0 (non-“contact” within the last 12 months) and 97 respondents (38.8%) answered 1 (experienced a street stop or traffic stop within the last 12 months).

## Chapter 4: Analysis (Results)

The statistical analysis was done by using the SPSS program. This study used univariate analysis to assess the consistency between three items (that make up the “attitude” measure) and to find the mean and standard deviation of the respective data sets in this study. Additionally, this study uses bivariate analysis to assess: race & street stops, race & traffic stops, race & “attitude”, and “contact” & “attitude”. Specifically, crosstab analysis was used (for H1 and H2) in order to analyze mutually exclusive nominal-level data (e.g., race and street stops) and independent t-tests were used (for H3 and H4) because the independent variables were dichotomous and because the dependent variables were continuous. Additionally chi-square tests were run in an attempt to find consistency between two nominal variables. The results of the chi-square test were used to compare race (non-white or white) & street stops and race (non-white and white) & traffic stops. Both chi-square tests produced a p-value greater than .05 *alpha*, which means that there is not relationship between race & street stops, as well as race & traffic stops. Therefore, the chi-square tests (and their respective tables produced by SPSS) are not displayed in this study.

H1: The number of street stops for non-whites is greater than the number of street stops for whites.

To investigate H1, crosstab analysis was used due to the nominal orientation of race and street stops (table 3). The results of this analysis show that 42 (80.8% of non-white respondents) have not had police contact in the form of a street stop within the past 12 months; meanwhile 10

respondents (19.2% of non-white respondents) did. In regards to white respondents, 175 white respondents (89.7% of white respondents) did not have police contact in the form of a street stop within the past 12 months; 20 white respondents (10.3% of white respondents) have had police contact in the form of a street stop within the past 12 months. In total, 12.1% of respondents in this study have had police contact in the form of street stops within the past 12 months of this study. Of those who have had street stops within the past 12 months, non-whites account for 33.33% of street stops and whites account for 66.67% of street stops.

Table 3  
*Cross Tabulation Analysis of Race (non-white & white) and Street Stops*

		.00*	1.00**	Total
Non-white	Count	42	10	52
	% within white	80.8%	19.2%	100%
	% within RCVSTRTR	19.4%	33.3%	21.1%
	% of Total	17.0%	4.0%	21.1%
White	Count	175	20	195
	% within white	89.7%	10.3%	100%
	% within RCVSTRTR	80.6%	66.7%	78.9%
	% of Total	70.9%	8.1%	78.9%
Total	Count	217	30	247
	% within white	87.9%	12.1%	100%
	% within RCVSTRTR	100%	100%	100%
	% of Total	87.9%	12.1%	100%

\* = no street stop contact

\*\* = street stop contact

To further investigate this hypothesis, Chi Square was used. Chi Squares are method of drawing a relationship between two nominal variables. For H1 the Chi Square method was used to see if there was a connection between race and street stops. The Chi Square analysis was not

significant because the p-value produced was greater than .05 *alpha* ( $p > 0.05$  *alpha*), so in that sense – race and street stops are not connected.

Table 4  
*Chi-Square Tests on Race (non-white & white) and Street Stops*

Street Stop	non-white (N= 52)		white (N=195)		$\chi^2$ (1)	p
	n	%	n	%		
No street stop contact	42	80.8%	175	89.7%	3.099	.078
Street stop contact contact*	10	19.2%	20	10.3%	3.099	.078

\* = within the last 12 months of when the survey was taken

H2: The number of traffic stops for non-whites is greater than the number of traffic stops for whites.

To investigate H2, cross tabulation analysis was used due to the nominal orientation of race and traffic stops (table 5). The results of this analysis show that 37 (71.2% of non-white respondents) have not had police contact in the form of a traffic stop within the past 12 months; meanwhile 15 respondents (28.8% of non-white respondents) did. In regards to white respondents, 138 white respondents (70.8% of white respondents) did not have police contact in the form of a traffic stop within the past 12 months; 57 white respondents (29.2% of white respondents) have had police contact in the form of a street stop within the past 12 months. The percentages of non-whites and whites who have had a traffic stop within the past 12 months are relatively similar (28.8% and 29.2%, respectively), which implies that race might not play a role in traffic stops (based on the experiences of the respondents). In total, 29.1% of respondents in this study have had police contact in the form of traffic stops within the past 12 months of this

study. Of those who have had traffic stops within the past 12 months, non-whites account for 20.8% of street stops and whites account for 79.2% of street stops. To note, of the cross tabulation done on race & street stops and race & traffic stops (respectively), white students registered the highest percentage among race-“contact” categories by yielding a 23.1% (traffic stops) out of the total respondents who have and have not had a contact with police within the past 12 months (247 respondents). This percentage can be compared among the other race-“contact” categories: non-white traffic stops within the past 12 months (6.1% of the total 247 respondents), white street stops within the past 12 months (8.1% of the total 247 respondents), and non-white street stops within the past 12 months (4.0%).

Table 5  
*Cross Tabulation Analysis of Race (non-white & white) and Traffic Stops*

		.00*	1.00**	Total
Non-white	Count	37	15	52
	% within white	71.2%	28.8%	100%
	% within RCVSTRTR	21.1%	20.8%	21.1%
	% of Total	15.0%	6.1%	21.1%
White	Count	138	57	195
	% within white	70.8%	29.2%	100%
	% within RCVSTRTR	78.9%	79.2%	78.9%
	% of Total	55.9%	23.1%	78.9%
Total	Count	175	72	247
	% within white	70.9%	29.1%	100%
	% within RCVSTRTR	100%	100%	100%
	% of Total	70.9%	29.1%	100%

\* = no traffic stop contact

\*\* = traffic stop contact

To further investigate this hypothesis, Chi Square was used. Chi Squares are method of drawing a relationship between two nominal variables. For H2 the Chi Square method was used



to see if there was a connection between race and traffic stops. The Chi Square analysis was not significant because the p-value produced was greater than .05 *alpha* ( $p > 0.05$  *alpha*), so in that sense – race and traffic stops are not connected.

Table 6  
*Chi-Square Tests on Race (non-white & white) and Traffic Stops*

Traffic Stop	non-white (N= 52)		white (N=195)		$\chi^2$ (1)	p
	n	%	n	%		
No traffic stop contact	37	71.2%	15	28.8%	.003	.957
Traffic stop contact contact*	138	70.8%	20	29.2%	.003	.957

\* = within the last 12 months of when the survey was taken

H3: Non-white college students have a less favorable attitude toward police than white students.

To investigate this hypothesis, an independent t-test was run (table 7). A t-test was used because the independent variable is binary (non-white students or white students) and because the hypothesis is concerned with the differing attitudes (although ‘differing’, “attitude” is one variable) between the binary variable (non-white students and white students). An independent version of the t-test was used because the two means have only been measured once and because the dependent variable is deemed to be continuous. The t-test produced 34 non-white responses (M=11.3235, SD=2.76033) and 154 white responses (M=12.5714, SD=2.95026). The p-value (done in the t-test of equality of means) with equal variances assumed is .025 (t-observed=-2.257, df=186), which is less than the .05 *alpha* level used to gauge the hypothesis ( $p < .05$ , *alpha* = .05). Therefore, the null hypothesis (that there is no statistically significant relationship between race and attitude toward police) is rejected. Further, difference in attitudes between non-

whites and whites is statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ,  $alpha = .05$ ), as non-white respondents, on average, have an attitude that is more negative than white students.

Table 7  
Group Statistics and Independent Samples Test of Attitude and Race (non-white & white)

	non-white (N= 34)		white (N=154)		df	t	p
	M	SD	M	SD			
Attitude	11.3245	2.76033	12.5714	2.95026	186	-2.257	.025*

\*=  $p > .05$

H4: Contact in the form of street stops or traffic stops negatively affects attitudes toward police.

To investigate this hypothesis, an independent t-test was run (table 8). A t-test was used because the independent variable is binary (respondents either had “contact” with police within the past 12 months or they had not) and because the hypothesis is concerned with the differing attitudes (like H3, “attitude” in H4 is one variable) of respondents. An independent version of the t-test was used because the two means have only been measured once and because the dependent variable is deemed to be continuous. The t-test produced 117 respondents who have not had “contact” with police within the past 12 months ( $M=12.7778$ ,  $SD=2.66882$ ) and 72 respondents who did have “contact” with police within the past 12 months ( $M=11.6389$ ,  $SD=3.23409$ ). The p-value (done in the t-test of equality of means) with equal variances assumed is .009 ( $t\text{-observed}=2.625$ ,  $df=187$ ), which is less than the .05 *alpha* level used to gauge the hypothesis ( $p < .05$ ,  $alpha = .05$ ). Therefore, the null hypothesis (there is no statistically significant relationship between contact and attitudes toward police) is rejected. Further,

difference in attitudes between those who have had “contact” within the past 12 months and those who have not is statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ,  $alpha = .05$ ), as people who have had “contact” with police within the past 12 months have a more negative attitude toward police.

Table 8  
*Group Statistics and Independent Samples Test of Attitude and Contact (street stops & traffic stops)*

	no contact (N= 117)		contact (N=72)		df	t	p
	M	SD	M	SD			
Attitude	12.7778	2.66882	11.6389	3.23409	187	2.625	.009*

\*=  $p > .05$

## Chapter 5: Discussion

**General Discussion.** This study sought to add to the existing literature on police-citizen interactions, as there needs to be more literature on this subject in order to better interpret the contemporary police-citizen dynamic (Pollock, 2014). In the process, four hypotheses were tested. The first finding from the first hypothesis did not find a relationship between race and street stops (as evidenced by Chi Square analysis), so the first hypothesis of this study was incorrect. This finding supports Ridgeway’s (2009) notion that the majority of police do not operate on unethical means. Furthermore, this finding partially rejects the findings of the respective police departments of *Bailey*, *Hall*, and *Floyd*, as street stops in this study do not have a clear indication of being related to race. However, it is important to note, though, 19.2% of non-white respondents were stopped; meanwhile, only 10.3 of whites were stopped via a street stop – and therefore, the police methods used by the respective defendants (city police departments) in *Bailey*, *Hall*, and *Floyd* cannot be ruled out. Although more research will have to

be done on this subject, Kelling & Wilson's (1982) work regarding the "broken windows" theory can be applied here because of its proactive street-related policing measures. Ultimately, though, this finding supports Pollock's (2014) notion that more research needs to be done on this subject in order to garner a better understanding of what is happening.

The second hypothesis, which tested to see if there was a relationship between race and street stops, provided some interesting results. Nonetheless, the second hypothesis was incorrect. Unlike the differences between race and street stops, the difference between non-whites and whites stopped was nearly non-existent (non-whites were stopped via a traffic stop 28.8% of the time and whites at 29.2%). Never mind the fact that these percentages are identical, but the fact that the number white traffic stops was greater than non-white traffic stops rejects much of the police-citizen literature including the conclusions of *Bailey*, *Hall*, and *Floyd* and their respective police departments operating under racial profiling. Furthermore, this finding does not follow suit to Durose & Langton's (2013) finding in 2011 that minorities were unfairly targeted in contact with police. Additionally, this finding cannot directly disprove Inzlicht's (2011) theory regarding the innate attribute of stereotyping people based on the color of their skin, but it at least retains the notion that the majority of police officers can put law and ethics before any other priority. This finding affirms Tooley et al. (2009), Ridgeway (2009), Marcin (2014), and Deggans (2014) which found that the majority of police officers act upon ethical and impartial reasoning.

The third hypothesis anticipated that this study would provide results that non-white college students have a less favorable attitude toward police than white students. Through an independent t-test sample, the relationship between differing attitudes (between non-white and white students) was found. On average, non-white students had a more negative attitude toward police. Several different theories can possibly explain as to why this is the case. Since citizens recall past empirical and vicarious experiences of police, it can be difficult for police officers to interact with citizens with a “clean slate” (Kerner et al., 1968; Maxson et al., 2003; Miller et al., 2004). Therefore, in regards to the colonial model theory, it can be especially challenging with some non-white minorities to interact with police due to their relatives’ pasts – a set of events that inherently taint a working police-citizen dynamic (Kerner et al., 1968; Staples, 1975). Furthermore, this finding also has subcultural theory and social learning theory implications in regards to police-citizen interactions: through vicarious interactions and negative empirical experiences, the “social learners” begin to feel marginalized by the police, and they assimilate with other people who have been marginalized by police (Cohen, 1995; Bandura, 1977). However, in this study, such group formations and collection of data of one’s opinion on how their relatives and ancestors were treated by police – were not measured and recorded. Therefore, future research should be done on this subject to test its prevalence.

The fourth hypothesis of this study was confirmed by a statistically significant t-test. It was determined in the statistical analysis that contact (in the form of street stops or traffic stops) negatively affects attitudes toward police. According to *Floyd*, many stop-and-frisks in proactive policing communities are deemed to be “fruitless” and an “inefficient time waster”; this can provide the foundation as to why people feel negatively after being stopped by police. As Marcin

(2014) alludes to, a lot of police work isn't always positive, as police officers have to enforce the law. Further, Tooley et al. (2009) claims that police work can be difficult because people don't like being subjected to its enforcement (e.g., getting a speeding ticket). In extrapolation, people don't seem to like being subject to street or traffic stops because they end up "wasting" the citizen's time (no written warning) or because they end up having to pay a fee back of a ticket of some sort.

**Limitations.** Despite the effort to better determine if racism in policing is system, and the intention of adding to the police-citizen literature, there are limitations to this thesis. Mainly, this thesis (and its respective research) is somewhat inferior to large scale projects like the PPCS. Under government funding, the PPCS is able to garner millions of peoples' experiences in the form of data; meanwhile, my thesis, although useful because it provides a snapshot of police-citizen interactions in southeastern Massachusetts for college age students, it only have about 250 respondents (Durose & Langton, 2013). In essence, the PPCS is able to better generalize about the nation's police-citizen dynamic because of the scale of their project (Durose & Langton, 2013). Also in relation to the PPCS, this study is limited because while the PPCS utilizes interviews, this research was strictly quantitative – an approach that provides numbers, but not content for the stories behind the numbers (Durose & Langton, 2013).

In regards to extrapolating these results to be representative of all of southeastern Massachusetts, this study is limited because Bridgewater State University is only one college/university in the area. Therefore, it seems unlikely that the respondents to this thesis can

accurately represent the entire college age population in southeastern Massachusetts. Additionally, this might imply that this particular population represents more suburban areas in comparison to colleges/universities placed in Boston or other major cities in the area. As evidenced by *Floyd*, city police officers may take up a different mentality than police officers in smaller towns or precincts. Therefore, it should be noted that the respondents' experiences may not best represent the police-citizen interactions hosted in cities like Boston.

## Chapter 6: Conclusion

**Contribution.** In an effort to better understand the contemporary police-citizen dynamic, this thesis as attempted to added on the existing respective literature. The main way in which this thesis tried to answer that is by answering two research questions (does police contact differ by race/ethnicity and does the type of police contact impact attitudes toward police). Although this research is not as large as projects like the PPCS, this thesis can better elaborate on the relative research questions and add to the literature. Additionally, this thesis might not directly solve the issue of police misconduct, but it serves and strives to be a proponent to finding such a solution.

In regards to the first research question, this thesis has found that police contact does not differ by race/ethnicity. Although the non-white students of this study were found to be almost twice as likely to be stopped via a street stop – the statistical analysis did not reconcile the two variables. Furthermore, non-whites and white respondents were just about as likely (white respondents were found to be a little more likely) to be stopped via a traffic stop. In conjunction,

these two findings answer the first research question with a no. This thesis' findings did not find results similar to that of *Floyd* or the Department of Justice (2015) which found racial profiling in the policing tactics of the New York Police Department and Ferguson, MO Police Department, respectively.

In regards to the second research question of this thesis, the respective findings were statistically significant. On average, although slightly different, non-white students thought less of police than white students. The finding stemming from the research of the fourth hypothesis can better speculate as to why this is the case. The respondents to this research viewed police with a more negative attitude after having street stop or traffic stop-related contact with police. Therefore, since about 50% of non-whites had such contact and 40% of whites did, it would make sense that non-whites would view the police with a more negative attitude. Regardless of the speculation, this study did find that street stops and traffic stops negatively impact attitudes toward police.

**Future Research.** By reaffirming the notion that most police officers act ethically, and by discovering that police contact (in the form of street stops and traffic stops), the literature can go in a view different directions. The main reason this is the case is because the findings of this study still do not explain as to why egregious police officers act against what they sworn an oath for. According to Ridgeway (2009) it can be difficult to identify such officers without looking at statistics, so as Pollock (2014) there needs to be more research done on this subject in its entirety in order to best understand the police-citizen dynamic. Specifically, there needs to be



“consistent” research done on this timely subject (Pollock, 2014). One of the emerging propositions to cutting down on aberrant, unethical police officers is the implementation of police body cameras (*Floyd, et al. v. City of New York*, 2013). According to *Floyd*, police body cameras are a solution to keeping police officers in the constant “eye of the public” (always acting ethical), as they have been proven to reduce complaints against police and police misconduct. However, more research needs to be done on this subject as it is fairly new (*Floyd, et al. v. City of New York*, 2013). Furthermore, there needs to be specific research done to find out if police body cameras will stop police officers that resort to extreme unnecessary violence (e.g., murder).

Although the concept of “parking tickets” and “speeding tickets” are likely to stay, there also needs to be more research done on effective policing and community relations (Marcin, 2014). Effective and considerate community policing has proven to be a stable in developing lasting police-citizen interactions (Marcin, 2014). So, as cities like New York move away from proactive, “zero tolerance” policing, it will be essential to understand which direction such departments should be moving in. Future research should strive to answer what makes community policing an effective approach in reducing crime and building community moral (Marcin, 2014).

Future research should also seek out to better differentiate between the different types of vicarious experiences that citizens have. Kerner et al.’s (1968) work and the colonial model theory, the social learning theory, and the subcultural theory can all explain as to how one

person's bad experience can lead to a negative attitude toward police, but none of these academic facets elaborate on how the much of a role the media plays in influencing citizen interactions with police. This study has established that citizens have a more negative attitude toward police because of street stops and traffic stops; however this research did not elaborate on the media's role in influencing that. This is a question worth answering in future, as Deggans (2014) believes that the media dramatizes their stories in order to garner viewership.

## References

*Bailey v. City of Philadelphia*, 2011

Bandura, A. (1977). Social learning theory.

Barajas, J. (May 1, 2015). Freddie Gray's death ruled a homicide. PBS. Retrieved from <http://www.pbs.org/newshour/rundown/freddie-grays-death-ruled-homicide/>

Barro, R. J., & Lee, J. W. (1993). International comparisons of educational attainment. *Journal of monetary economics*, 32(3), 363-394.

Bergner, D. (April 2014). Is Stop-and-Frisk Worth It? The Atlantic. Retrieved from <http://www.theatlantic.com/features/archive/2014/03/is-stop-and-frisk-worth-it/358644/>

Bump, P. (December 3, 2014). New York has essentially eliminated stop-and-frisk – and crime is still down. The Washington Post. Retrieved from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/wp/2014/12/03/new-york-has-essentially-eliminated-stop-and-frisk-and-crime-is-still-down/>

Cartledge, G., & Dukes, C. (2008). DISPROPORTIONALITY OF AFRICAN AMERICAN CHILDREN IN SPECIAL EDUCATION

Center for Constitutional Rights. (n.d.). Daniels, et al. v. the City of New York. Retrieved from <http://ccrjustice.org/ourcases/past-cases/daniels,-et-al.-v.-city-new-york>

Center for Constitutional Rights. (n.d.). Floyd, et al. v. City of New York, et al. Retrieved from <http://ccrjustice.org/stopandfrisk>

Chang, A. (April 26, 2011). Alleged Illegal Searches by NYPD May Be Increasing Marijuana Arrests. Retrieved from <http://www.wnyc.org/story/126232-marijuana-arrests/>

- Chang, A. (July 16, 2012). Map: NYPD Finds Most Guns Outside Stop-and-Frisk Hotspots. Retrieved from <http://www.wnyc.org/story/222809-wnyc-map-police-find-guns-where-they-stop-and-frisk-less/>
- Clarke, R., Lett, C. (November 11, 2014). What happened when Michael Brown met Officer Darren Wilson. CNN. Retrieved from <http://www.cnn.com/interactive/2014/08/us/ferguson-brown-timeline/>
- Clear, Todd R., Cole, George F., Reisig, Michael D., Petrosino, Carolyn. (2014) *American Corrections in Brief* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Cengage Learning
- CNN Wire Staff (June 18, 2012) Rodney King dead at 47. Retrieved from <http://www.cnn.com/2012/06/17/us/obit-rodney-king/>
- Cohen, A. (1955). Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 11 (4). 422.
- Col. Tooley, M., Chief Montana, H., Linkenbach, J., Dep. Sheriff, Lande B., J., Lande, G.M. June 2009. The Media, the Public, and the Law Enforcement Community: Correcting Misperceptions. *International Association of Chiefs of Police*. 76 (6). Retrieved from [http://www.policechiefmagazine.org/magazine/index.cfm?fuseaction=display\\_arch&article\\_id=1828&issue\\_id=62009](http://www.policechiefmagazine.org/magazine/index.cfm?fuseaction=display_arch&article_id=1828&issue_id=62009)
- Daniels, et al. v. the City of New York, 1999
- Daniels, et al. v. the City of New York, 2003
- Deggans, E. (December 6, 2014). Four Lessons From The Media's Conflicted Coverage of Race. National Public Radio. Retrieved from

<http://www.npr.org/sections/codeswitch/2014/12/06/368713550/four-lessons-from-the-medias-conflicted-coverage-of-race>

Disaster Center (n.d.). New York Crime Rates 1960 - 2013. Retrieved from <http://www.disastercenter.com/crime/nycrime.htm>

Donders, N.C., Joshua Correll, J., & Wittenbrink, B. (September, 2008) Danger stereotypes predict racially biased attentional allocation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 44 (5), 1328-1333. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022103108000656>

Durose, M., & Eith, C. (October 5, 2011). Contacts Between Police And The Public, 2008. Retrieved from <http://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=2229>

Durose, M., & Langton, L. (September 24, 2013). Police Behavior During Traffic And Street Stops, 2011. Retrieved from <http://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=4914>

Durose, M., Schmitt, E., & Langan, P. (April, 2005). Contacts between Police and the Public Findings from the 2002 National Survey. Retrieved from <http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/cdsp99.pdf>

Fagan, J., & Davies, G. (2000). Street stops and broken windows: Terry, race, and disorder in New York City. *Fordham Urban Law Journal*, 28, 457-504.

Federal Bureau of Investigation. (February 12, 2015). Hard Truths: Law Enforcement and Race. Federal Bureau of Investigation. Retrieved from <https://www.fbi.gov/news/speeches/hard-truths-law-enforcement-and-race>

Floyd, et al. v. City of New York, et al., 2013

- Gabbidon, S. L., Greene, H. T., & Young, V. D. (2002). *African American classics in criminology & criminal justice*. Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage.
- Gabbidon, Sean L., & Greene, Helen Taylor (2013). *Race and Crime* Third Edition
- Gelman, A., Fagan, J., & Kiss, A. (December, 2005). An Analysis of the New York City Police Department's "Stop-and-Frisk" Policy in the Context of Claims of Racial Bias. Retrieved from <http://www.stat.columbia.edu/~gelman/research/published/frisk9.pdf>
- Godown, J. (August, 2009). *Police Chief Magazine*. Retrieved from [http://www.policechiefmagazine.org/magazine/index.cfm?fuseaction=display&article\\_id=1859&issue\\_id=82009](http://www.policechiefmagazine.org/magazine/index.cfm?fuseaction=display&article_id=1859&issue_id=82009)
- Goldstein, J., Santora, M. (August 1, 2014). Staten Island Man Died From Chokehold During Arrest, Autopsy Finds. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from [http://www.nytimes.com/2014/08/02/nyregion/staten-island-man-died-from-officers-chokehold-autopsy-finds.html?\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2014/08/02/nyregion/staten-island-man-died-from-officers-chokehold-autopsy-finds.html?_r=0)
- Hall et al. v. City of Chicago*, 2012.
- Harris, D., A. (1997). Driving While Black and All Other Traffic Offenses: The Supreme Court and Pretextual Traffic Stops, 87 *J. Crim. L. & Criminology* 544
- Harris, D., A. (1999). *Driving While Black: Racial Profiling on Our Nation's Highways*. American Civil Liberties Union.
- Hennelly, B. (July 28, 2007). Quinn Wants NYPD to Release Stop-and-Frisk Data. Retrieved from <http://www.wnyc.org/story/79991-quinn-wants-nypd-to-release-stop-and-frisk-data/>

Hennelly, B. (May 30, 2008). NYPD Ordered to Turn ‘Over Stop And Frisk’ Data to NYCLU.

Retrieved from <http://www.wnyc.org/story/77400-nypd-ordered-to-turn-over-stop-and-frisk-data-to-nyclu/>

History.com. (n.d.). The U.S. Constitution. History.com. Retrieved from

<http://www.history.com/topics/constitution>

Inzlicht, M. (2011). *Stereotype Threat: Theory, Process, and Application*. Oxford University Press. 5, 141–143.

Isquith, E. (September 11, 2014). NYPD Commissioner Bill Bratton: “Broken windows” critics “just don’t get it”. Retrieved from

[http://www.salon.com/2014/09/11/nypd\\_commissioner\\_bill\\_bratton\\_broken\\_windows\\_critics\\_just\\_dont\\_get\\_it](http://www.salon.com/2014/09/11/nypd_commissioner_bill_bratton_broken_windows_critics_just_dont_get_it)

James, B. (March 2, 2015). A look at stop-and-frisk data in Philadelphia, 3 other cities.

Kerner, O., Lindsay J., Harris., Abel, I., Brooke, E., Thorton C., ... Jenkins, H. (1968). *Report of the national advisory commission on civil disorders. Special report to the President.*

Washington, DC: National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders

Lee Jr., J., & Ransom, T. (2011). The Educational Experience of Young Men of Color

Marcin, S. (2014). Policing the Homeless: One Community’s Strategy. *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin*, 1-4.

Maxson, C., Hennigan, K., Sloane, D.C. (June 2003). "Factors That Influence Public Opinion of The Police". United States Department of Justice. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/197925.pdf>

McLaughlin, E. (August 11, 2014). Fatal police shooting in Missouri sparks protests. CNN. Retrieved from <http://www.cnn.com/2014/08/10/justice/missouri-police-involved-shooting/>

Meshane, M.D., Williams III, F. P. (2008). A Thesis Resource Guide for Criminology and Criminal Justice. Pearson Education, Inc.

Merton, R.K. (1948). The Self-Fulfilling Prophecy. *The Antioch Review*, 8 (2), 193-210.

Miller, J., Davis, R.C., Henderson, N.J., Markovic, J., Ortiz, C.W. (May 2004). Public Opinions of the Police: The Influence of Friends, Family, and News Media. United States Department of Justice. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/205619.pdf>

Myrdal, G. (1944). *An American Dilemma*.

New York City Liberties Union. (May 9, 2012). Stop-And-Frisk 2011. Retrieved from [http://www.nyclu.org/files/publications/NYCLU\\_2011\\_Stop-and-Frisk\\_Report.pdf](http://www.nyclu.org/files/publications/NYCLU_2011_Stop-and-Frisk_Report.pdf)

New York Police Department. (2014). NYPD Stop Question and Frisk Report Data Base.

Retrieved from

[http://www.nyc.gov/html/nypd/html/analysis\\_and\\_planning/stop\\_question\\_and\\_frisk\\_report.shtml](http://www.nyc.gov/html/nypd/html/analysis_and_planning/stop_question_and_frisk_report.shtml)



Newport, F. (August 20, 2014). Gallup Review: Black and White Attitudes Toward Police. Gallup. Retrieved from <http://www.gallup.com/poll/175088/gallup-review-black-white-attitudes-toward-police.aspx>

Ortiz, E. (April 8, 2015). Michael Slager Charged with Murder of Walter Scott in South Carolina. NBC News. Retrieved from <http://www.nbcnews.com/storyline/walter-scott-shooting/michael-slager-south-carolina-officer-charged-murder-black-man-n337526>

Peck, J. (2015), "Minority perceptions of the police: a state-of-the-art review", *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 38 (1).

*People v. De Bour*, 1976

Pollock, W. (2014). *Things Change: An Intergenerational Examination of the Correlates of Police Contact*. *Crime & Delinquency* 60 (8). Retrieved from <http://cad.sagepub.com.libserv-prd.bridgew.edu/content/60/8/1183.full.pdf+html>

Reaves, J. (February 16, 2000). At Diallo Trial, Justice Is Weighed in Different Measures. Retrieved from <http://content.time.com/time/arts/article/0,8599,39427,00.html>

Ridgeway, G. (April, 2009). Summary of the RAND Report on NYPD's Stop, Question, and Frisk. Retrieved from [http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/testimonies/2009/RAND\\_CT329.pdf](http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/testimonies/2009/RAND_CT329.pdf)

Shaw, C.R., and McKay, H.D. (1969). *Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press

*Shneck v. United States*, 1919

Spivak, B. L., & Thomas, S. M. (2013). Police contact with people with an intellectual disability: the Independent Third Person perspective. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 57 (7), 635-646.

Staples, R. (1975). White Racism, Black Crime, and American Justice: An Application of the Colonial Model to Explain Crime and Race. *Phylon*, 36 (1), 14-22. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/274841>

*Terry v. Ohio*, 1968

The New York Times. (March 18, 1999). Mr. Spitzer's Inquiry. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/1999/03/19/opinion/mr-spitzer-s-inquiry.html>

Turkewitz, J. (May 1, 2012). In New York, a 20-Year-Old Policy Suddenly Prompts a Lawsuit. Retrieved from <http://www.theatlantic.com/national/archive/2012/05/in-new-york-a-20-year-old-policy-suddenly-prompts-a-lawsuit/256584/>

U.S. Const. amend. I, II, III, IV, VI, VIII, XIII, XIV, XV, XIX, XXVI

United States Department of Justice Civil Rights Division. (March 4, 2015). Investigation of the Ferguson Police Department. Retrieved from [http://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/opa/press-releases/attachments/2015/03/04/ferguson\\_police\\_department\\_report.pdf](http://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/opa/press-releases/attachments/2015/03/04/ferguson_police_department_report.pdf)

Walker, S., & Katz, C. (2013). *The Police in America: An Introduction* (8th ed.). McGraw-Hill.

*Whren v. U.S.*, 1996

Wihbey, J. (March 4, 2015). Excessive or reasonable force by police? Research on law enforcement and racial conflict in the wake of Ferguson. Retrieved from

<http://journalistsresource.org/studies/government/criminal-justice/police-reasonable-force-brutality-race-research-review-statistics#>

Wilson, James Q., and George L. Kelling. (1982). "Broken Windows: The Police and Neighborhood Safety." *Atlantic Monthly*, 29–38.

WNYC Newsroom (May 12, 2012). Timeline | The City's Use of Stop-and-Frisk). Retrieved from <http://www.wnyc.org/story/212932-timeline-citys-use-stop-and-frisk/>

Wolfgang, M., C.F., and Bernard Cohen, B. (1970). *Crime and Race: Conceptions and Misconceptions*.

Appendix A: Consent Form



October 5, 2015

Dr. Jennifer Hartsfield  
Criminal Justice  
311C Maxwell Library

Re: IRB Application – Case #2016036

Dear Dr. Hartsfield:

This letter is to inform you that the Institutional Review Board (IRB) has approved (*expedited*) the research project titled, *Police Contacts and Attitudes toward Police: A Study of Race and Policing*.

The approval for your study is active for a period of one (1) year from the date of this letter. You are expected to adhere to the procedures as outlined in your proposal. Any changes in procedures, protocol, or the consent form will require the approval of the Institutional Review Board. You are also expected to notify the IRB immediately in the event of injury to or any problem with the subject participating in the study.

As the principal investigator, you have primary responsibility for protecting the rights and welfare of human research subjects and for complying with the provisions of the Institutional Review Board.

Best wishes on the completion of your research project. Please contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "E. Spievak". The signature is written in a cursive style and is positioned above the printed name of the sender.

Dr. Elizabeth Spievak  
Chair, Institutional Review Board

ES/dfd

cc: Gary Portway

## Appendix B: Survey

Dear Participant:

You are invited to participate in a research study designed to measure contact with police and your attitude toward police officers. Your participation in the study will last about 20 minutes. There are no foreseeable risks to the survey. This study is important to science/society because it will add to the knowledge base of police citizen interactions. Individually, you may not benefit personally by participating in this study.

The information you provide will be collected anonymously. Your name will not be included on the questionnaire, the written work or any of the materials used in this study. If the data should be published, your identity will not be revealed. Absolute confidentiality cannot be guaranteed, but will be upheld to the extent permitted by law.

Your participation in this study is voluntary and you may refuse to participate or discontinue your participation at any time without incurring any penalty or losing any benefits to which you are entitled. You are also free to decline to answer any questions that make you uncomfortable.

If you have any questions about this study, please feel free to call Dr. Jennifer Hartsfield, 508-531-2718. If you have any questions about your rights as a research subject, you may call the University Institutional Review Board office (508-531-1242) and will be given an opportunity to discuss any questions in confidence, with a member of the committee. This is an independent committee composed of faculty and staff of Bridgewater State University and its affiliates, as well as lay members of the community not connected with the institution. The committee has reviewed this study.

By turning the page and beginning the survey, you are acknowledging that your current questions have been answered in language that you understand.

Thank you for your help.

# Police Contact Questionnaire

Affiliation: Bridgewater State University Topic: Police  
IRB  
Approved: Yes Surveyor: Gary Portway Jr.  
Anonymity: Survey results are anonymous Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## Introduction

The content of this questionnaire is comprised of your contacts with police. This survey may take up to 20 minutes to complete. Please do not share your name. Please fill in the respective box for your answer choice. Unless specified otherwise – each question refers to your MOST RECENT contact with police.

## Specific Directions

Within the questionnaire, you will find eight total sections: general questions, general police-related questions, street stop (and street stop outcome), traffic stop (and traffic stop outcome), voluntary and special involuntary contacts, and police behaviors. You will answer only ONE type of section out of the: street stop-related questions (“street stop” and “street stop outcome”, traffic stop-related questions (“traffic stop” and “traffic stop outcome”), and “voluntary and special involuntary contacts” sections.

The way you determine which section to answer is based on your MOST RECENT experience with police. You will only answer ONE of those three sections. In conjunction with ONE of those three categorical sections, you will answer the “general questions” section, the “general police-related” section, and the “police behaviors” section. You WILL NOT answer every section in this questionnaire.

## General Questions

Please answer the following general, non-police related questions about yourself.

1. What is your age? (please write in your age in years) \_\_\_\_\_

2. Which of the following best represents your gender?

- Male
- Female
- Other

3. Which of the following best represents your race? (choose all that apply)

- Asian
- Black or African American
- Hispanic, Latino
- Middle Eastern, Arabic
- Native American, Alaskan, Pacific Islander
- White
- Other

4. What is your major(s)? (please write in your answer) \_\_\_\_\_

5. Where have you lived in the last 12 months? Check all that apply.

- Bridgewater State University (on campus)
- Bridgewater, MA (off campus)
- City (population of 50,000 people or more; for example: Taunton, MA or Boston, MA)
- Suburban Area (population between 2,500 people and 50,000 people; for example: Mansfield, MA)
- Rural Area (population fewer than 2,500 people; for example: Sherborn, MA)

6. Have you ever been sanctioned (disciplined/punished for any reason) by an academic institution in which you attended?

- Yes, at a college or university
- Yes, in high school
- Yes, in middle school/junior high
- Yes, in elementary school
- No, never

7. How many times have you been arrested?(please write in your answer) \_\_\_\_\_

8. How often do you usually drive?

Everyday or almost every day

A few times a year

A few days a week

Never

A few days a month

9. Question 9 has several parts and is not a sole question:

Have you taken/are you taking any of the following types of classes at Bridgewater State University:	
9a. A class that focuses on race or ethnicity? (ex. "Race, Class, Crime, & Justice")	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
9b. A class that spends time discussing race/ethnicity or race/ethnic relations?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
9c. I've never taken a class where race/ethnicity is discussed.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No



10. Have you ever attended a college or university besides Bridgewater State University?

Yes (if you select this option, then answer 10a., 10b., and 10c. located below this question and then answer questions 11 and 12)

No (if you select this option, then please move on to question 11 and then skip question 12)

<p>Have you taken any/are you taking any of the following types of classes during your time at any college or university that you attended that is <b>not</b> Bridgewater State University:</p>	
<p>10a. A class that focuses on race or ethnicity? (ex. Race, Class, Crime, &amp; Justice)</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>10b. A class that spends time discussing race/ethnicity or race/ethnic relations?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>10c. I have never taken a class where race/ethnicity is discussed.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>

11. Do you read local news or national news in a newspaper or other published outlet? This includes web news or content read online.

Yes-How many days per week\_\_\_\_\_ How many hours per week\_\_\_\_\_

No

12. Do you watch the local news?

Yes-How many days per week\_\_\_\_\_ How many hours per week\_\_\_\_\_

No

13. Do you watch national news (examples: CNN, FOX, MSNBC, ABC World News, etc)

Yes-How many days per week\_\_\_\_\_ How many hours per week\_\_\_\_\_

No

14. Do you watch fictional crime dramas such as CSI, Law and Order SVU, Criminal Minds, NCIS, etc?

- Yes-How many days per week\_\_\_\_\_ How many hours per week\_\_\_\_\_
- No

## General Police-Related Questions

(Please answer the following general questions regarding your contacts with police.)

1. Have you had **any** contact with police within the **past 12 months**:

- Yes (if you select this option, then please answer question 2 and progress through the questionnaire)  
 No (if you select this option, then please answer 1a and then move to the “**Police Behaviors**” section)

1a. If you have not had contact with police within the past 12 months, have you ever had contact with police?

- Yes  
 No

2. Do you know any police officers that work in your neighborhood by name or sight?

- Yes  
 No

3. Question 3 has several parts and is not a sole question:

Within the <b>past 12 months</b> , have you...	
3a. reported any kind of crime, disturbance, or suspicious activity to the police?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
3b. reported a non-crime emergency such as a traffic accident or medical emergency to police?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
3c. Participated in block watch or other anti-crime programs WITH police?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
3d. Been stopped by the police while in a public place, but not in a vehicle that was moving vehicle? (this includes a parked vehicle)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
3e. Been stopped by the police while driving a motor vehicle?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
3f. Been the passenger in a motor vehicle that was stopped by the police?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
3g. Been involved in a traffic accident that was reported to the police?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
3i. Been arrested?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

4. How many times in the past 12 months have you made face-to-face contact with police? (please write in your answer)

---

## Street Stops

**STOP!** You will only answer this section if your most recent contact with police within the past 12 months was a street stop, also known as a stop by police that occurred in a public place but not in the vehicle.

1. Has your most recent police contact (**within the past 12 months**) been a street stop (refer to the text in the parenthesis above for a better explanation of what a street stop is):

No (If you select this answer, then please move to the section titled “**traffic stop**”):

Yes (If you select this answer, then please answer question 1a below)

1a. How many times **within the past 12 months** have your contacts with police been a street stop?  
(please write in your answer)

---

2. If you had contact with police while in a public place but not a vehicle within the past 12 months, did the police give a reason for stopping you?

Yes

No

3. If you had contact with police while in a public place but not a vehicle within the past 12 months, were there any other persons with you at the time of the stop?

Yes (If you select this answer, then please answer question 3a below)

No

3a. How many people were with you at the time of the stop? (please write in your answer)

---

4. Question 4 has several parts and is not a sole question:

If you had contact with police in the <b>past 12 months</b> in a public place (but not in a motor vehicle):	
4a. Did the police/were the police suspect you of something?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
4b. Did the police/were the police match you to the description of something they were looking for?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
4c. Did the police/were the police seeking information about another person?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
4d. Did the police/were the police investigating a crime?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
4e. Did the police/were the police providing a service or assistance to you?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
4f. Did someone you were with match the description of someone the police were looking for?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
4g. Was someone you were with suspected of something?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

5. At the beginning of your most recent contact with police, was there one or more than one officer present?

- Yes  
 No

6. Would you say the police officer(s) had a legitimate reason for stopping you?

- Yes  
 No

7. Please answer only question 7a or 7b; determine which question to answer by reading through question 7a and its first answer choice)

7a. If there was one police officer involved, would you say that the officer was... (please select all that apply)

- (If there was more than one officer involved, please select this option and answer question 7b)
- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Asian                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Native American, Alaskan, Pacific Islander |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Black or African American | <input type="checkbox"/> White                                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hispanic, Latino          | <input type="checkbox"/> Other                                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Middle Eastern, Arabic    | <input type="checkbox"/> Not sure                                   |

7b. If there was more than one police officer involved, what were the races of the officers involved? (please select all that apply)

- (If there was only one officer involved, please select this option, then answer question 7a, and then move on to question 8 after that)
- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Asian                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Native American, Alaskan, Pacific Islander |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Black or African American | <input type="checkbox"/> White                                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hispanic, Latino          | <input type="checkbox"/> Other                                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Middle Eastern, Arabic    | <input type="checkbox"/> Not sure                                   |

8. What time of the day did this contact occur?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> During day: After 6 a.m. – 12 noon   | <input type="checkbox"/> After 12 midnight – 6 a.m.      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> After 12 noon – 6 p.m.               | <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know what time of night   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know what time of day          | <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know whether day or night |
| <input type="checkbox"/> At night: After 6 p.m. – 12 midnight |  |

9. Did this stop occur in the same city or town where you live?

- Yes  
 No

10. How long did this stop last? (please write in your answer by using hours and minutes; for example, 1 hour and 20 minutes)

---

11. Do you believe this stop was an appropriate amount of time?

- Yes  No, too short  
 No, too long  Don't know

### Street Stop Outcome

**STOP** You will only answer this section if your most recent contact with police within the past 12 months was a street stop, also known as a stop by police that occurred in a public place but not in the vehicle. This section will ask you about the outcome of your most recent contact with police.)

12. During your most recent contact with police were you ticketed or given a warning?

- Yes  
 No

13. If you were given a warning, what type of warning was it?

- N/A (you were not given a warning during this contact)  Both  
 Verbal  Neither  
 Written  Don't know

14. Did the police give you a direct command during this contact?

- Yes  Don't know  
 No

15. Did you comply with the request of the police officer(s)?

- Yes  Don't know  
 No



16. Question 16 has several parts and is not a sole question:

Which of these factors influenced how you responded to the request by the officer:	
16a. Was it because it was a police officer?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
16b. Was it because the officer was respectful or considerate?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
16c. Was it because you believed that the officer was being fair?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
16d. Was it because the officer convinced you it was the right thing to do?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
16e. Was it because the officer was trying to help?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
16f. Was it because the officer yelled at you?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
16g. Was it because the officer handcuffed you?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
16h. Was it because the officer threatened to use a weapon?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
16i. Was it because the officer issued another threat?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
16j. Was it because the officer aimed a weapon at you?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
16k. Was it because you don't trust the police (for example, you thought that they were going to abuse their power)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Which of these factors influenced how you responded to the request by the officer:	
16l. Was it because the police were hassling you? (for example,	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

the police kept trying to intimate you and belittle you)	
16m. Was it because you were already late for something? (for example, you were running late for a doctor's appointment and you just wanted to end the contact with police as fast as possible)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
16n. Was it because the officer was not helpful?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
16o. Was it because the officer was not respectful or considerate?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
16p. Was it because the officer was not being fair?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
16q. Was it because it was not the right thing to do?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

17. Question 17 has several parts and is not a sole question:

During the contact, did the police officer:	
17a. Shout at you?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
17b. Curse at you?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
17c. Threaten to arrest you?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
17d. Threaten you with [a ticket/other tickets]?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
During the contact, did the police officer:	
17e. Threaten to use force against use?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

17f. Actually push or grab you?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
17g. Handcuff you?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
17h. Actually kick or hit you?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
17i. Actually spray you with a chemical or pepper spray?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
17j. Actually use an electroshock weapon against you, such as a stun gun?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
17k. Actually point a gun at you?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

18. Do you feel that any of the force used or threatened against you was excessive?

Yes

No

19. Question 19 has several parts and is not a sole question:

At any time during this contact, did you...	
19a. Disobey or interfere with the officer(s)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
19b. Try to get away?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
19c. Push, grab, or hit the police officer(s)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
19d. Resist being handcuffed, arrested, or searched?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
19e. Complain to the officer(s)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
At any time during this contact, did you...	
19f. Argue with the police officer(s)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

19g. Curse at, insult, or verbally threaten the police officer(s)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
--	--

20. Were you injured as a result of this contact?

- Yes
- No

21. If you were injured as a result of the contact, did you seek medical attention for your injuries?

- N/A (I was not injured as a result of the contact)
- Yes
- No (I was injured and received medical attention for my injuries)

22. Were you arrested during this contact?

- Yes
- No

23. At any time during this stop, did the police officer(s) actually search you, frisk you, or pat you down?

- Yes
- No

24. At any time during this stop, did the police officer(s) ask for permission to search you, frisk you, or pat you down?

- Yes
- No

25. If you were searched, frisked, or patted down during the police contact: do you think that the police officer(s) had a legitimate reason to do so?

- N/A (I was not searched, frisked, or patted down during the police contact)
- Yes
- No

26. If the police searched you, did they find any illegal items (for example, drugs or weapons)?

- N/A (the police did not search you)
- Yes
- No

27. If you were arrested and searched, did the search occur before you were arrested?

- N/A (you were not arrested during the contact)
- Yes
- No

## Traffic Stop

**STOP!** You will only answer this section if your most recent contact with police within the past 12 months was a traffic stop, also known as a stop by police that occurred while you were in a motor vehicle that was moving. This section will ask you about the outcome of your most recent contact with police.

1. Has your most recent police contact (**within the past 12 months**) been a traffic stop (refer to the text in the parenthesis above for a better explanation of what a traffic stop is):

No (If you select this answer, then please move to the section titled “**voluntary and special involuntary contacts**”)

Yes (If you select this answer, then please answer question 1a below)

1a. How many times **within the past 12 months** have your contacts with police been a traffic stop?  
(please write in your answer)

---

2. At the beginning of your most recent contact with police, was there one or more than one officer present?

Yes

No

3. Would you say the police officer(s) had a legitimate reason for stopping you?

Yes

No

4. Please answer only question 4a or 4b; determine which question to answer by reading through question 7a and its first answer choice)

4a. If there was one police officer involved, would you say that the officer was... (please select all that apply)

- (If there was more than one officer involved, please select this option and answer question 4b)
- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Asian                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Native American, Alaskan, Pacific Islander |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Black or African American | <input type="checkbox"/> White                                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hispanic, Latino          | <input type="checkbox"/> Other                                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Middle Eastern, Arabic    | <input type="checkbox"/> Not sure                                   |

4b. If there was more than one police officer involved, what were the races of the officers involved? (please select all that apply)

- (If there was only one officer involved, please select this option, then answer question 4a, and then move on to question 5 after that)
- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Asian                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Native American, Alaskan, Pacific Islander |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Black or African American | <input type="checkbox"/> White                                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hispanic, Latino          | <input type="checkbox"/> Other                                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Middle Eastern, Arabic    | <input type="checkbox"/> Not sure                                   |

5. What time of the day did this contact occur?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> During day: After 6 a.m. – 12 noon   | <input type="checkbox"/> After 12 midnight – 6 a.m.      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> After 12 noon – 6 p.m.               | <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know what time of night   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know what time of day          | <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know whether day or night |
| <input type="checkbox"/> At night: After 6 p.m. – 12 midnight |  |

6. Did this stop occur in the same city or town where you live?

- Yes  
 No

7. How long did this stop last? (please write in your answer by using hours and minutes; for example, 1 hour and 20 minutes)

---

8. Do you believe this stop was an appropriate amount of time?

- Yes
  No, too short  
 No, too long
  Don't know

9. Were there any other persons with you at the time of the stop in the motor vehicle?

- Yes (if you select this option, then please answer question 9a)  
 No (if you select this option, then please move on to question 10)

9a. If you answered "Yes" to question 9, how many people were with you at the time of the stop? (please write in the answer)

---

10. Question 10 has several parts and is not a sole question:

Was the reason for your stop because of:	
10a. Speeding?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
10b. A vehicle defect?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
10c. A record check (for example, a license plate, driver's license, or vehicle registration)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
10d. A roadside check for drunk drivers?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
10e. A seatbelt violation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
10f. An illegal turn or illegal lane change?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
10g. A stop sign or stop light violation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
10h. using a cell phone while driving?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No



## Traffic Stop Outcome

**STOP!** You will only answer this section if your most recent contact with police within the past 12 months was a traffic stop, also known as a stop by police that occurred while you were in a motor vehicle that was moving. This section will ask you about the outcome of your most recent contact with police.

11. During your most recent contact with police were you given a traffic ticket (this does not include any type of warning)?

- Yes
- No

12. If you were given a warning, what type of warning was it?

- N/A (you were not given a warning during this contact)
- Verbal
- Written
- Both
- Neither
- Don't know

13. Did the you get out of the vehicle at any time because the police asked or told you to do so?

- Yes
- No

14. Question 14 has several parts and is not a sole question:

During the contact, did the police officer:	
14a. Shout at you?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
14b. Curse at you?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
14c. Threaten to arrest you?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
14d. Threaten you with [a ticket/other tickets]?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
14e. Threaten to use force against you?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
14f. Actually push or grab you?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
14g. Handcuff you?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
14h. Actually kick or hit you?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

15. Question 15 has several parts and is not a sole question:

At any time during this contact, did you:	
15a. Disobey or interfere with the officer(s)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
15b. Try to get away?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
15c. Push, grab, or hit the police officer(s)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
15d. Resist being handcuffed, arrested, or searched?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
15e. Complain to the officer(s)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
15f. Argue with the police officer(s)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
15g. Curse at, insult, or verbally threaten the police officer(s)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

16. Were you injured as a result of this contact?

Yes

No

17. Did you seek medical attention for these injuries?

N/A (You were not injured during this contact)

Yes

No

18. During this contact, were you arrested?

Yes

No

19. Question 19 has several parts and is not a sole question:

At any time during this stop, did the police officer(s):	
19a. Actually conduct a vehicle search?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
19b. Ask permission to conduct a vehicle search?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
19c. Actually search you, frisk you, or pat you down?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
19d. Ask permission to search you, frisk you, or pat you down?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

20. Do you think the police officer(s) had a legitimate reason to search the vehicle?

N/A (they did not search the vehicle)

Yes

No

21. Do you think the police officer(s) had a legitimate reason to search you, frisk you, or pat you down?

N/A (you were not searched)

Yes

No

22. During the search, did the police officer(s) find any illegal items, such as a weapon or drugs?

N/A (you were not searched)

Yes

No

23. If you were arrested and searched: did the search occur before you were arrested?

N/A (you were not searched and arrested)

Yes

No

## Voluntary and Special Involuntary Contacts

**STOP!** You will only answer this section if your most recent contact with police within the past 12 months was either a voluntary police contact or a special involuntary contact. Voluntary police contact is when you initiate contact with police on your own will. An example of a voluntary contact would be if you walked/drove up to a police officer and asked him or her for directions to the nearest gas station. A special involuntary contact is contact with police that does not take fit into the categories of either “street stops” or “traffic stops”. An example special involuntary contact with police would be if the police knocked on the door of your home because they were doing an investigation and you talked to them.)

1. Was your most recent contact with police within the **past 12 months involuntary and not** a street stop (in a public place but not in a motor vehicle that was moving)/traffic stop (within a motor vehicle that was moving)? (for example, you were in a house and the police showed up and initiated contact with you or somebody with you):

- Yes (if you select this option then please move on to the “**police behaviors**” section)
- No (if you select this option then please continue on with the questionnaire by answering the next question)

2. Has your most recent police contact (**within the past 12 months**) been a voluntary contact (refer to the text in the parenthesis above for a better explanation of what a voluntary contact is):

No (If you select this answer, then please move to the section titled “**police behaviors**”)

Yes (If you select this answer, then please answer question 1a below)

- 2a. How many times **within the past 12 months** have your contacts with police been a voluntary contact? (please write in your answer)

---

3. Was your voluntary contact with police face-to-face?

- Yes
- No

4. How did you contact the police?

- Called the police
- Went to the police station
- Officer came to respondent's house
- Other
- Don't remember

5. Were the police helpful?

- Yes
- No

6. Did the situation improve after you contacted the police?

- Yes
- No

7. Were you satisfied with the police response during your most recent contact?

- Yes
- No

8. Would you be more likely, less likely, or just as likely to contact the police in the future for a SIMILAR problem?

- More likely to call
- Less likely to call
- Just as likely to call
- Don't know

9. Would you be more likely, less likely, or just as likely to contact the police in the future for a DIFFERENT problem?

- More likely to call
- Less likely to call
- Just as likely to call
- Don't know

10. What time of the day did this contact occur?

- During day: After 6 a.m. – 12 noon
- After 12 noon – 6 p.m.
- Don't know what time of day
- At night: After 6 p.m. – 12 midnight
- After 12 midnight – 6 a.m.
- Don't know what time of night
- Don't know whether day or night

11. How long did this contact last? (please write in your answer by using hours and minutes; for example, 1 hour and 20 minutes)

---

12. Do you believe the police spent an appropriate amount of time with you?

- Yes
- No, too much time

- No, too little time
- Don't know

## Police Behaviors

Please answer the following questions regarding your experiences/opinions of the police. If you have not had any contact with police in the last 12 months please skip to question 8.

1. Looking back on your most recent contact with police, do you feel the police behaved properly?  
 Yes  Don't know  
 No
2. Did you file a complaint against the police following the last contact you had with police?  
 Yes  
 No
3. With whom did you file the complaint?  
 Police  Don't know  
 Review Board
4. Looking back on this most recent contact with police, do you feel the police treated you respectfully?  
 Yes  Don't know  
 No
5. Would you say you have...  
 Great respect for police  No opinion  
 Little respect for police  Don't know  
 Mixed feelings for police
6. Has your opinion of police changed because your most recent contact with them?  
 Yes  Don't know  
 No
7. If your opinion of the police has changed because the most recent contact with them – how so?  
 You now think more positive of them  You now have mixed feelings about them  
 You think more negative of them  Don't know
8. Which one of these parties or instances most influences your opinions about police?  
 Your own experiences  The media  
 Other people's experiences  Don't know

9. How much do you respect the police?
- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> A lot to completely         | <input type="checkbox"/> Not a lot to very little |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mixed feelings to a lot     | <input type="checkbox"/> Not little to not at all |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mixed feelings              | <input type="checkbox"/> No opinion               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mixed feelings to not a lot | <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know               |
10. How confident are you in your local police to protect you?
- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Complete confidence | <input type="checkbox"/> Not that confident |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Very confident      | <input type="checkbox"/> Not very confident |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Pretty confident    | <input type="checkbox"/> No opinion         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mixed feelings      | <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know         |
11. Do you think the police are...
- |  |                                     |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> More honest than most people                    | <input type="checkbox"/> No opinion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> About the same as most people<br>(honesty-wise) | <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less honest than most people                    |                                     |
12. How honest do you think police officers GENERALLY ARE?
- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Completely honest | <input type="checkbox"/> Mixed feelings  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Very honest       | <input type="checkbox"/> Not that honest |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Pretty honest     | <input type="checkbox"/> Not very honest |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Not honest at all |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No opinion        |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know        |  |
13. Do you believe that the police where you live should be...
- |   |                                     |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> More involved within community     | <input type="checkbox"/> No opinion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less involved within the community | <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mixed feelings                     |                                     |
14. Do you believe that the local police in your place of residency should be
- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Doing a great job         | <input type="checkbox"/> Doing a poor job |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Doing a decent job        | <input type="checkbox"/> No opinion       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mixed feelings            | <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Doing a below-average job |   |



15. Do you believe that, generally, the police in your state of residency are
- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Doing a great job         | <input type="checkbox"/> Doing a poor job |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Doing a decent job        | <input type="checkbox"/> No opinion       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mixed feelings            | <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Doing a below-average job |   |
16. Do you believe that the police in the United States (as a whole, excluding outliers)
- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Doing a great job         | <input type="checkbox"/> Doing a poor job |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Doing a decent job        | <input type="checkbox"/> No opinion       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mixed feelings            | <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Doing a below-average job |   |
17. How common do you think police corruption is within the United States?
- Prevalent
  - Very common
  - Common
  - Uncommon
  - Very uncommon
  - Only a few cases per year
  - Non-existent
  - No opinion
  - Don't know

This completes the questionnaire. Please bring the questionnaire to the surveyor. Thank you for your cooperation