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Chapter 1: Introduction

Introduction

This study was an examination of the impact of three environmental factors and three personal characteristics of the parties involved in a police-citizen encounter and allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters that were filed in 2008 in an urban U.S. city. Policing differs from most professions because of the legal authority police officers have to use deadly force. The visible display of the tools of the police trade (i.e., firearm, conducted energy device, baton, pepper spray/mace, handcuffs, etc.), worn around the officer’s waist, foretells the danger, violence, and interpersonal conflict inherent in police work. On occasion, police service leads to conflict between police and the citizens they serve. Most people understand that the use of force is inherent in police work (Lindgren, 1981; Manning, 1980). As such, police officers must be mentally and physically prepared to carry out this sensitive aspect of policing.

Sometimes, police-citizen conflict may lead police to use force to control the encounter. The uncomfortable truth is that using force gently is not possible, and people may die as the result of police use of force. The grant of state authority that permits police officers to take a human life comes with a great responsibility to ensure the police officer’s decision to use force, and the amount of force he or she uses, is appropriate in the given situation. Police use of inappropriate or excessive force can lead to civil disorder and is an impediment to productive police-community relations. As an example,
several shootings involving New York City area police officers over the past 13 years have sparked community unrest and call for greater accountability over police use of force. While the following cases may represent the extreme of possible outcomes of police-citizen engagements, they are helpful in highlighting the need for continuous study in the area.

On February 4, 1999, an unarmed male named Amadou Diallo was shot at 41 times and killed by four New York Police Department (NYPD) police officers. Mr. Diallo was retrieving his wallet from his pocket when he was killed by the officers (Cooper, 1999). On November 25, 2006, three unarmed males were shot at 50 times by five NYPD police officers. One of the males, Sean Bell, was killed. The males, seated in Mr. Bell’s vehicle, were trying to maneuver around unmarked police rental vehicles that intentionally blocked Mr. Bell’s vehicle from leaving a parking space (McFadden, 2006).

On October 17, 2010, an unarmed male named Danroy “DJ” Henry, Jr., was shot at and killed by two police officers in Westchester County as he drove away from a fire zone located near a bar in Pleasantville, NY. One of the officers, while on the hood of Mr. Henry’s vehicle, fired several times through the front windshield, killing Mr. Henry (Guilfoil, 2011). While these three instances involved unarmed citizens, police use of deadly force during this 13-year period in the New York City area included the killing of armed individuals as well.

Police also used deadly force in mistaken identity shootings of armed off-duty police officers. On January 25, 2008, off-duty City of Mount Vernon Police Officer Christopher Ridley was mistaken for an armed suspect by four on-duty Westchester County Department of Public Safety Police Officers and shot. At the time of the
shooting, Police Officer Ridley was making an off-duty arrest of a suspect who assaulted a citizen on a street in the city of White Plains, N.Y. (Standora, 2008).

On May 28, 2009, off-duty NYPD Police Officer Omar Edwards was mistaken for an armed suspect by on-duty NYPD police officers and shot. Although three NYPD officers were present, only one fired upon Police Officer Edwards. At the time of the shooting, Police Officer Edwards was in foot pursuit of a suspect he discovered rifling through his personal vehicle (Gendar, Pearson, Paddock, & Standora, 2009)

The police officers in the Diallo and Bell shootings were acquitted of criminal charges in connection with the deaths of Mr. Diallo and Mr. Bell. A state grand jury in the Henry case failed to indict the two officers. The case is under review by the federal government. The police and prosecutor investigations into the shootings of Police Officer Ridley and Police Officer Edwards determined the police officer shooters acted within statutory guidelines and therefore would not face criminal charges. No attempt was made during the investigation of these incidents to determine the role the “place” or neighborhood/community environment might have played in producing or exacerbating conflict in the encounters, with the resulting use of force.

The community in which the police-citizen encounters occurs helps shape an individual’s perceptions of the other party in the encounter. The neighborhood or community in which the encounter occurs influences the number and type of police-citizen interactions (Warren, 2008). Understanding the neighborhood impact on verbal conflict in police-citizen encounters can be instructive in developing more effective engagement strategies or de-escalation techniques to help police officers better manage
interpersonal conflict and thus help to avoid the escalation of such encounters into those involving the use of physical force.

**Problem Statement**

Numerous researchers have examined police use of force but have directed little attention to the predictors of verbal conflict or to the initial decision-making of the participants involved in police-citizen encounters that have resulted in physical violence. Even less attention has focused on the place or context in which police-citizen encounters occur. The objectives of this study was to identify factors associated with verbal conflict in police-citizen encounters, using a community or neighborhood environmental perspective.

The city that is the focus of the study is urban and complex. The resident population and those who visit, work, or recreate in the city are diverse (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). The many people from different backgrounds and life experiences who live, work, or interact with one another will on occasion experience conflict. Police officers are not immune from the social missteps attendant to working in a multicultural, multiracial, and multiethnic environment. Police officers, whether city residents or residing near the city, are exposed to and are likely affected by the city’s environment in a manner similar to those who reside or work in the city.

Police officers spend a significant part of their day patrolling neighborhoods and responding to calls for service, during which they encounter crime victims, perpetrators of violence, and those committing other criminal or disorderly acts. The literature suggested the environment influences people. As such, influences on an officer’s decision-making include the police officer’s exposure to danger and violence, the effects
thereof, and the demographic characteristics and economic conditions of the neighborhood the officer patrols (Dunham, Alpert, Stroshine & Bennett, 2005; Parker, MacDonald, Alpert, Smith, & Piquero, 2004; Sobol, 2010; Wilson, 2009).

Theoretical Rationale

Terrill and Reisig (2003) viewed theories that explain police officer behavior in three broad categories: sociological, psychological, and organizational. Discussion of the literature reviewed in these three categories is in Chapter 2. The focus here is to introduce the two theories that informed the research concerning the relationship of the place of the encounter (neighborhood/community) and verbal conflict during police-citizen encounters.

Austin Turk, a conflict theorist, studied interactions among groups. Turk developed a theory of *norm resistance* to explain how factors surrounding encounters could be manipulated to produce different probabilities of overt conflict between authorities and those subject to the authorities (Lanza-Kaduce & Greenleaf, 1994; Turk, 1966, 1969; Weidner & Terrill, 2005). Turk believed the norm announcers, (i.e., legislators or those who influence the legislative process) obtain compliance with laws because individuals under their jurisdiction accept the law as the result of the legislative process or are aware of the sanctions imposed on those who defy the power structure. Turk distinguished subjects from authorities by the subject’s “inability to influence the process of norm creation or enforcement, even though the norms in question directly affect their life chances” (Turk, 1969, p. 33). Turk also distinguished between cultural norms, which define appropriate behavior, and social norms, indicating conformance to appropriate behavior via threat or sanctions. Behavior is learned experientially through
unsuccessful challenges to authorities such as police or the courts or through socialization.

With respect to the relationship between authorities and subjects, Turk theorized the likelihood of conflict between the two could be explained by examining the difference in their cultural and social norms. Turk (1969) believed, “The greater the cultural difference, the greater the probability of conflict” (p. 54) notion used to explain conflict did not go far enough. He discussed four possible situations, each with a different potential for conflict:

1. The cultural and social norms of the authorities and subjects are substantially different. Where each group’s behavior conforms to a substantially different set of rules/beliefs, conflict between the groups is more likely.

2. The behavior of authorities and subjects varies from their stated rules and beliefs. Where each group’s actions do not conform to their stated beliefs, conflict is less likely.

3. The behavior of authorities is consistent with their stated rules and beliefs while the same is not true of subjects. Here, conflict is more likely.

4. The behavior of subjects is consistent with their rules and beliefs, however, those rules and beliefs have little impact on the behavior of the authorities. Here, conflict is less likely.

Turk identified two additional factors affecting the likelihood of conflict between authorities and those subject to the authorities. The first factor is how well the individual is organized. Turk theorized an individual is less likely to change his behavior, particularly when others or witnesses are present, if the others support his actions. The
second factor is the sophistication of the individual. Turk defined sophistication as an individual’s ability to get what he wants from the authority or prevent the authority from totally achieving its goals (Turk, 1969). Turk posited conflict was most likely when subjects were highly organized and less sophisticated than authorities, and least likely when subjects were unorganized and sophisticated.

Turk also believed some factors, when added to or subtracted from positional authority, affect the likelihood of overt conflict between authorities and subjects (Kowalski & Lundman, 2008; Turk, 1966, 1969). The structural reinforcers, for example, White police officer, Black citizen, and reversals for example, Black police officer, White citizen, that increase or decrease the authority of the individual in the authority position affect the relationship between the authority and subject (Kowalski & Lundman, 2008).

Four empirical tests of Tuck’s theory of norm resistance appeared in the literature (Kowalski & Lundman, 2008). Some researchers believed Turk’s theory was not tested more often because defining the theory’s concepts was difficult (Weidner & Terrill, 2005). Greenleaf and Lanza-Kaduce (1995) and Lanza-Kaduce and Greenleaf (2000) conducted two of the four empirical tests of Tuck’s theory of norm resistance, while Kowalski and Lundman (2008) and Weidner and Terrill (2005) each conducted one.

Greenleaf and Lanza-Kaduce (1995) tested the theory’s assertions about organization, which they defined as multiple arrests, legal relationship between combatants, position arrestee holds in household, and similar, and sophistication, which was the subject’s impairment, or information police obtained about the incident prior to the officer’s arrival at the scene, of both authorities and subjects in analyzing the
Charleston Police Department’s (CPD) domestic disturbance incident reports from 1988 through 1991. The CPD had a “must arrest” policy for perpetrators of domestic violence. The researchers posed four hypotheses:

1. Norm resistance is more likely when there is greater social support for the subject or greater complexity in the subject’s role,

2. Norm resistance is more likely when officers and citizens are less sophisticated,

3. Public visibility of the police-citizen encounter increases the chances of norm resistance, and

4. Indicators of offensiveness are likely to be related to norm resistance.

Greenleaf and Lanza-Kaduce (1995) found support for Turk’s theory on organization and sophistication. However, they acknowledged their challenge in the operationalization of organization and sophistication and recommended the need to conduct additional research in this area.

The second empirical test of Turk’s theory was again conducted by Lanza-Kaduce and Greenleaf (2000). They applied Tuck’s theory of norm resistance to assess the impact of race and age on police-citizen conflict. The researchers made two assumptions. First, authority of government officials, including police, rests in their position. Second, Americans are socialized to defer to older persons and to Whites. Although the researchers acknowledged some decline in deference over the years, 76.2% of Americans still endorse these general principles of deference (Nevitte, 1996). The researchers hypothesized:
1. Police-citizen conflict is lowest when the positional authority of officers is supported by or is consistent with social norms of deference,

2. Police-citizen conflict is highest when positional authority is undermined by social norms of deference, and

3. The likelihood of police-citizen conflict is mid-range when there is a neutral impact on positional authority, meaning positional authority is neither enhanced nor undercut by deference norms or reversals and reinforcers cancel each other out (Lanza-Kaduce & Greenleaf, 2000).

Lanza-Kaduce and Greenleaf (2000) noted several shortcomings with the methodology chosen to conduct the study, including small sample size, police-citizen interactions limited to domestic disturbances calls, southern culture, and others. The researchers expressed caution about drawing conclusions from the results of their study, which indicated support for Tuck’s theory of structural reinforcers and reversals. Age and race deference patterns that reversed or countered positional authority resulted in more resistance and deference norms that reinforced positional authority and resulted in less resistance (Lanza-Kaduce & Greenleaf, 2000).

The third empirical study also tested the impact of organization and sophistication on the likelihood of conflict in police-citizen encounters. Weidner and Terrill (2005) found support for hypotheses 1 and 2 but not for 3 and called for additional research (Weidner & Terrill, 2005). The hypotheses suggested

1. Conflict is greater where there is a lot of social support for the citizen and/or the citizen’s role is more complex,
2. The more sophisticated the parties, the greater their ability to avoid conflict, and

3. Displays of conflict will decrease when positional authority is supported by race, age, sex, and wealth deference norms, and will increase when it is undermined by these deference norms.

Kowalski and Lundman (2008) conducted an empirical study examining the impact of structural reinforcers and reversals on citizens’ views of the lawfulness and propriety of police actions during vehicle stops. The researchers hypothesized: (a) structural reinforcers increase the likelihood that a citizen will believe they were stopped for a legitimate reason and that the officer behaved appropriately, and (b) structural reversals reduce the likelihood that a citizen will believe they were stopped for a legitimate reason and that the officer behaved appropriately. Kowalski and Lundman found support for Turk’s theory regarding organization and sophistication but not the impact of the structural reinforcers and reversals of age, gender, and race.

In summary, one empirical study tested Turks’ theory of organization and sophistication, one empirical study tested Tuck’s theory of structural reinforcers and reversals, and two empirical studies tested organization, sophistication, structural reinforcers, and structural reversals. The three studies that tested Turk’s theory of organization and sophistication showed support for his theory (Greenleaf & Lanza-Kaduce, 1995; Kowalski & Lundman, 2008; Weidner & Terrill, 2005). Of the three empirical studies testing Turk’s theory of structural reinforcers and reversals, two found no support for Turk’s theory. The single study that showed support for Turk’s theory acknowledged the study’s methodological shortcomings and cautioned against drawing
conclusions from the findings (Kowalski & Lundman, 2008; Lanza-Kaduce & Greenleaf, 2000; Weidner & Terrill, 2005)

The second theorists, Sykes and Clark (1975), posited a theory of deference exchange that occurs during police-citizen encounters. Deference includes the parties showing appreciation and appropriate behavior to the encounter. Sykes and Clark’s theory focused on the social position each individual occupied in relation to the other. The researchers asserted the average encounter between a police officer and a citizen is shaped by an unequal or asymmetrical status norm in which the amount of deference shown by the two parties is contingent upon the status each has, relative to the other.

The assumption in the theory suggests that oftentimes, police occupy a higher status than do the citizens with whom they interact. The assumption is generally based on the officer’s job, which has state conferred power and authority, or in some cases, by the officer’s socioeconomic status. Thus, police officers show a smaller amount of deference to citizens, when compared to the amount of deference they expect from the citizen. If the citizen resists how the officer defines them during the encounter, the police officer can force that definition upon the recalcitrant civilian. Ultimately, police officers can unilaterally change the role the citizen plays in the encounter. Police have the power to arrest, which enables the officer to maintain his/her authority and concurrently redefine the civilian’s identity. By using the power of arrest, the police officer changes the relationship from police officer-citizen to police officer-perpetrator (Hudson, 1970).

Sykes and Clark’s (1975) theory of deference exchange poses the difference in the status of one’s position influences the quantity and direction flow of deference in police-citizen encounters. The researchers suggested most people generally understand the
rules governing deference between people. In police-citizen encounters, an understanding is reached among the participants, permitting each to possess an identity that is respected by the other (Hudson, 1970). Context also influences the rules of deference. Sykes and Clark (1975) theorized:

- Citizens who call for police service express some deference to the officer for responding to his/her call for service.
- If a person, alleged to be a violator, is present at the scene when the officer arrives, the alleged violator is assumed to have failed to display deference to his/her fellow citizens.
- A violator’s requirement to show deference is related to the alleged offense. The greater the offense, the more deference s/he must show.
- Police-citizen encounters involving people of color are complex. Police and people of color share mutual expectations and obligations regarding deference. An unbiased police officer’s expectation of deference from a person of color may be interpreted by the citizen as an expression of the officer’s superiority. Refusal by a person of color to express deference to the officer may be interpreted by the officer as the citizen’s refusal to respect society’s general social obligation to respect the officer’s symbolic status.

The two theories that guided the study complement one another. Both theories examined the position or status of each party to an encounter, relative to the other. Turk’s theory was developed in the context of super-ordinate and subordinate relationships, while Sykes and Clark’s theory focused specifically on police officer-citizen encounters. The theories differed in Turk’s belief that the nature of the
relationship could be enhanced or diminished. The likelihood of conflict can be increased or decreased by structural reinforcers, structural reversals, organization, and sophistication. Turk believed certain factors, such as age, race, gender, the presence of witnesses or associates of the subordinate, and the ability of both parties to manipulate the other, could either increase or decrease the positional authority in super-ordinate and subordinate encounters. Sykes and Clark’s theory did not make such allowances. Sykes and Clark believed the actual or perceived failure of individuals of a lesser social status to display the requisite deference dictated by general social norms leads to conflict.

**Significance of the Study**

Service lies at the foundation of policing. To be effective in crime control and order maintenance, police officers need the support and cooperation of those they serve. Police officers who are unprofessional, disrespectful, discourteous, or display incivility undermine police-community relations and hamper their own ability to accomplish a mission. This research may help police officers avoid the landmines inherent in interpersonal communication by identifying environmental factors or personal characteristics associated with conflict in police-citizen encounters. The findings might help law enforcement agencies develop more effective training and citizen engagement strategies, enhance police officers’ interpersonal skills, better manage conflict, and guide decision-making with respect to police use of force.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of the study was to identify factors or conditions present in the City’s neighborhoods and communities associated with allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters. Interpretation of the
citizen complaint data was informed by Turks’ (1966, 1969) theory of norm resistance and Sykes and Clark’s (1975) theory of deference exchange.

Research Questions

The following questions guided this study:

1. Does the socioeconomic status of the community where the police-citizen encounter occurs have an impact on allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters?

2. Does the time of day, segmented into the timeframes of 7:00 a.m.–2:59 p.m. (day shift), 3:00 p.m.–10:59 p.m. (night shift), and 11:00 p.m.–6:59 a.m. (midnight shift), have an impact on allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters?

3. Does the day of the week, segmented into the periods of Sunday through Wednesday (midweek), and Thursday through Saturday (weekend), have an impact on allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters?

4. Does gender of the citizen and police officer have an impact on allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters?

5. Does age of the citizen and police officer have an impact on allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters?
6. Does race of the citizen and police officer have an impact on allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters?

Definitions of Terms

**Abuse of authority.** Use of police powers to intimidate or otherwise mistreat a civilian, including improper street stops, frisks, searches, the issuance of retaliatory summonses, and unwarranted threats of arrest.

**Compstat.** A crime control strategy developed by the New York Police Department, which has the guiding principles of (a) accurate and timely intelligence, (b) rapid deployment of personnel and resources, (c) effective tactics, and (d) relentless follow-up.

**Conflict.** The filing of a civilian complaint against a police officer for discourtesy or offensive language.

**Discourtesy.** Inappropriate behavior or verbal conduct by an officer, including rude or obscene gestures, vulgar words, and curses.

**Force.** The use of unnecessary or excessive might or roughness, up to and including deadly force.

**Offensive language.** Slurs, derogatory remarks, or gestures based upon a person’s sexual orientation, race, ethnicity, religion, gender, or disability.

**Terry stop.** The police practice of using force if necessary to stop, question, and under certain circumstances, conduct a protective pat-down or frisk of an individual on less than probable cause.
**Workload.** Calls for service that police personnel address over the course of a shift, a 24-hour period, or some other temporal measure. The calls may be dispatched, citizen-initiated, or police-initiated.

**Summary of Remaining Chapters**

The manner in which police officers and community members engage one another shapes the type of relationship the police and community share. Sociological, psychological, and organizational factors affect these interactions in both positive and negative ways. The impact of the environment or place where the police-citizen encounter occurs as well as personal characteristics of the participants are examined in this study. The study is informed by Turk’s (1966, 1969) theory of norm resistance and Sykes and Clark’s (1975) theory of deference exchange to help the researcher better understand the dynamics of authority-subject relationships.

Chapter 2 contains a selective review of the literature relevant to the research problem and Chapter 3 contains a detailed description of the methodology used to conduct the study. Chapter 4 has a presentation of the research findings and Chapter 5 is a discussion of the findings reported in Chapter 4.
Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

Introduction and Purpose

Law enforcement agencies need the support and cooperation of the communities they serve to effectively perform their crime control and order maintenance duties. Community support may diminish if people perceive the police as abusing their authority or as unfair in their dealing with the community. Few issues test a community’s confidence in their police more than a police officer’s use of force. Identifying environmental factors associated with conflict in police-citizen encounters can help inform the development of more effective interpersonal communication training for police officers. The creation of more effective engagement and de-escalation strategies to counter the impact of some environmental factors and personal characteristics could decrease the likelihood of police-citizen encounters escalating to the point where the police officer believes the use of force is necessary.

Topic Analysis

The extant literature included empirical testing of several theories concerning the impact of neighborhoods on human behavior. The theories appear, as suggested by Terrill and Reisig (2003), in three broad categories: sociological, psychological, and organizational. The categories are not mutually exclusive and overlap among them is common.

Sociological category. The literature in the sociological category examines the socioeconomic condition of the neighborhoods in which police officers patrol, the
situational context of the police-citizen encounter, and the culture and subculture within police agencies. One line of thought attempts to explain why individuals from certain neighborhoods are more likely than individuals from other neighborhoods to engage in criminal behavior. Social structure theorists believe social and economic forces in deteriorated lower-class neighborhoods determine criminal behavior patterns (Siegel, 2010). Peeples and Loeber (1994) tested this construct in their study of 506 young Black males in public schools in Pittsburg, PA. The researchers examined official records suggesting that generally, young Black males were more often delinquent than were young White males. The researchers sought to determine (a) if delinquency among young Black males who did not live in lower-class neighborhoods was more frequent than were their White counterparts, and (b) if ethnicity and/or living in lower-class neighborhoods was related to delinquency.

Peeples and Loeber (1994) conducted a longitudinal study of three cohorts of young males in the first, fourth, and seventh grades. During screening for these cohorts, the student, his caregiver(s), and the student’s teacher provided information concerning the student’s social and asocial behavior. A self-reporting delinquency scale was developed and administered every six months over a two-year period to examine the frequency of the students’ misbehavior and hyperactivity, as well as parental supervision of non-school activities, under-class index, and neighborhood classification. The initial sample contained 219 White males and 290 Black males. Because the study’s focus was Black males, the researchers classified Hispanic and Asian males as White. This classification however, presented a potential flaw in the study’s design. More Black males lived in poor and single-parent families than did the other males in the study.
Black males were less supervised than the White males and no difference emerged between the two regarding hyperactivity.

The results disclosed that twice as many Black males, as compared to White males, engaged in serious misconduct (Peeples & Loeber, 1994). The study also showed that misconduct among Black males who did not reside in lower-class neighborhoods was similar to that of White males not residing in lower-class neighborhoods. The study findings suggested a relationship between communities and the behavior of individuals who inhabited those communities. The study also demonstrated the value of ecological context or place in social science research.

A second sociological theory took place to explore the impact of the police vocation in police-citizen encounters. Hartjen (1972) identified danger, authority, efficiency, hostility, and suspicion as the most important focal or occupational concerns of police work and theorized that the police officers’ sense of their job influenced how they performed their duties. Hartjen believed the focal concern of danger was important in the context of police-citizen encounters. A police officer’s apprehension of danger “colors the policeman’s perspective of an encounter, and, hence, influences his response to it” (Hartjen, 1972, p. 67).

Hartjen (1972) suggested the fear of danger led the officers to take an “antagonistic” (p. 68) approach in police-citizen encounters. Such an approach may evoke an antagonistic response from the citizen. The police officer may then perceive the citizen’s response as an indication of a likely physical assault from the citizen. A self-fulfilling prophecy may ensue in which the police officer’s behavior evokes the citizen behavior he fears most and thus reinforces the police officer’s fear of impending danger.
The officer’s perceived sense of danger may result in a preemptive strike against the citizen as a protective measure.

A police officer’s focal concern of hostility arises from the officer’s perception of resentment he or she senses in interactions with the public. Over time, the officer comes to see the public as antagonistic to the officer and police work. Many police view citizen encounters as places of potential danger that are filled with conflict.

The police officer’s focal concern of suspicion arises from the innate responsibility to detect criminality or disorder. Police are suspicious of most persons: Police officers view the world through a lens of suspicion, which affects how the officers respond to it. To assist themselves in determining when and how to engage members of the public, police officers place assignments, persons, and acts into categories, which can provide the officers with a means to make order out of uncertainty and thus enable an appropriate response. The behavior and physical characteristics of the citizen, along with the location and time of the citizen encounter, influence how the officer categorizes the encounter. Thus, police officers stereotype people, places, and things to help guide their responses in a given situation. Police officers who view a neighborhood in a particular manner tend to see all members of that neighborhood as consistent with their perceptions of the neighborhood. Therefore, in a high crime-area, police officers believe treating any person in that area as a suspect and engaging them accordingly is reasonable (Hartjen, 1972).

Hudson (1970) empirically tested the concept that the nature of police work itself causes police officers to become cautious and suspicious when interacting with citizens. The researcher examined 667 police-citizen encounters that led to the citizen filing a
complaint against the Philadelphia police officer with the Philadelphia Advisory Board. The Philadelphia Advisory Board investigates citizen complaints of alleged police misconduct and classifies them into one of four categories: brutality, illegal search and seizure, harassment, and other. The Board investigated and closed all of the cases examined.

While examining these encounters, the focus was on (a) the socialization process in the police work itself and the police officer’s emphasis on his authority in police-citizen encounters, (b) the situational context of the interactions, and (c) the police use of arrest, which gave him the advantage during the encounter. Interpretation of the data was based on the following assumptions: (a) police officers believe citizens will be uncooperative, (b) police officers must remain in control during police-citizen encounters, (c) police officers cannot permit any challenge of their authority, and (d) certain groups commit more crime than others do and the officer should treat such persons with suspicion.

Hudson (1970) learned about the operation of the Philadelphia Police Advisory Board by attending 30 of the board’s hearings. In several of the hearings, the complainants spoke of their frustration in getting the officer to explain the reason for the action taken. The issue was not the actions of the officer but instead the officer’s refusal to justify this behavior to the citizen. Hudson posited that the officer believed the resolution to the encounter was the officer’s responsibility and the officer could not permit the citizen to challenge his authority. Hudson placed the police officer’s authority at the center of police-citizen encounters, indicating the authority was more important than the social status of the citizen and the situational context in which the encounter
occurred. Ultimately, Hudson concluded the citizen complaints resulted from failed management of police-citizen interactions.

A third sociological theory is deference exchange. The theory of deference exchange holds that during police-citizen encounters, the parties decode the words and actions of the other party and create their response (Alpert, Dunham, & MacDonald, 2004). Van Maanen (1978) suggested police officers assign people they encounter to one of three categories: (a) suspicious persons, (b) assholes, and (c) know-nothings. The category to which a police officer assigns an individual influences the officer’s actions toward that individual.

Police officers believe suspicious persons are likely to have committed, are about to commit, or are committing a serious offense (Van Maanen, 1978). As such, the officers treat suspicious persons like suspects, in a professional and firm manner. In suspicious person encounters, a professional police response is the initial engagement strategy. At the other end of the police-citizen behavioral engagement continuum are the know-nothings. Know-nothings are citizens who approach a police officer to request a police service. Officers initially treat know-nothings with deference and the appropriate level of respect. Assholes however, are citizens who refuse to accept the police officer’s assessment or characterization of the encounter. The police therefore stigmatize assholes and treat them harshly due to their recalcitrant behavior.

Situational conditions shape a police officers’ views of the people they encounter (Van Maanen, 1978). The context of the encounter influences the categorical assignment of the citizen. The need is important for citizens to understand that police officers bring the power of the state into every police-citizen encounter. The officer may interpret
certain actions or behaviors of the citizen as a challenge to or disregard of the officer’s authority or as a refusal to take the situation seriously. Police officers view police-citizen encounters as a place where the citizen acknowledges, challenges, or leaves unresolved the officer’s authority. Citizens who deny or doubt the officer’s authority effectively strike at the core of the officer’s self-image and the manner in which he/she structures his/her environment (Alpert et al., 2004). To a large degree, the rules of engagement for each category of citizen govern the police officer’s response.

Binder and Scharf (1980) used a deference exchange lens to view police-citizen encounters. The researchers did not conduct original research, but instead, based their findings on a review of the literature, empirical studies, and information available to them through the National Institute of Justice. The researchers concluded the following factors affected police-citizen encounters: (a) police characteristics, such as suspiciousness or sensitivity to their authority being undermined or challenged, that are likely to result in police use of force; (b) citizen characteristics, such as an actual or perceived threat to police, or disrespect of police, that are likely to result in police use of force, and (c) the interplay of these characteristics during an encounter. The exchanges between police officers and citizens during the encounter are shaped by the decisions each party makes in response to actions of the other.

Mastrofski, Reisig and McClusky (2002) also tested deference exchange theory. The investigators posited that citizens tend to withhold deference from authorities until the authorities earn it, even though they expect government officials to always respond respectfully. The researchers examined police disrespect during police-citizen exchanges. Mastrofski et al. (2002) examined (a) the behavior of the citizen disrespected...
by police, (b) the identity of that citizen, and (c) the place where police engaged the
citizen. The researchers believed disrespectful communication was used to demean, 
incite, or show contempt of another.

Police must often interact with the public, either victims or perpetrators, when
members of the public are at their emotional or physical worst (Mastrofski et al., 2002).
Such individuals may lash out against the police officer who is there to assist them or to
enforce the law. No matter how poorly the citizen verbally treats the officer, police
training instructs, and members of the public expect, police officers not to respond in
kind. Police incivility undermines the public’s confidence in police and questions the
police officer’s ability to be neutral and fair in enforcing the law. Mastrofski et al.
examined encounters that prior research identified as conflict-rich, such as a citizen who
is (a) considered a suspect, (b) interrogated, (c) searched, (d) warned/threatened, (e)
issued a citation, (f) met with force, or (g) arrested.

Mastrofski et al. (2002) collected data through systematic observation of police
officers assigned to patrol areas in the cities of Indianapolis, Indiana and St. Petersburg,
Florida as part of a project on policing neighborhoods in 1996 and 1997. The findings
showed that the actions and appearance of suspects greatly influenced their treatment by
police. Suspects who were male, were young, initiated disrespect, showed little self-
control, or had low incomes were more likely to encounter police disrespect. The study
findings supported the notion that the place of police-citizen interactions influenced the
likelihood of police disrespect. Specifically, more concentrated disadvantage in a
neighborhood increases the risk of police disrespect (Mastrofski et al., 2002). The
findings have important policy implications for police executives because police agencies
can reduce the probability of police incivility by informing police officer decision-making regarding when and how to engage and disengage citizens.

Engel (2003) tested deference exchange theory, as well, examining resistance and disrespect in police-suspect encounters from the citizen’s point of view. He used observational data collected in 1977 from a study involving 24 police departments in Rochester, New York, St. Louis, Missouri, and Tampa/St. Petersburg, Florida. Engel hypothesized that (a) differences between the SES level of police officer and citizen influence the citizen’s reactions toward police, (b) the citizen’s assertion of his/her social identity with the officer causes the citizen to challenge the officer’s authority, and (c) citizens or situations involving actual or perceived aggression are more likely to result in acts of resistance toward the officer. Citizen resistance was measured by actions the officer considered resistant or observers’ characterizations of disrespect. The study concluded that non-White suspects were significantly more likely to show all signs of resistance, with the exception of physical aggression. Juvenile suspects were not more likely than adults to be resistant toward police, male suspects were not significantly more likely than female suspects to display any type of resistance, and suspects under the influence of drugs or alcohol were significantly more likely to engage in all forms of resistance.

Rojek, Alpert, and Smith (2010) used the lens of deference exchange and *authority maintenance ritual* to examine police officer and citizen versions of police use of force during an incident. Authority maintenance ritual is a strategy used by a police officer to control citizen behavior through coercion or reassertion of police authority during citizen encounters. The researchers posited that the police officer’s and the
citizen’s versions of the encounter that resulted in the officer’s use of force were likely to be self-serving, to justify the individual’s conduct, and to differ from the version of the other participant. Rojeck et al. theorized that the failure of a citizen to acknowledge the legality of the officer’s actions and to show appropriate deference to the officer increased the likelihood of the use of force in the police-citizen encounter. A distinguishing characteristic of the study was the attempt to capture the perspectives of opposing parties involved in the same use-of-force incident.

From January through June of 2007, Rojeck et al. (2010) received copies of use-of-force incident reports from the Richland County, South Carolina Sheriff’s Department within two days of the incident. The researchers attempted to interview at least one of the officers involved in the incident and the citizen(s) involved in the incident. The researchers interviewed 123 deputy sheriffs and 21 citizens. The researchers did not make contact with all of the citizens before the citizens were released from the criminal justice system, and of the 31 citizens they contacted prior to release, 21 agreed to be interviewed. As expected, the parties offered differing accounts of the encounter.

The deputy sheriffs presented their actions as reasonable and the citizens presented the deputies’ actions as improper (Rojeck et al., 2010). The deputies cited the citizens’ combative behavior as a reason to maintain their authority through coercion. The citizens refused to comply with the deputies’ commands due to their feelings of victimization by the deputies. The low status afforded them by the deputies hampered the citizens’ ability to favorably resolve the encounter. Rojeck et al. noted that when police officers and citizens interacted, the officer had the advantage because of his legal authority to arrest the citizen. The citizen’s failure to recognize the officer’s authority
and understand his subordinate status relative to the officer could lead to an adverse outcome.

A fourth sociological approach is conflict theory. Manning (1980) reviewed existing literature and offered a novel construct in which to view the relationship between violence and the role of the police. He suggested certain functions are assigned to law enforcement agencies in the United States, such as calls for emotionally disturbed persons, due to the police officer’s lawful ability to use force. Manning used the theoretical lens of conflict theory to examine the relationship between violence and the police role and asserted that police are violent and the purpose of their coercive powers is to advance the interests of those who control police agencies or influence police policies. Manning believed that police use of force toward minorities and the poor was the result of the American social structure, the economic origins of the criminal law, and the lack of meaningful punishments for police officers who employ excessive force against members of such groups. Manning alleged violence was inherent in policing and asserted that police culture, values, beliefs, and practices contained central themes of violence.

A fifth sociological approach explores the subculture of the law enforcement profession. Waegel (1984) examined the impact of police subculture on the way police officers understood, explained, and justified the use of deadly force. He explored police subcultural prospective beliefs, which influence decisions to use deadly force, and retrospective beliefs, which justify the use of deadly force, using data from two sources to draw his conclusions. First, Waegel collected data over a 10-month period covering 1976 and 1977 as a participant-observer in a police agency located in the northeastern United

Waegel (1984) reported police use of pejorative stereotypes such as animals, scrotes, and so forth in interacting with persons displaying certain behaviors, characteristics, or attitudes. The officers view such citizens differently than they viewed citizens they considered respectable. The officers believed the aberrant citizens deserved harsh treatment. Officers, who often witness the extremes of what people do to one another, have strong feelings that offenders should receive punishment, one way or another. Many of the officers share and reinforce such views. Waegel found a strong police subculture that overrode legal statutes and department policy governing the use of deadly force.

Stroshine, Alpert, and Dunham (2008) called attention to the dearth of research on the discretionary decision-making of police officers regarding whether to engage or arrest citizens and noted the little attention researchers paid to understanding the reasons why police officers choose to initiate citizen contact. The researchers conducted empirical research on the thought processes of police officers, starting from the initial citizen encounter but prior to actually engaging citizens or taking action. Stroshine et al. examined police officers’ individual informal working rules in the Savannah, Georgia and Miami-Dade, Florida police departments, investigating how the rules helped the officers define suspicious people, places, and situations. This study provided insight into how informal work rules governed police officer decision-making.

Trained observers accompanied police officers on patrol and gathered information on the officers’ thoughts, actions, reactions, and encounters with the public during 132
shifts (Stroshine et al., 2008). The observers were instructed to elicit information from the officers and the officers were encouraged to share their thoughts as they patrolled their areas observing people and places. The researchers found 12 categories of informal work rules guiding police attitudes and actions during initial decision-making. Stroshine et al. found police-citizen encounters were shaped by the police officer’s notions concerning the group to which the citizen belonged and/or the location of the encounter.

A sixth sociological theory examines the impact of the location or place of the police-citizen interaction on police officer behavior. Smith (1986) examined the impact of neighborhood context on police behavior and attempted to ascertain the extent to which neighborhood characteristics influenced police discretion and the degree to which police responded differently in encounters across neighborhoods. Smith analyzed observational data collected in 1977 from study neighborhoods located in Rochester, New York, St. Louis, Missouri, and Tampa-St. Petersburg, Florida, the same data set analyzed by Engel (2003). Twenty-four police departments served the neighborhoods.

Smith (1986) identified 11 neighborhood characteristics and assessed their impact on police arrest decisions, police exercise of coercive authority, and the filing of official police reports. He found that police actions varied, based on neighborhood context. Police were generally more active and were more likely to assist residents and to stop suspicious persons and suspected violators in racially mixed neighborhoods. Additionally, police were three times more likely to arrest suspects stopped in low socioeconomic status neighborhoods than suspects stopped in higher socioeconomic status neighborhoods. This was true, notwithstanding the type of crime, race, or demeanor of the suspect or whether the victim wanted the suspect arrested. Smith
concluded that police behavior was influenced by the people they encountered and the neighborhood in which the encounter occurred.

Klinger (1997) reviewed the ecological literature on crime and crime control and noted the scant research and absence of a theory on variations in police behavior across communities. While some research suggested police actions varied across urban neighborhoods, no systematic theory linked police activity to the neighborhood context in which the activity occurred. Klinger offered a theory suggesting an inverse relationship between the level of neighborhood deviance and police vigor to control crime. He noted the decentralized nature of police organizations and recorded how they typically subdivided their jurisdictional areas into smaller, more manageable areas to patrol. The smaller geographical areas, including precincts, districts, and so on, had administrative structures separate from police headquarters.

While by the larger organization governs the smaller areas, police work is too varied and complex for standard operating procedures to address every type of situation a police officer may encounter, and patrol officers enjoy a large amount of discretion in performing their duties. Informal work rules develop within the smaller patrol areas to guide police officer decision-making while performing their duties. Klinger posited: (a) the extent of deviance, (b) the deservedness of the victim, (c) police cynicism, and (d) workload shaped police vigor in a community. He reasoned that as levels of deviance increase in a community, patrol officers become more cynical and view crime victims in those neighborhoods as less deserving of police protection. Over time, officers consider elevated levels of crime in the neighborhood as normal. The increased workload in neighborhoods with high levels of deviance saps patrol resources, and in an effort to
conserve limited resources, patrol officers adopt a more lenient approach to enforcement, which keeps their limited resources on patrol, and use less vigor to enforce minor acts of criminality (Klinger, 2004).

Terrill and Reisig (2003) examined neighborhood context and used systematic social observation of police officer-citizen interactions to collect data and assess the role of the neighborhood context in police use of force. Graduate and undergraduate students received training as field observers and then rode with and recorded the actions of police officers in two police agencies in two different states. The two neighborhoods selected for the study were closely matched for socioeconomic conditions. Following data analysis, the researchers concluded the police officers were significantly more likely to use a greater amount of force against criminal suspects, regardless of the suspect’s behavior, in high-crime areas and neighborhoods with high concentrations of disadvantaged residents. Terrill and Reisig acknowledged that additional research was necessary to better understand how the officers’ perceptions of the neighborhood impacted their decision-making. The researchers also felt additional research was necessary to develop a more explicit theory of police behavior that could be empirically tested.

Ingram (2007) continued the line of research into the effects of neighborhood characteristics on police behavior but viewed it in the context of police traffic citation practices. Although researchers had conducted prior studies on police traffic enforcement practices, little attention was directed to the place in which traffic stops occurred. Ingram attempted to fill this gap by examining the impact of neighborhood structural characteristics, including low economic status, racial composition, crime rates, and other
factors, on the number of traffic citations written during traffic stops. Ingram controlled for driver demographics and investigated the spatial distribution of police practices to determine the extent to which the larger geographic environment affected citation issuance.

Ingram (2007) found significant differences in the number of citations issued across neighborhoods. Levels of neighborhood disorganization, disadvantage, violent crime, and racial composition were all significant predictors of the number of citations issued. Lower economic status neighborhoods and neighborhoods with high percentages of Black residents were immediate predictors of summonses issuance. With regard to spatial distribution, the study findings showed the percentage of Hispanic residents in the immediate neighborhood was an important predictor of whether officers would issue a citation.

**Psychological category.** The literature in the psychological category examined the impact of cognition, perception, and biases of police officers on their behavior or decision-making. Plant and Peruche (2005) used signal detection technology to study the impact of a suspect’s race on a police officer’s decision to shoot or not shoot an individual. The researchers recruited 50 police officer volunteers (41 male, 9 female, 42 White, 5 Black, 2 Hispanic, 1 Native American) from a Florida law enforcement agency and tested their decision-making, via computer simulations, to shoot or not shoot armed and unarmed Black and White suspects. The officers were familiarized with the computer simulation program and instructed how to indicate a shoot or don’t shoot response on a laptop computer.
Photographs of nine Black and nine White college-age males were used in the experiment (Plant & Peruche, 2005). Pictures of the males appeared on a computer screen with a formatted image of a gun or a non-threatening object such as a cell phone. The gun or other object was positioned so the individual’s face was visible. The picture remained on the screen until the officer made a decision to shoot or not shoot or until the expiration of a specific period of time. The results of the initial test disclosed the officers were more likely to shoot unarmed Black suspects than unarmed White suspects. After extensive exposure to the computer simulation program in which there was no correlation between the race of the suspect and the presence of a weapon, the officers were retested. This time, the officers’ shooting of unarmed Black suspects was consistent with their shooting of unarmed White suspects. The findings suggested that with extensive training, the role played by racial bias in a police officer’s decision to shoot a suspect could be controlled.

Plant and Peruche (2005) acknowledged the test did not mimic actual conditions under which officers make the critical decision to shoot or not shoot. Another concern with the study was the lack of a discussion about how long the effects of the extensive exposure to the simulation program lasted or the frequency with which the extensive exposure would have to be repeated in order to maintain the increased performance level between Test 1 and Test 2. Last, whether the gains in performance between Test 1 and Test 2 were negated after the officer returned to policing communities where the violent criminal suspects they encountered align with the officer’s preconceived notions of a criminal suspect did not appear in the study results.
Correll et al. (2007) also used signal detection technology to assess the decision of police officers and community members to shoot or not shoot at images displayed on screen. The researchers examined latency, which is the time required to respond correctly to the image, and errors, which is inappropriate shooting or failure to shoot at the image. Community members were the standard used to compare the performance of the police. The researchers believed that to comprehensively assess bias among police, examining bias in the communities they served was necessary.

Correll et al. (2007) hypothesized that because police and community members had exposure to the same social and cultural influences, the two groups would display similar levels of racial bias in use of force decision-making. All of the participants were volunteers. One hundred and twenty-four police officers (9 female, 114 male, 1 missing gender; 85 White, 16 Black, 9 Hispanic, 1 missing ethnicity) from one department comprised one sample group. One hundred and twenty-seven citizen participants (51 female, 73 male, 3 missing gender; 29 White, 16 Black, 63 Hispanic, and 9 other) comprised the second sample group. One hundred and thirteen police officers (12 female, 100 male, 1 missing gender; 72 White, 10 Black, 15 Hispanic, 13 other, 3 missing ethnicity) from other than the local area comprised the third sample group. The three groups completed a 100-trial video game simulation in which armed and unarmed White and Black men appeared in a variety of background images.

The researchers told the participants that any armed target constituted an immediate threat and should be shot as quickly as possible. Correll et al. (2007) also told participants that unarmed targets posed no threat and should not be shot. The speed and accuracy of the participants’ decision-making were the primary variables and Correll et
al. compared performance across the three groups. The police officers received $50 for their participation and citizens received $20. The study findings indicated the police samples outperformed the community sample in making faster correct decisions, were better able to detect the presence of a weapon, and had a significantly higher criterion for the decision to shoot. The three samples were similar in their display of racial bias in the speed with which they made shoot/don’t shoot decisions.

Smith and Alpert (2007) examined literature concerning the disproportionate number of stops, searches, and arrests to which police subject Blacks and Hispanics. From the review of the literature, Smith and Alpert posited a theory of police behavior based on stereotype formation, suggesting that police officers have unconscious biases toward people of color that come from exposure to groups involved in deviant or criminal activities or through a false connection with deviant or criminal behavior. Whether police officers bring race-based notions or prejudicial views with them as a product of how they were socialized prior to entering law enforcement, whether officers acquired such bias during their employment, whether a combination of the two is to blame, or something else entirely, remains undetermined. Smith and Alpert called for additional research to test both the social conditioning and illusory correlation components of their theoretical construct.

Warren (2008) used the lens of race to determine citizen perceptions of police disrespect during traffic stops. She reviewed the literature disclosing that Blacks were more dissatisfied with police than Whites were due to their belief that Blacks were frequently subjected to aggressive patrols, excessive use of force, and racially biased policing. Blacks were more skeptical than Whites were and questioned the legitimacy of
major social institutions due to the long history of discrimination and humiliation. Stories people hear about police from family, friends, and the media provide a context citizens may use to evaluate their encounter with police. Stories of inappropriate police behavior shared among family and friends can create a larger culture of distrust and can reduce a community’s faith in police. Warren (2008) noted that little of the existing research sought to understand the factors that influence interpretation of police encounters. The research was an examination of the independent and combined effects of other people’s experiences and trust in social institutions on race differences in how individuals perceive police disrespect.

The data analyzed were from a North Carolina highway traffic study (Warren, 2008). In her study, 2,920 Black and White North Carolina licensed drivers were contacted via telephone between June 2000 and March 2001 to participate in a telephone survey. Of the 2,920 drivers contacted, 630 reported a traffic stop by police within the preceding 12-month period. The smaller group became the study sample. Warren asked questions of the group to enable determination of whether family or friends had related any negative or disrespectful experiences with police officers to them and to assess participants’ level of trust in social institutions. Study results suggested that citizens who distrusted social institutions and heard negative stories about police from their family and friends were significantly more likely to perceive police disrespect during their own police-citizen encounter.

Stone et al. (2010) reviewed police-on-police shootings nationally since 1981. Their findings supported the conclusions reached by Plant and Peruche (2005) and Smith and Alpert (2007). They found, “Inherent or unconscious racial bias plays a role in
shoot/don’t-shoot decisions made by officers of all races and ethnicities” (Stone et al., 2010, p. 3). While scholars believe sociological and psychological aspects of the police officer’s working environment influence police officer behavior, the extent to which procedural guidelines, supervision, and agency tone influences police officer behavior is not clear.

Organizational category. The literature in the organizational category addressed the influence of the police organization itself, such as structure, operational philosophy, and policies, on police officer behavior and decision-making. Reiss (1980) observed that organizations could control police officers’ use of force decision-making by limiting the use of force to specific circumstances, such as self-defense situations. He suggested that organizations could reduce incidents involving the use of deadly force by using policy or training to guide police officer decision-making. Reiss believed that police organizations should provide officers with as much initial information as possible when the officers are dispatched to an assignment, and then continue to update the officer as new or additional information becomes available. Such additional or new information could guide decision-making away from the use of deadly force. Examples of such information could include suspect is alone in residence, suspect is unarmed, and similar other circumstances.

Lindgren (1981) shared Reiss’s belief that police organizations influence police behavior. Police agencies organization is either generalist, with tasks not divided or assigned to a specific group of officers, or specialist, with tasks divided and assigned to specific groups of officers. Lindgren referred to generalist agencies as horizontally undifferentiated. In generalist organizations, police officers handle a variety of
assignments and exercise a great amount of discretion in completing assignments. Horizontally undifferentiated organizations tend to promote local decision making in which officers make operational decisions at the lower levels in the organization.

Specialist police agencies tend to be hierarchical, with multiple levels of decision-making. Lindgren referred to these agencies as *vertically differentiated*. Specialist organizations also promote local decision-making. In organizations characterized by local decision-making, power and influence over the direction of such organizations remain with top management. Lower level managers’ roles in decision-making are often limited to information sharing. Top management develops and implements agency policy, but lower level managers inform their decision-making.

Lindgren (1981) differed from Reiss (1980) regarding the degree to which organizational policies control police officer decision-making regarding police use of force. Lindgren distinguished between operational and policy decisions and suggested that operational decision-making normally occurs in minor or low-consequence areas of the agency. Therefore, operational decision-making lacks real power. The concern in police agencies is that police use of force is primarily a personal decision made by officers at or near the entry level in the police organization. Police officers’ decisions to use force are often without considerable reflection and rarely reviewed by a supervisor prior to its use. Operational decision-making concerning police use of force conflicts with organizational theory. Such theories call for critical decision-making at the highest levels in the organization.

Chappell, MacDonald, and Manz (2006) examined the impact of police organizational structures on police officer arrest decisions. For years, law enforcement
agencies were conceptualized as watchman, legalistic, or service organizations. Watchman agencies’ operational philosophy is order maintenance. In these agencies, police officers rarely enforce minor criminality, with the exception of the minor offenses considered important by citizens and local politicians. Such organizations have flat bureaucratic structures, some specialization, few rules, and little emphasis on professionalism.

Legalistic agencies’ operational philosophy is full enforcement of the law. Such departments tend to be specialized and police officers in these agencies are professional, operate independently of the communities they serve, and treat all citizens equally but impersonally (Chappell et al., 2006). Service agencies’ operational philosophy is to work with the community and identify public order offenses that police and community mutually want addressed. The use of arrests is limited to serious crimes. Service agencies are professional, local in command structure, and specialized.

Chappell et al. (2006) analyzed data from large urban police agencies of all three types to determine police officer arrest rates for Uniform Crime Reporting Program index offenses and violent offenses. The researchers also examined the degree of role and task specialization within the agencies. The researchers posited that agencies placing greater emphasis on professionalism and specialization, and having more administrative personnel would be more legalistic and have higher rates of arrests for violent crime and crime overall than the other two types. Agencies responsive to local politics that had employee unions and residency requirements would have lower rates of arrest per officer because they functioned in a watchman style manner. Agencies practicing community policing that were more diverse and had more sworn officers than administrative...
personnel would have lower rates of arrest per officer because they functioned in a service style manner.

The findings of Chappell et al. (2006) did not support the assumptions derived from the literature. The researchers concluded that the literature and theories on organizational control of police discretion might place too much emphasis on the influence of organizational context. Chappell et al. suggested the typology gleaned from the literature might have limited use for police agencies utilizing proactive police strategies.

Summary and Conclusion

The literature is clear that sociological, psychological, and organizational factors influence the manner in which police officers perform their jobs. What is not clear is the degree to which individual factors or combinations of factors within and among categories influence police behavior. Chapter 3 provides the methodology used to examine the role of neighborhood factors and personal characteristics of the citizen and police officer in citizen complaints of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters.
Chapter 3: Research Design and Methodology

Introduction

Police use of force, particularly deadly force, is likely to draw attention when used. The elements influencing media coverage and community interest in such incidents include the type of force, whether physical or deadly; the amount of force; the participants involved; the circumstances surrounding the incident; and the location of the incident. The volume of scholarly writing and research on police use of force indicate the topic is of great social interest. The interest of the current study was in examining police-citizen encounters prior to the use of force. The objective of this study was to explore police-citizen encounters in the context of the location of the encounter. Specifically, the neighborhood or community where police-citizen encounters occurred was the topic examined in an attempt to identify relationships between specific neighborhood or community factors, personal characteristics of the police officer or the citizen, and allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters.

The literature suggested humans are influenced by their environment (Meares, 1998; Sobol, 2010; Wilson, 2009). Police officers spend a significant part of their workday engaged in proactive patrol and responding to calls for service where the officers encounter crime victims, perpetrators of crime, and individuals in crisis. A police officer’s routine exposure to danger, violence, victims in distress, and criminals at their worst influences the officer. Understanding the interplay between the place where
police–citizen encounters occur and allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters was the goal of the study.

Although police officers undergo scrutiny whenever they use force, the inquiry is usually limited to a legal determination of whether the officer’s use of force fell within statutory and agency guidelines. This type of inquiry usually does not increase understanding of why force incidents occur. Most authorities generally accept that due to the nature of policing and maintaining social order, police use of force is inevitable (Lindgren, 1981; Manning, 1980). What is not inevitable is that police-citizen encounters must end badly. Ideally, conflict precedes the use of physical or deadly force. Thus, an examination of the context of police-citizen encounters in which conflict—in the current study, allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language—occurred, but did not escalate to use of force, should provide insight into neighborhood conditions or personal characteristics associated with allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters. The research questions guiding this study follow.

1. Does the socioeconomic status of the community where the police-citizen encounter occurs have an impact on allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters?

2. Does the time of day, segmented into the timeframes of 7:00 a.m.–2:59 p.m. (day shift), 3:00 p.m.–10:59 p.m. (night shift), and 11:00 p.m.–6:59 a.m. (midnight shift), have an impact on allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters?
3. Does the day of the week, segmented into the periods of Sunday through Wednesday (midweek) and Thursday through Saturday (weekend), have an impact on allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters?

4. Does gender of the citizen and police officer have an impact on allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters?

5. Does age of the citizen and police officer have an impact on allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters?

6. Does race of the citizen and police officer have an impact on allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters?

Police managers recognize that police officer workload, the character of neighborhoods, and the activities occurring in neighborhoods change over the hour of the day, the day of the week, and the month of the year (Lowe, 2005; Sowinski, 2009; Trugman, 1999). While seasonal variations in police-citizen encounters were beyond the scope of this inquiry, the relationship between time, in terms of the shifts police officers generally work and the portion of week, and conflict in police-citizen encounters was examined. The first premise of the study suggested a situational adjustment in a police officer’s tactics and citizen engagement strategy, depending on the hour of the day, day of the week, and the neighborhood in which the encounter occurs. Police managers also recognize, through resource allocation and deployment practices, increased workloads in
the form of calls for service and proactive activities at night and over the weekend. Therefore, the second premise was that nights on Thursday through Saturday were periods of increased workload for police officers and thus presented more opportunities for adverse police-citizen encounters (Lowe, 2005; Sowinski, 2009; Trugman, 1999).

The study involved analyzing a portion of the data collected by the City to investigate citizen complaints made against members of its police force for the following reasons:

- **Force**: the use of unnecessary or excessive force, up to and including deadly force.
- **Abuse of authority**: abuse of police powers to intimidate or otherwise mistreat a civilian, including improper street stops, frisks, searches, issuance of retaliatory summonses, and unwarranted threats of arrest.
- **Discourtesy**: inappropriate behavior or verbal conduct by the officer, including rude or obscene gestures, vulgar words, and curses.
- **Offensive language**: slurs, derogatory remarks, and gestures based upon a person’s sexual orientation, race, ethnicity, religion, gender, or disability (Civilian Complaint Review Board, 2003).

The complainant categories are hierarchical, with force and abuse of authority as the most egregious and discourtesy and offense language as the least. City agency staff categorized the complaints, based on the most egregious conduct alleged. Therefore, each civilian complaint was recorded in the single most appropriate hierarchical category, even though the conduct alleged included less serious offenses. This style of recoding helped to prevent multiple counts for the same incident. For example, if a citizen alleged an officer to have used excessive force and offensive language, the complaint was
recorded as one incident in the category of force. The incident also reflected the less serious allegation of offensive language. Many incidents contain multiple allegations of police misconduct.

Upon in-take, a City agency staff member assigned civilian complaints to one of the four complaint categories. The assignment could change, based on information disclosed during the course of the investigation of the complaint. For example, the initial classification of a civilian complaint as offensive language could be changed to a higher category, if during the investigation of that complaint, the complainant or the investigator showed that another complaint category was more appropriate. Complaints received from the public that did not fall into one of the four complaint categories, such as allegations of corruption or fitness for duty, were referred to the police department for investigation.

The City agency received civilian complaints by telephone, U.S. mail, Internet, in person, and referrals from the police department for any complaints lodged at police facilities (see Appendix A for sample forms). Civilian complaints were recorded on an in-take form to ensure the City agency obtains the information necessary to contact the complainant for a subsequent interview and to commence an investigation, if appropriate. Complaints lodged at police facilities were recorded on complaint forms similar to the form used by the City agency and forwarded by the police department to the agency for investigation. A City agency employee entered the information from the in-take forms into the agency’s complaint database.

The data for this study were civilian complaints filed against the City’s police officers during calendar year 2008 in which the most egregious misconduct alleged was
discourtesy or offensive language. The distinctions between conducts assigned to the two categories were slight. Because the conduct alleged in the two categories was similar and both categories involved some degree of verbal conflict rather than physical force, they were combined and analyzed together. A quantitative analysis took place of complaint data filed in 2008 and entered in the City agency’s database. Complaints of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language, which is a measure of conflict, represented the dependent variable. The socioeconomic status of the community where the encounter occurred, time of day, day of week, and gender, age, and race of the citizen and police officer were the independent variables in the study. The inquiry was an examination of whether a relationship existed between allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters and the independent variables of the study.

Research Context

In the mid-1990s, the police department changed the way it policed the City. The police department’s operational philosophy of community policing was replaced with a strategy focused on enforcement of low-level public disorder and quality of life offenses (Fagan & Davies, 2000; Gelman, Fagan & Kiss, 2007; Greene, 1999). The shift in enforcement strategy was driven by Kelling and Wilson’s (1982) theory of broken windows. The theory asserts that when police do not address minor public order offenses, the public displays of disorder will frighten citizens and undermine a community’s informal social controls, leading to more serious crime problems. Included among the new strategies created to address crime, the fear of crime, and public disorder in the City, was the use of Terry stops and searches. In Terry v. Ohio, 1968, the United
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States Supreme Court recognized the legitimacy of the police practice of stopping, using force if necessary, questioning, and under certain circumstances conducting a protective pat-down or frisk of an individual on less than probable cause, the legal standard required for police officers to effect an arrest. Terry stops are unique because the individual is not under arrest but is also not free to leave the encounter prior to the officer’s completion of a field investigation. Most states codified the Terry decision into state procedural law.

The police department’s enforcement strategies were guided by the four Compstat principles developed by the City police department: (a) accurate and timely intelligence, (b) rapid deployment of personnel and resources, (c) effective tactics, and (d) relentless follow-up. This enforcement model produced a significant drop in Uniform Crime Reporting Program Part I Index Crime: murder, robbery, forcible rape, aggravated assault, burglary, grand larceny, and grand larceny auto (Greene, 1999).

Although the proactive strategy of zero tolerance enforcement of quality of life offenses produced dramatic drops in serious crime, many argued the aggressive enforcement style encouraged heavy-handed police tactics in response to non-criminal conduct, and the policy generated considerable community discontent and allegations of racial profiling (Gelman et al., 2007). The composition of the City was as follows: White 35%, Hispanic 27%, Black 25%, and Other 13% (Civilian Complainant Review Board, 2009). The socioeconomic status of its neighborhoods ran the gamut from poor to affluent. The racially, ethnically, and financially diverse City was policed by a single police agency.
Research Participants

In 2008, several thousand citizens lodged complaints against the City’s police officers in one of the four complaint categories of force, abuse of authority, discourtesy, or offensive language. The study was delimited to encounters not involving force or abuse of authority, as those types of complaints exceeded the scope of the inquiry. The study population consisted of 3,199 people who filed a civilian complaint in calendar year 2008 against a police officer in which with the most egregious misconduct alleged was discourtesy or offensive language (Civilian Complaint Review Board, 2009).

Each complaint can contain several allegations of misconduct. Therefore, the unit of measure for this study was complaints and not allegations. The City maintained a database of police-citizen encounters that resulted in the filing of a civilian complaint against an officer. The database contains numerous variables, including the place of occurrence of the incidents and the participants involved in them. Three variables relating to neighborhood ecology, community district socioeconomic status (SES) level, time of day and day of week of the police-citizen encounter, were selected for a quantitative analysis, as well as three characteristics of the complainant and police officer: age, gender, and race.

Instruments Used in Data Collection

Because the researcher analyzed archival data collected by the City, an ex-post facto research design was appropriate (Vogt, 2005). The City captured information from civilian complaint forms prepared by complainants and information discovered through the investigation of civilian complaints. City employees entered the information into a database created and maintained by the City for case management. Although the City’s
database contained hundreds of variables appropriate for study, only six were analyzed in the current study. Complaints with data missing from one of the relevant data fields were excluded from the study. The City also maintained data concerning the workload of the police department. The original intent was to examine police workload by shift, and day of week to determine any correlation with the time of day and day of week of citizen allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language. However, the police workload data were not available.

**Procedures for Data Collection and Analysis**

The filing of a civilian complaint for discourtesy or offensive language was used as an indicator of conflict in police-citizen encounters and was the dependent variable. During the review of the literature, the researcher located a 2010 City report analyzing neighborhood disparities in fatal childhood injuries (Fortin, DiGrande, Glaser, & Stayton, 2010). The report used community districts as the neighborhood level of analysis. The researchers in that study created a socioeconomic index that determined the socioeconomic status for the City’s 59 community districts by using education, employment, income, and race of the community district residents. Each of these four indicators was ranked from 1, Very Low, to 4, High. The lower numbers indicated a lower socioeconomic index. The rankings were totaled to create a socioeconomic index of the four indicators. This City granted permission to use the socioeconomic index rankings for the 59 community districts in the current study (see Appendix B).

The independent variables of neighborhood socioeconomic status, time of day, day of week, and the gender, age, and race of the citizen and police officer were analyzed using frequency analyses, chi-square tests of independence, and regression correlation.
The tests helped to determine associations between the independent variables and the dependent variable, allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters. Frequency analyses and chi-square tests of independence are appropriate for an analysis of nominal and ordinal data (Huck, 2008).

When a relationship or association exists between two variables, one variable may be used to predict the other (Girden & Kabacoff, 2011). A regression correlation was used to determine whether a correlation existed between the ages of the citizen (predictor variable) and police officer involved in the police-citizen encounter. Data from the 3,199 complaints were entered into SPSS and the statistical analyses performed. The interpretation of the data was informed by Sykes and Clark’s (1975) theory of deference exchange and Austin Turk’s (1966, 1969) theory of norm resistance. The following null hypotheses were asserted.

**H1:** There is no relationship between allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters and the SES of the community in which the police-citizen encounter occurs.

**H2:** There is no relationship between allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters and the time of day in which the police-citizen encounter occurs.

**H3:** There is no relationship between allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters and the day of week in which the police-citizen encounter occurs.
There is no relationship between allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters and the gender of the complainant and police officer.

There is no relationship between allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters and the age of the complainant and the police officer.

There is no relationship between allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters and the race of the complainant and the police officer.

Summary

The purpose of the study was to identify factors or conditions present in the City’s neighborhoods and communities associated with allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters. An ex-post facto research design was used to conduct the study, which consisted of an analysis of 2008 civilian complaint data from a large urban police department. Frequency analyses, chi-square tests of independence, and a regression correlation were used to analyze the data. The analysis sought to determine if a relationship existed between allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language as the dependent variable and each of the five independent variables. The independent variables were socioeconomic status of the community where the police-citizen encounter occurred, time of day of the police-citizen encounter, day of week of the police-citizen encounter, and the age, gender, and race of the complainant and the police officer.
In March 2012, citizen complaint data for the categories of discourtesy and offensive language was obtained electronically from the City. The data did not identify the citizen or police officer but disclosed the age, gender, and race of both. The data provided the location of the encounter to determine the socioeconomic status of the community district in which the encounter occurred. The data analysis and findings appear in Chapter 4 and the discussion of the findings is in Chapter 5.
Chapter 4: Results

This chapter addresses the six research questions presented in Chapter 1 and provides a synopsis of the findings. Thereafter, each research question appears with the data analysis associated with answering the question. The first section contains each research question and its results.

Research Questions

Research Question 1. Does the socioeconomic status of the community where the police-citizen encounter occurs have an impact on allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters? Yes, the SES has a relationship with allegations. The allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language were not evenly distributed across community SES levels. Statistically significant differences were observed between observed community district SES and expected community district SES in police-citizen encounters for each of the five major subdivisions (areas) of the City. Therefore, the null hypothesis suggesting no relationship between allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters and the SES of the community in which the police-citizen encounter occurs was rejected.

Research Question 2. Does the time of day, segmented into the timeframes of 7:00 a.m.–2:59 p.m. (day shift), 3:00 p.m.–10:59 p.m. (night shift), and 11:00 p.m.–6:59 a.m. (midnight shift), have an impact on allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters? Yes, the majority of police-citizen
encounters involving police discourtesy or police use of offensive language occurred during the night shift. However, the frequency analysis alone could not determine whether the difference in the distribution of complaints across timeframes was statistically significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there is no relationship between allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters and the time of day in which the police-citizen encounter occurs was not rejected.

**Research Question 3.** Does the day of the week, segmented into the periods of Sunday through Wednesday (midweek), and Thursday through Saturday (weekend), have an impact on allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters? Yes, the majority of police-citizen encounters in which an allegation of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language occurred during the weekend. However, the frequency analysis alone could not determine whether the difference in the distribution of complaints across the periods was statistically significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there is no relationship between allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters and the day of week in which the police-citizen encounter occurs was not rejected.

**Research Question 4.** Does gender of the citizen and police officer have an impact on allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters? Yes, statistically significant differences were observed between observed gender encounters and expected gender encounters involving male citizens. No statistically significant differences were observed between observed gender encounters and expected gender encounters involving female citizens. Therefore, the null
hypothesis that there is no relationship between allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters and the gender of the complainant and police officer was rejected.

**Research Question 5.** Does age of the citizen and police officer have an impact on allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters? Yes, a statistically significant and positive correlation between citizen age and police age was observed. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there is no relationship between allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters and the age of the complainant and the police officer was rejected.

**Research Question 6.** Does race of the citizen and police officer have an impact on allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters? Yes, statistically significant differences were observed between observed racial encounters and expected racial encounters for three of the four racial groups studied. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there is no relationship between allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters and the race of the complainant and the police officer was rejected.

**Data Analysis and Findings**

Prior to analyzing the six research questions, data hygiene and data screening took place to ensure the variables of interest met appropriate statistical assumptions. The analyses of the data followed a similar analytic strategy. The variables were first evaluated for missing data, frequency cell counts \( n_{cell} \geq 5 \), normality (whether the data set had a normal distribution), linearity (whether the difference between scores on two
Research Question 1. Does the socioeconomic status of the community where the police-citizen encounter occurs have an impact on allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police citizen encounters?

This question was examined using five chi-square tests of independence to determine if differences existed between the observed frequency of police-citizen encounter complainants and the expected frequency of complaints based on the SES of the City’s 59 community districts. A separate chi-square statistic was calculated for police-citizen encounters in each of the City’s five major subdivisions: Area A, Area B, Area C, Area D, and Area E. The overall socioeconomic distribution of the City’s community districts (expected community district SES) were compared to the frequency of complaints observed within community districts (observed community district SES) per area. Data collected from the City were used to assess the observed distribution of police-citizen encounters.

During a previous health study, a City agency created a socioeconomic index called the Community District SES for the City’s community districts by using education, employment, income, and race of the residents (Fortin et al., 2010). Community district SES was classified into four categories: Very Low SES, Low SES, Medium SES, and High SES. The City’s five major subdivisions were further divided into 59 community districts: 12 community districts within Area A, 18 within Area B, 12 within Area C, 14
within Area D, and 3 within Area E. Table 4.1 shows a cross tabulation of community
district SES by the City’s five areas.

Table 4.1

![Cross Tabulation of Community District SES by Area](image)

Missing data were investigated by performing frequency counts in SPSS 20.0.
Subsequently, 34 cases with missing data were present in Observed community district
SES and were removed from the analyses. Thus, for Question 1, data for 3199 complaints
were received and 3165 were evaluated ($n_{total} = 3165$). Specifically, 772 police-citizen
encounters occurred in Area A, 1033 occurred in Area B, 779 occurred in Area C, 462
occurred in Area D, and 127 encounters occurred in Area E. In addition, 45.72% of the
total number of encounters ($n_{total} = 3165$) occurred in Very Low SES neighborhoods,
24.87% in Low SES neighborhoods, 14.82% in Medium SES neighborhoods, and
14.60% of police-citizen encounters occurred in High SES neighborhoods. Frequency
and percent statistics for observed encounters are in Table 4.2.
Table 4.2

*Descriptive Statistics of Observed Encounters by Community District SES and Area*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community District SES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>1447</td>
<td>45.72</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>24.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>24.87</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1033</td>
<td>32.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>14.82</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>24.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>14.60</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>14.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3165</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expected frequency counts were calculated for each of the four levels of community district SES per area. After calculating the expected proportion of Very Low SES, Low SES, Medium SES, and High SES for each area, the proportions were multiplied by the total number of encounters observed in the respected. Proportions of expected community district SES were calculated by dividing the number of community districts for each level of SES by the total number of districts within that particular area. As an example, for expected community district SES of Area A, because 7 of the 12 districts are Very Low SES (58.3%), Area A would expect approximately 450 encounters across the 7 Very Low SES communities (58.3% * 772 = 450.3). Frequency and percent statistics for expected community district SES encounters are in Table 4.3.
Table 4.3

*Descriptive Statistics of Expected Encounters by Community District SES and Area*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Expected Community District SES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>58.33</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>44.44</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>27.78</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>35.71</td>
<td>42.86</td>
<td>21.43</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using SPSS 20.0, five chi-square tests of independence were performed to determine if differences existed between the observed frequency of police-citizen encounters and the expected frequency of encounters based on the socioeconomic status of the City’s community districts. Results indicated statistically significant differences were present between observed community district SES and expected community district SES for police-citizen encounters occurring within Area A, \( \chi^2 (2, n = 772) = 44.84, p < .001 \). Statistically significant differences were present between observed community district SES and expected community district SES for police-citizen encounters occurring...
within Area B, \( \chi^2 (3, n = 1033) = 84.47, p < .001 \). Statistically significant differences were present between observed community district SES and expected community district SES for police-citizen encounters occurring within Area C, \( \chi^2 (3, n = 771) = 36.00, p < .001 \). Statistically significant differences were present between observed community district SES and expected community district SES for police-citizen encounters occurring within Area D, \( \chi^2 (2, n = 462) = 33.44, p < .001 \). Statistically significant differences were present between observed community district SES and expected community district SES for police-citizen encounters occurring within Area E, \( \chi^2 (1, n = 127) = 18.28, p < .001 \). Therefore, the null hypothesis that there is no relationship between allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters and the SES of the community in which the police-citizen encounter occurs was rejected. See Table 4.4 for details of the five chi-square tests of independence.

**Research Question 2. Does the time of day, segmented into the timeframes of 7:00 a.m.-2:59 p.m. (day shift), 3:00 p.m.–10:59 p.m. (night shift), and 11:00 p.m.–6:59 a.m. (midnight shift), have an impact on allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters?**

This question was examined using frequency analysis to assess differences of police-citizen encounters across time of day categories. Data collected from the City were used to assess this characteristic. Missing data were investigated by conducting frequency counts in SPSS 20.0. Subsequently, 76 cases with missing data were present in the time of day data field. Thus, for Question 2, data for 3199 complaints were received and 3123 were evaluated (\( n_{\text{total}} = 3123 \)).
Table 4.4

*Chi-square Test of Independence Between Observed and Expected Community District SES by Area*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>44.84</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>772</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1033</td>
<td>84.47</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1033</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>771</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>33.44</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>462</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>18.28</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using SPSS 20.0, frequency statistics were calculated to assess frequency differences of police-citizen encounters across time of day categories. Results indicated that 47.36% of the total number of encounters ($n_{total} = 3123$) occurred during the night shift, 28.15% occurred during the midnight shift, and 24.50% of police-citizen encounters occurred during the day shift. The frequency analysis identified differences between allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters and the time of day in which the police-citizen encounter occurred. The
frequency analysis alone could not determine whether that difference was statistically
significant and the additional data needed to determine statistical significance were not
available. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there is no relationship between allegations
of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters
and the time of day in which the police-citizen encounter occurs was not rejected.

Frequency and percent statistics for Question 2 are in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5

*Descriptive Statistics for Question 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of Day</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>24.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night</td>
<td>1479</td>
<td>47.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midnight</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>28.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 3. Does the day of the week, segmented into the periods of Sunday through Wednesday (midweek), and Thursday through Saturday (weekend), have an impact on allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters?

This question was examined using frequency counts to assess differences of police-citizen encounters across day of week categories. Data collected from the City were used to assess this characteristic. Missing data were investigated by performing frequency counts in SPSS 20.0. Subsequently, 76 cases with missing data were present.
in day of week. Thus, for Question 3, data for 3199 complaints were received and 3123 were evaluated ($n_{total} = 3123$).

Using SPSS 20.0, frequency statistics were calculated to assess frequency differences of police-citizen encounters across day of week categories. Results indicated 51.14% of the total number of encounters ($n_{total} = 3123$) occurred during the weekend (Thursday–Saturday) and 48.86% of police-citizen encounters occurred during midweek (Sunday–Wednesday). The frequency analysis identified differences between allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters and the day of the week. The frequency analysis alone could not determine whether that difference was statistically significant. The additional data needed to determine statistical significance were not available. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there is no relationship between allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters and the day of week was not rejected. Frequency and percent statistics for Question 3 are displayed in Table 4.6.

Table 4.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day of Week</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Midweek</td>
<td>1526</td>
<td>48.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend</td>
<td>1597</td>
<td>51.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 4. Does gender of the citizen and police officer have an impact on allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters?

This question was examined using two chi-square tests of independence to determine if differences in gender existed between complainants and police officers involved in police-citizen encounters (observed gender encounters), as compared to the overall distribution of gender amid the City’s citizens and police officers (expected gender encounters). Specifically, a separate chi-square statistic was calculated for complaints made by males and females (complainant gender). Data collected from the 2008 American Community Survey (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010) and the City were used to test the characteristics. Because several police-citizen encounters consisted of both male and female complainants \( n = 623 \) and/or police officers \( n = 43 \), they were subsequently removed from the analysis.

For expected gender encounters, composite scores based on gender proportions were created to represent the expected frequency of encounters \( n_{\text{exp}} \) between the City’s citizens and police officers. Composite scores were calculated by multiplying the expected gender proportion of the City’s citizens \( \text{male } %_{\text{exp}} = 47.5\%, \text{female } %_{\text{exp}} = 52.5\% \) by the total number of observed cases in the analysis \( n_{\text{tot}} = 1388 \). This calculation provided a total expected frequency count for male citizens \( \text{male } n_{\text{exp tot}} = 659 \) and female citizens \( \text{female } n_{\text{exp tot}} = 729 \). To determine expected frequency counts for male citizens * male police officers, male citizens * female police officers, female citizens * male police officers, and female citizens * female police officers, total expected frequency counts \( \text{male } n_{\text{exp tot}} = 659, \text{female } n_{\text{exp tot}} = 729 \) were multiplied by
the expected gender proportion of police officers \((\text{male } \%_{exp} = 82.5\%, \text{female } \%_{exp} = 17.5\%)\).

Data collected from the City revealed 75.50% of the complainants of police-citizen encounters were male \((n = 1048)\) and 24.50% were female \((n = 340)\). Furthermore, 90.27% of the police officers involved in police-citizen encounters were male \((n = 1253)\) and 9.73% were female \((n = 135)\). Frequency and percent statistics for Question 4 are in Table 4.7.

Table 4.7

*Observed and Expected Frequencies of City, Police Department, and Police-Citizen Encounters by Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>(N)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>(N)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complainants</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1048</td>
<td>75.50</td>
<td>Citizens</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>47.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>24.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>52.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1388</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1388</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1253</td>
<td>90.27</td>
<td>Officers</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1145</td>
<td>82.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>9.73</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>17.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1388</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1388</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing data were investigated by performing frequency counts in SPSS 20.0. A total of 1811 cases with missing data or cases with both male and female complainants and/or police officers were found and removed. Additionally, frequency cell counts less than 5 \((n_{cell} < 5)\), or less than “80% of cells have expected frequencies of less than 5”
(Pallant, 2007) violated the assumption of the chi-square test of independence. No frequency cell counts violated this assumption. Thus, for Question 4, 1707 were evaluated by the chi-square test model containing male citizens (\(n_{observed} = 1048, n_{expected} = 659\)) and 1069 were evaluated by the chi-square test model containing female citizens (\(n_{observed} = 340, n_{expected} = 729\)).

Using SPSS 20.0, two chi-square tests of independence were conducted to determine if differences in gender existed between the observed frequencies of police-citizen encounters and the expected distribution of police-citizen encounters, as adjusted by the gender demographics of the City’s citizens and police officers. Results indicated statistically significant differences existed between observed gender encounters and expected gender encounters for police-citizen encounters involving male complainants, \(\chi^2(1, n = 1707) = 40.37, p < .001\). Statistically significant differences did not exist between observed gender encounters and expected gender encounters for police-citizen encounters involving female complainants, \(\chi^2(1, n = 1069) = 0.01, p = .920\). Therefore, the null hypothesis that there is no relationship between allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters and gender was rejected. See Table 4.8 for details of the two chi-square tests of independence.
### Table 4.8

**Chi-square Test of Independence between Observed and Expected Encounters by Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complainant Gender</th>
<th>Police Officer Gender</th>
<th>Encounter</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1048</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>659</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>340</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>729</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research Question 5.** Does age of the citizen and police officer have an impact on allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters?

This question was examined using a regression analysis to test the correlation between the ages of the citizens and officers who were involved in a police-citizen encounter. The criterion variable for Question 5 was the age of the police officers involved (police age) and the predictor variable was the age of the citizen(s) involved (citizen age). Several police-citizen encounters involved more than one citizen and/or police officers, thus the age of the oldest citizen/police offer was used. Descriptive statistics for citizens and police officers are in Table 4.9.
### Table 4.9

**Descriptive Statistics of Citizens and Police Officers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Age</td>
<td>2438</td>
<td>34.63</td>
<td>12.269</td>
<td>0.658</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Age</td>
<td>1588</td>
<td>37.05</td>
<td>6.812</td>
<td>0.437</td>
<td>-0.621</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before testing the question, the data were screened for missing data and univariate outliers. The data were screened for univariate outliers by transforming raw scores to \( z \)-scores and comparing \( z \)-scores to a critical value of +/- 3.29, \( p < .001 \) (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). \( Z \)-scores exceeding the critical value were more than three times larger/smaller than the average and thus represented outliers. The distributions were evaluated and 13 cases with univariate outliers were found in the citizen age distribution and one was found in police age distribution; these 14 cases were removed from the analysis. Missing data were investigated by performing frequency counts in SPSS 20.0. A total of 761 cases with missing data or univariate outliers existed in citizen age distribution and a total of 1611 cases with missing data or univariate outliers existed in police age distribution, and all were removed from the analysis. For Question 5, data for 3199 complaints were collected and 1417 were entered into the regression model; \( n = 1417 \).

Before analyzing Question 5, basic parametric assumptions were assessed. That is, for the criterion and predictor variables (police age and citizen age) assumptions of normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity of variance were evaluated. To test if the
distributions were significantly skewed, the skew coefficient was divided by the skew standard error, resulting in a $z$-skew coefficient, as recommended by Tabachnick and Fidell (2007). Specifically, $z$-skew coefficients exceeding the critical value of $\pm3.29$ ($p < .001$) may indicate non-normality. As seen in Table 4.10, based on the evaluation of the $z$-skew coefficients, the distributions did exceed the critical value. $Z$-kurtosis was also evaluated using the same method and police age was found to be significantly kurtotic ($z$-kurtosis $=-5.049$). Although the criterion and predictor variables were significantly skewed, by the central limit theorem, the variables were assumed to be normally distributed. The central limit theorem states that with sufficiently large sample sizes, the distributions can be assumed to be normally distributed (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).

Table 4.10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Skew</th>
<th>Skew SE</th>
<th>$z$-Skew</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Kurtosis SE</th>
<th>$z$-Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Age</td>
<td>0.658</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>13.16</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>2.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Age</td>
<td>0.437</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>7.16</td>
<td>-0.621</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>-5.049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Homoscedasticity is the assumption that the standard deviations of errors of prediction are approximately equal for all predicted DV scores (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Homoscedasticity is evaluated through visual evaluation of the residual scatterplots. When the band enclosing the residuals is approximately equal in width at all values of the predicted DV, homoscedasticity is assumed. Figure 4.1 displays the residual scatterplot of citizen age.
Figure 4.1. Residual scatterplot of police officer age.

Regression was performed using SPSS 20.0 to assess the correlation between the ages of the citizens and officers involved in the police-citizen encounter. Results indicated a statistically significant positive correlation between citizen age and police age; $r = .087$, $r^2 = 0.008$, $F (1, 1415) = 10.906$, $p = .001$. That is, as the age of the citizen increased, so did the age of the police officer. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there is no relationship between allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters and the age of the complainant and police officer was rejected. Table 4.11 displays descriptive and inferential statistics for the predictor variable.
Table 4.11

Model Summary of Regression Analysis for Question 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression Model Detail</th>
<th>( R )</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
<th>( SE )</th>
<th>( F )</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Omnibus Model</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>11.779</td>
<td>10.906</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>29.881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictor Variable</td>
<td>0.153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question 6. Does race of the citizen and police officer have an impact on allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters?

This question was examined using four chi-square tests of independence to determine if differences in race existed between complainants and police officers involved in police-citizen encounters (observed racial encounters) and the overall distribution of races amongst the citizens and police officers (expected racial encounters). Specifically, a separate chi-square statistic was calculated for each complainant race assessed in the study. Racial data were collected on several different racial types from the 2008 American Community Survey (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010) and the City; however, due to low frequencies of several groups, four racial groups were used in the analysis of Question 6 (White, Black, Hispanic, and Other). Because several police-
citizen encounters consisted of two or more citizens \((n = 142)\) and/or police officers \((n = 141)\), they were subsequently removed from the analysis.

For expected racial encounters, composite scores based on racial proportions were created to represent the expected frequency of encounters \((n_{\text{exp}})\) between the City’s citizens and police officers. Composite scores were calculated by multiplying the expected racial proportion of the City’s citizens \((\text{White } %_{\text{exp}} = 35\%, \text{ Black } %_{\text{exp}} = 25\%, \text{ Hispanic } %_{\text{exp}} = 27\%, \text{ and Other } %_{\text{exp}} = 13\%)\) by the total number of observed cases in the analysis \((n_{\text{tot}} = 1543)\). This provided a total expected frequency count for each citizen race \((\text{White } n_{\text{exp tot}} = 540, \text{ Black } n_{\text{exp tot}} = 386, \text{ Hispanic } n_{\text{exp tot}} = 417, \text{ and Other } n_{\text{exp tot}} = 201)\). To determine expected frequency counts for White/Black/Hispanic/Other citizens * White police officers, White/Black/Hispanic/Other citizens * Black police officers, White/Black/Hispanic/Other citizens * Hispanic police officers, and White/Black/Hispanic/Other citizens * Other police officers, total expected frequency counts \((\text{White } n_{\text{exp tot}} = 540, \text{ Black } n_{\text{exp tot}} = 386, \text{ Hispanic } n_{\text{exp tot}} = 417, \text{ and Other } n_{\text{exp tot}} = 201)\) were multiplied by the expected racial proportion of the City’s police department \((\text{White } %_{\text{exp}} = 53.7\%, \text{ Black } %_{\text{exp}} = 16.4\%, \text{ Hispanic } %_{\text{exp}} = 24.4\%, \text{ and Other } %_{\text{exp}} = 5.5\%)\).

Data collected from the City disclosed that the racial composition of complainants were 13.09% White \((n = 202)\), 43.55% Black \((n = 672)\), 19.05% Hispanic \((n = 294)\), and 24.30% comprised of Other races \((n = 375)\). The observed racial distribution of complaints filed against police officers was 49.77% White \((n = 768)\), 14.58% Black \((n = 225)\), 25.34% Hispanic \((n = 391)\), and 10.30% comprised of Other races \((n = 159)\). Table
4.12 displays the observed and expected frequency counts for both citizens and police officers.

Table 4.12

*Frequency of Race for City, Police Department, and Police-Citizen Encounters*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complainants</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>13.09</td>
<td>Citizens</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>43.55</td>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>24.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1543</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1543</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>49.77</td>
<td>Police</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>14.58</td>
<td>Officers</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>25.34</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1543</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1543</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing data were investigated by performing frequency counts in SPSS 20.0, and 1656 cases with missing data or police-citizen encounters with two or more citizens and/or police officers were found and removed. Additionally, frequency cell counts less than five \( (n_{cell} < 5) \), or less than “80% of cells have expected frequencies of less than 5” (Pallant, 2007) violate the assumption of the chi-square test of independence. No
frequency cell counts violated this assumption. Thus, for Question 6, data for 3199 complaints were received and 1543 were evaluated.

Using SPSS 20.0, four chi-square tests of independence were conducted to determine if differences in race existed between the observed distribution of police-citizen encounters and the expected distribution of police-citizen encounters, as adjusted by the racial demographics of the City’s citizens and police officers. results indicated that statistically significant differences did exist between observed racial encounters and expected racial encounters for three of the four racial groups; for White complainants, \( \chi^2 (3, n = 743) = 11.41, p = .010 \); for Hispanic complainants, \( \chi^2 (3, n = 711) = 19.4, p < .001 \); and for complainants of Other racial groups, \( \chi^2 (3, n = 576) = 28.58, p < .001 \). Police-citizen encounters involving Black complainants was not statistically significant, \( \chi^2 (3, n = 1057) = 1.63, p = .653 \). See Table 4.13 for details of the chi-square tests of independence.

**Summary of Results**

Inferential statistics were used to draw conclusions from the study sample. The SPSS was used to code and tabulate scores on the data collected on the sample and to provide summarized values, where applicable, including the median, mean, variance, and standard deviation. Finally, frequency analyses, regression correlation, and chi-square tests of independence were used to detect differences in allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters, and community SES, time of day, day of week, and the gender, age, and race of the citizen and police officer involved in the encounter. Four of the six research questions yielded significant findings: Community SES, gender, age, and race matter in police-citizen encounters.
Table 4.13

*Chi-square Test of Independence Between Observed and Expected Encounters by Race*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizen Race</th>
<th>Racial Encounter</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>χ^2</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>11.41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>541</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>385</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>417</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>28.58</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 5: Discussion

Introduction

This chapter contains an exploration of the implications of the findings reported in Chapter 4, identification of the limitations that affected the results of the study, recommendations for future research, and an overall summary of the study based on the analysis and results. The study findings provided additional insight into the dynamics of police-citizen encounters in an urban City. Specifically, the study examined three environmental factors and three personal characteristics of the citizen and police officer. Statistically significant differences were established between the dependent variable, which was allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language, and three of the six independent variables: community SES, gender, and race. A statistically significant correlation between the dependent variable and the independent variable of age was established. Relationships between the dependent variable and the remaining two independent variables (time of day and day of week) also emerged but statistical significance could not be established. The police department in the urban City can use the findings to develop better citizen engagement and disengagement strategies, de-escalation techniques, and conflict management skills.

Implications of Findings

The implications of the three environmental factors and three personal characteristics of the police officer and citizen are in this section. The variables showing
importance included place, time of day, day of week, gender, age, and race. Discussion of the implications of each appear below.

**Place matters.** Warren noted the importance of place in police-citizen encounters: “Where you live not only affects the frequency of the interaction with police but the nature of the interaction as well” (Warren, 2008, p. 358). Smith concluded, “The lower the socioeconomic status of a neighborhood, the greater the probability that the offenders encountered by the police will be arrested” (Smith, 1986, p. 325).

Five chi-square tests of independence were used to determine if a relationship existed between the place of the encounter and allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during the police-citizen encounter. The results of the study, detailed in Chapter 4, disclosed a statistically significant relationship between allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters and the socioeconomic status of the community in which the police-citizen encounter occurred. Table 4.4 showed that when community districts were aggregated geographically by the City’s five major areas, allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language were higher than expected in Very Low SES level community districts and higher than expected in three of the four Areas containing Low SES level community districts.

The near opposite result was observed in Medium and High SES level community districts. Allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language were lower than expected in four of the five areas containing Medium SES level community districts and lower than expected in the four Areas containing High SES level community districts. Although Very Low and Low SES level community districts accounted for
54.23% of the City’s 59 community districts (See Table 4.1), police-citizen encounters in Very Low and Low SES level community districts accounted for 70.59% of the total number of citizen complaints alleging police discourtesy or police use of offensive language (See Table 4.2). Police officers in the City were almost three times as likely to receive a citizen complaint alleging discourtesy or use of offensive language during a citizen encounter in Very Low and Low SES level community districts than they would have in Medium and High SES level community districts. This finding supported the Mastrofski et al., conclusion indicating, “Police officers were significantly more likely to behave disrespectfully in neighborhoods characterized by higher levels of disadvantage” (Mastrofski et al., 2002, p. 538).

The literature offered several possible explanations for the study findings. Research suggested police officers may project their beliefs of the community itself upon the people they encounter in the community (Hartjen, 1972; Smith, 1986; Stroshine et al., 2008). Here, the police officer’s experiences from working in Very Low and Low socioeconomic status communities might have shaped their behavior during police-citizen encounters in those communities.

Police organizations influence the behavior of their officers through policy, training, deployment, and supervision (Lindgren, 1981; Reiss, 1980). The City’s police department utilized a proactive policing strategy that dramatically increased police-initiated citizen engagements. Police deployment practices were influenced, in part, by crime patterns. Because crime is disproportionately concentrated in disadvantaged communities, more police officers are assigned to such communities resulting in more
proactive police-initiated citizen engagements. The findings of this study may be the unintended consequence of the crime control policies adopted by the department studied.

**Nighttime may matter.** A frequency analysis of the time of day was used to determine if a relationship existed between time of day and allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters. Specifically, time of day was segmented into three timeframes or shifts: 7:00 a.m.–2:59 p.m. (day shift), 3:00 p.m.–10:59 p.m. (night shift), and 11:00 p.m.–6:59 a.m. (midnight shift). The results, detailed in Chapter 4, disclosed that 47.36% of the allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language occurred during the night shift and another 28.15% occurred during the midnight shift. These two shifts accounted for over 75% of the citizens’ complaints (See Table 4.5), producing an uneven distribution of citizen complaints across the three shifts. The data indicating the number of dispatched or other assignments (police workload) data across the three shifts were unavailable. Therefore, how closely the workload correlated with citizen complaints remains unknown. Without workload data, the significance or non-significance of the difference between observed and expected outcomes could not be determined.

**Weekends may matter.** A frequency analysis of the days of the week was used to determine if a relationship existed between the midweek and weekend periods and allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters. The days of the week were segmented into Sunday–Wednesday (midweek) and Thursday–Saturday (weekend) to determine which period accounted the greater number of complaints. The results, detailed in Chapter 4, disclosed that three days (42.85% of the week) accounted for 51.14% of the complaints (See Table 4.6). The
majority of citizen complaints occurred over the weekend, producing an uneven
distribution of citizen complaints across the days of the week.

The researcher speculated that police-citizen encounters that generate the majority
of citizen complaints occur after the traditional workday, at nighttime, and during the
days of the week when a many people engage in leisure or recreational activities, on
weekends. If the workload was greater over the weekend, more officers were assigned to
the weekend to address workload issues. Additional officers working during the
weekend would increase the overall opportunity for negative police-citizen encounters
and could explain the distribution, or the cause might be something else entirely. The
data for police workload across the days of the week were not available. Therefore, how
closely the workload correlated with citizen complaints remains unknown. Without
workload data, the significance or non-significance of the difference between observed
and expected outcomes could not be determined.

**Gender matters.** Two chi-square tests of independence were used to determine
whether a relationship existed between gender and allegations of police discourtesy or
police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters. The findings, detailed
in Chapter 4, disclosed a statistically significant relationship between allegations of
police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters
and males, both complainants and police officers. The findings showed that 75.50% of
the complainants and 90.27% of the police officers complained of were males (see Table
4.7). When the proportion of males in the City’s resident population and the proportion
of males in the City’s police department were considered, a statistically significant
difference emerged in the number of observed citizen complaints made by male
complainants against male police officers than would be expected, based on the respective proportions in the resident and police department populations.

No statistically significant difference existed between the number of observed and expected complaints made by female complainants against female police officers. In fact, the number of observed gender encounters for male complainants against female police officers and the number of observed gender encounters for female complainants against male and female police officers were lower than expected, given their proportions in the City and the City police department (See Table 4.8). This finding was consistent with research indicating women are “significantly less likely than men to perceive police as disrespectful” (Warren, 2008, p. 369).

Sykes and Clark’s (1975) theory of deference exchange may help to explain the observed results. The theory of deference exchange suggests, in part, that females defer to males (Sykes & Clark, 1975). Therefore, the researcher expected and found lower observed versus expected complaints from (a) male complainants against female officers and (b) female complainants against male officers (See Table 4.8). Gender deference with respect to same gender encounters is likely neutralized. Therefore, in same-gender encounters, gender should not impact observed and expected outcomes. Table 4.8 shows male complainants made more complaints against male police officers than expected; however, female complainants made fewer complaints against female police officers than expected, a situation offering several possible explanations.

One explanation is that although females accounted for 17.50% of the City’s police officers, females may account for a smaller percentage of police officers on patrol or in other enforcement positions. If this conjecture is accurate, the expected number of
police-citizen encounters involving female officers would be proportionately smaller and statistical significance might be affected. Another explanation, as noted above, is that females are less likely to perceive police officers as disrespectful.

**Age matters.** A regression correlation was used to determine whether a relationship existed between the age of the complainant and police officer and allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters. Table 4.11 shows a statistically significant positive correlation between the complainant’s age and the police officer’s age. As the age of the citizen increased, the age of the police officer also increased. These findings may be explained using Sykes and Clark’s (1975) theory of deference exchange.

The theory suggests, in part, that younger people defer to older people (Sykes & Clark, 1975). Showing respect for one’s elders or offering one’s seat to an older person on public transportation systems are common Western displays of age deference. Table 4.9 shows, on average, the police officer was nearly three years older than the citizen complainant was. This closeness in age might not have been discernible to the parties, and thus deference based on age might have been neutralized. The finding of the the age of the complainants and the police officers as moving together and in the same direction might have neutralized the effects of deference based on age in such encounters.

**Race matters.** Four chi-square tests of independence were used to determine if a relationship existed between the race of the complainant and police officer and allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters. Table 4.13 shows a statistically significant difference between observed racial encounters and expected racial encounters for White, Hispanic, and Other race
complainants. The results for White complainants with respect to observed and expected encounters with White, Black, Hispanic and Other race police officers were fewer complaints than expected, and the difference between the two was statistically significant. The results for Hispanic complainants with respect to observed and expected encounters with White, Black, and Other race police officers were fewer complaints than expected but more than expected for encounters with Hispanic police officers. Overall, Hispanic complainants lodged fewer complaints for alleged police discourtesy or police use of offensive language than would have been expected, and the difference between the two was statistically significant. The results for Black and Other race complainants with respect to observed and expected encounters with White, Black, Hispanic, and Other race police officers showed more complaints than expected. However, the difference for Black complainants was not statistically significant, while the difference for Other race complainants was statistically significant.

The findings with respect to Black and Hispanic complainants were unexpected and are inconsistent with the general narrative regarding police encounters with persons of color. The literature disclosed that Blacks and Hispanics have been subjected to a disproportionate number of stops, searches, and arrests by police (Smith & Alpert, 2007; Warren, 2008). Smith and Alpert offered a theory of police behavior, based in stereotype formation to explain this result and asserted that police officers have unconscious biases toward people of color that comes from exposure to members of these groups involved in deviant or criminal activities or through a false connection with deviant or criminal behavior. Smith (1986) found that police use of their coercive powers was not related to
the race of the individual they encountered, but instead was related to the racial composition of the neighborhood in which the police-citizen encounter occurred.

This researcher expected the observed complaints of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language for Black and Hispanic complainants to be more than expected, statistically significant difference. Mastrofski et al. (2002) obtained unexpected results in his study on police disrespect toward members of the public. In that study, with respect to suspects that did not provoke the police, the researchers found that minority suspects were less likely than White suspects to be disrespected by the police. Perhaps race doesn’t matter as much as previously thought.

**Limitations**

The 2008 workload data of the City’s police department were unavailable. The data would have permitted drawing conclusions with respect to whether the observed distribution of complaints of alleged police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters across time of day and day of week were statistically different from the workload distribution across time and day of week. While the findings showed an uneven distribution, the distributions may not correlate with workload distribution and therefore may not be predictive environmental factors influencing the filing of citizen complaints against police officers. The researcher data concerning the percentage of male and female police officers on patrol or other enforcement positions were also not available. This data would have provided greater insight in explaining the observed and expected gender outcome finding regarding female complainants versus female police officers.
Recommendations for Practice

Alternate enforcement and deployment model. The findings disclosed statistically significant relationships among allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language and (a) community SES, (b) gender, (c) age, and (d) race. The first recommendation is that the City’s police department should examine its enforcement and deployment practices in very low and low socioeconomic status and other disadvantaged communities. The presence of people of color in urban socioeconomically disadvantaged communities is a reality of policing. Employing aggressive, assertive, or zero tolerance enforcement models, like the extensive use of Terry type stops, full enforcement of quality of life, and other minor offenses in these communities increases the number of police-citizen encounters and increases the opportunity for conflict during the encounters. The extensive use of aggressive enforcement practices in disadvantaged communities may reinforce the perceptions in those communities of unfair police practices in poorer communities.

While police executives may correctly assert that such enforcement strategies reduce crime, their adverse impact on police-community relations may make it a pyrrhic victory. The City should determine if another enforcement and deployment model that also reduces crime but has a less adverse impact on police-community relations is appropriate. Examples include problem-oriented community policing, intelligence-led policing, and predictive policing. This is arguably more a political decision than a decision made on merit.

Police-citizen engagement training. Notwithstanding whether the City changes the enforcement strategy, the second recommendation is that the City should develop
police-citizen engagement training, informed by the findings of the current study. At a minimum, such training should be interactive and scenario-based. Fact patterns from actual substantiated citizen complainants could be used to develop the scenarios. Police agencies tend to be insular in their tactical scenario-based training because department or other law enforcement personnel serve as the actors in the scenarios. Training normally takes place in this manner to limit the exposure of police tactics to members of the public.

Such thinking worked reasonably well before the extensive distribution of technology that includes video recording capabilities in most cellular phones. Police tactics are used publicly and observed by members of the public every day. A basic Internet search will produce hundreds of videos recorded by citizens or by police dashboard or body cameras, displaying police tactics and operating protocols. Because the protection of police tactics is no longer a valid concern, police training should involve members of the public. Police agencies could partner with local colleges and universities and use students who major in the social sciences or drama or local community groups to serve as actors in the scenarios. Because the majority of the students will not have had police training, they will react as civilians in the scenarios. At best, police officers playing the role of civilians are likely to react as police officers playing the role of a civilian, and at worst, are likely to perpetuate and reinforce stereotypes and other negative views they hold of the community.

During these exercises, the police officer must demonstrate the skills learned during the lesson to the satisfaction of their instructors. An accompanying recommendation is that the students or community members and police officers should conduct exercises in which they switch roles. Such an exchange could ensure that each
participant will get a better perspective and deeper understanding of the concerns of the other. The immediate feedback police trainers receive from the students or community members and police officers will be invaluable in refining the training and developing training to address other subject matter.

The training sessions should be videotaped and the video used during the critique and debriefing of the exercise. Video of particularly instructive exercises could be used at other training sessions, but generally, the videotapes should be erased after each debriefing. Police officers must be aware of and reflect on how their perceptions of community and the people engaged in the community may inappropriately influence their behavior during police-citizen encounters. The recommended training should help raise awareness among police officers and create greater understand among community members.

**Reassess orientation training.** The third recommendation suggests the City’s police department should reassess the orientation training provided to officers newly assigned to a patrol command. The orientation training should include information about the demographics of the communities they will serve; the community, religious, and political leaders they are likely to encounter; and any specific circumstances or conditions that may arise due to religious practices or cultural belief systems. The training should highlight gender differences, including research findings indicating that women are less likely than men are to view police officers as disrespectful. Prior citizen complaints in which officers were disrespectful toward women can be instructive in identify patterns of behavior or speech the officer must be aware of and avoid when engaging female members of the public. Due to irregular assignment practices, an orientation session
could be recorded and could feature the commander officer and other essential unit personnel as well as local political, religious, or community leaders. The recording should be updated as needed and supplemented with live presentations by the training officer and selected community members.

**Transparency.** Police officers need to be more transparent in the actions with the community; the final recommendation in the study. When a police officer uses his or her coercive powers during a citizen engagement, such as when the citizen is stopped by force, frisked, searched, or handcuffed during the encounter, issued a citation, or other issue, that officer should, when it is safe to do so, explain the basis of his or her actions to the citizen. The citizen may still not like the manner in which he or she was engaged by the officer, but is less likely to question the legal basis for the engagement.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

The independent variables were viewed singularly in the current study, with respect to the dependent variable. Future research could view these and other variables all together and in various combinations to determine which combinations of factors produce the greatest likelihood of generating a citizen complaint of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language. Additional future research could again seek to test Turks’ (1966, 1969) notion of organization and sophistication by examining more deeply the instances involving multiple complainants and the complexity of the relationships among them. Investigation could also address the communication abilities or interpersonal skills of the complainant by viewing formal education, income, occupation, or some other indicator of the complainant’s ability to negotiate conclusion to his/her benefit.
Conclusion

The literature suggested the six factors examined in the current study are important to understanding human behavior. Frequency analyses, chi-square tests of independence, and a regression analysis were used to analyze citizen complaint data. The findings were generally consistent with the literature. Policing is a social endeavor and good police-community relations are essential for effective policing. Police agencies that view themselves as a part of the community invest time and resources to develop substantive relationships with communities and are respectful, civil, and fair in its dealing with community members. Such departments, regardless of their operational philosophy, tend to be more effective than are departments that operate as agents of social control. Interpersonal communication can present challenges because it becomes more complex and potentially more challenging when the parties are socially, racially, ethnically, or culturally diverse. Police officers do not get to choose whom they serve or encounter. Therefore, their ability to effectively engage people from all walks of life is a determinant of how successful the department will be in accomplishing its mission.

Unlike parties to most encounters, police officers have the legal authority to coerce behavior. Police officers affect citizen behavior through persuasion, threats of force, the actual use of force, and threats of or actual arrest of the citizen. Members of the community closely monitor police incivility and use of force. Police disrespect or the inappropriate use of force can spark civil unrest and disobedience and can destroy a community’s confidence that its officers police their community in a fair and unbiased manner. Environmental factors are present in some communities that complicate the
police-citizen communication process. The literature is clear that environment shapes the behavior of the actors in the environment.

The objective of this study was to examine three environmental factors and three personal characteristics of the parties to police-citizen encounters. Specifically, the factors examined included the influence of (a) socioeconomic status of a community, (b) time of day, (c) day of week, (d) gender, (e) age, and (f) race on the filing of citizen complaints of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language during police-citizen encounters. A statistically significant relationship emerged between the SES level of a community and the filing of citizen complaints for police discourtesy or police use of offensive language. In very low and low SES level communities, observed complaints were greater than expected. In medium and high SES level communities, observed complaints were fewer than expected. An uneven distribution of citizen complaints for police discourtesy or police use of offensive language emerged across shifts (time of day) and midweek/weekend (day of week). Statistical significance concerning the distribution was not established.

A statistically significant relationship emerged between complaints of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language and male complainants. A statistically significant positive correlation between the complainant’s age and the police officers age emerged. As the age of the citizen who lodged the complaint increased, so did the age of the police officer. A statistically significant relationship emerged between White, Hispanic, and Other race complainants and allegations of police discourtesy or police use of offensive language. Statistical significance was not established with respect to Black complainants.
The study disclosed a troublesome problem for the City’s police officers. People from very low and low SES level communities were more likely than people from higher socioeconomic status communities to perceive police officers as discourteous or using language considered offensive during police-citizen encounters. If a majority of these complaints is substantiated, the problem moves from perception to reality. If the incivility was intentional, the remedy is discipline. If the incivility was due to cultural incompetence, the solution is training. Educators know that adults learn by doing. An interactive scenario-based training methodology incorporating members of the public into the training exercises was a recommendation in the study. Although the solution is labor-intensive and more costly than a lecture-based approach, it may be more effective in achieving the desired outcome.
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Appendix A

In-take Forms

receives civilian complaints via the Internet, U.S. mail, telephone, walk-ins, and referrals from the police department. The in-take forms used by and/or the police department are included.
Online Complaint Form

If you wish to file a complaint against a member of our staff, please complete the form below. Please fill in as much information as possible, including your contact information. (Refer to our "How to File a Complaint" page for other ways to file a complaint.)

COMPLAINANT Information

First Name: 

Last Name: 

Address: 

City: 

State: 

Zip: 

Date of Birth: Month: 

Date: 

Year: 

Home Phone: 

Business Phone: 

Cellular Phone: 

E-mail address: 

Sex: M F 

Race: 

Did you witness the Incident complained of: Yes No 

If you are filing a complaint on behalf of someone else, what is your relationship, if any, to the person(s): 

Parent Spouse Relative Guardian Child Friend Other 

Please provide as much of the following information as you can about the person(s) on whose behalf the complaint is filed and any witness(es) to the incident: 

VICTIM/WITNESS Information

VICTIM/WITNESS A 

Is this person a: Victim Witness 

First Name: 

Last Name: 

Address: 

City: 

State: 

Zip:
Date of Birth: Month: Day: Year:

Home Phone:

Business Phone:

Cellular Phone:

E-mail address:

Sex: M F Race:

VICTIM/WITNESS B

Is this person a: Victim Witness

First Name: Last Name:

Address:

City: State: Zip:

Date of Birth: Month: Day: Year:

Home Phone:

Business Phone:

Cellular Phone:

E-mail address:

Sex: M F Race:

List any additional witnesses, along with their contact information, in your description of the incident.

INCIDENT Information

Date of Incident: Month: Day: Year: 2012

Time of Incident: 1:1 AM

Location of Incident:

Please provide a detailed description of the police officer(s):

OFFICER 1:
Rank:  First Name:  Last Name:

Is this officer a Subject Officer  Witness Officer

Sex:  Race:  

Precinct/Command:  Shield #:  

Plainclothes/in Uniform?  On Foot/in Car?  

Patrol Car #:  License Plate #:  Car Marked/Unmarked?  

Physical Description (eye color, hair color, approx. height & build, age, etc):

Please describe the role of this officer in the incident:

OFFICER 2:

Rank:  First Name:  Last Name:

Is this officer a Subject Officer  Witness Officer

Sex:  Race:  

Precinct/Command:  Shield #:  

Plainclothes/in Uniform?  On Foot/in Car?  

Patrol Car #:  License Plate #:  Car Marked/Unmarked?  

Physical Description (eye color, hair color, approx. height & build, age, etc):

Please describe the role of this officer in the incident:

OFFICER 3:

Rank:  First Name:  Last Name:

Is this officer a Subject Officer  Witness Officer
Sex:  
Race:  

Precinct/Command:  
Shield #:  

Plainclothes/In Uniform?  
On Foot/In Car?  

Patrol Car #:  
License Plate #:  
Car Marked/Unmarked?  

Physical Description (eye color, hair color, approx. height & build, age, etc):  

Please describe the role of this officer in the incident:  

OFFICER 4:  

Rank:  
First Name:  
Last Name:  

Is this officer a  
Subject Officer  
Witness Officer  

Sex:  
Race:  

Precinct/Command:  
Shield #:  

Plainclothes/In Uniform?  
On Foot/In Car?  

Patrol Car #:  
License Plate #:  
Car Marked/Unmarked?  

Physical Description (eye color, hair color, approx. height & build, age, etc):  

Please describe the role of this officer in the incident:  

Description of the Incident:  
Please enter as much detail as possible.  

I have read the foregoing complaint and the contents thereof are true to the best of my knowledge:  
True  
False
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DATE OF OCCURRENCE</td>
<td>Day, Month, Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME OF OCCURRENCE</td>
<td>Time of day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION OF OCCURRENCE</td>
<td>Location details</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAY OF WEEK</td>
<td>Monday, Tuesday, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHORT DESCRIPTION OF INCIDENT</td>
<td>简要描述事件</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION OF OCCURRENCE</td>
<td>地点</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE REPORTED</td>
<td>报告日期</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>时间</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VICTIM</td>
<td>凶手</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WITNESS</td>
<td>见证人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELATIONSHIP TO VICTIM</td>
<td>与受害人的关系</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSON ASSISTING INTERPRETER, REPRESENTATIVE</td>
<td>陪同翻译, 代表</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPLAINANT'S SURNAME</td>
<td>投诉人姓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST</td>
<td>名</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.O.S.</td>
<td>性别 (M: Male, F: Female)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTORNEY RETAINED</td>
<td>聘请律师 (是/否)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP CODE</td>
<td>邮政编码</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APT. NO.</td>
<td>单元号</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOME PHONE</td>
<td>家庭电话</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS PHONE</td>
<td>工作电话</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WITNESS / VICTIM SURNAME</td>
<td>见证人/受害者姓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST</td>
<td>名</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE OF BIRTH</td>
<td>出生日期</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>性别 (M: Male, F: Female)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACE</td>
<td>种族</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.O.S.</td>
<td>性别 (M: Male, F: Female)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTORNEY RETAINED</td>
<td>聘请律师 (是/否)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP CODE</td>
<td>邮政编码</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APT. NO.</td>
<td>单元号</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOME PHONE</td>
<td>家庭电话</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS PHONE</td>
<td>工作电话</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DETAILS</td>
<td>详细描述 (必要时)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMPLAINANT'S SIGNATURE</td>
<td>投诉人签名</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>签名日期</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TITLE AND SIGNATURE OF MEMBER RECEIVING COMPLAINT</td>
<td>接收投诉成员的职位和签名</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME PRINTED</td>
<td>印刷名称</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>印刷日期</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B
Permissions

Letter to <disguised>, CCRB, requesting complaint data
E-mail from <disguised>, CCRB, supplying requested data
Letter to <disguised>, DH&MH, requesting permission to use SES index
E-mail from <disguised>, DH&MH, granting permission to use SES index

Dear Name:

I am writing to thank you and the Board for allowing me limited access to quantitative data collected by the Civilian Complainant Review Board (CCRB). As you are aware, my research involves examining the impact of neighborhood environmental factors on conflict during police-citizen encounters. The data set that I would like to study is civilian complaints filed in 2008 against Police Department officers in which the major complaint was Discourtesy or Offensive Language. I am not interested in...
complaints or allegations of Force or Abuse of Authority. From the 2008 data set involving complaints of Discourtesy and Offensive Language, I am requesting the following quantitative data in electronic form:

a) Date of Incident
b) Day of Week of Incident
c) Time of Incident
d) Location of Incident
e) Zip Code of Incident Location
f) Type of Incident Location (i.e., street, residence, commercial, etc.)
g) Age of Complainant and Respondent
h) Gender of Complainant and Respondent

Access to this data will facilitate my research and I am very grateful. As I mentioned previously, I will not identify the city or in my dissertation as the source of my data. Also, I am not seeking any identifying information for the Complainant or Respondent. If you have any questions concerning this request, please feel free to contact me by phone at (xxx) xxx-xxxx or e-mail at xxx@xxx.com.

Sincerely,

Demosthenes Long
Dear Name:

I attach a dataset for use in connection with your proposed research study.

Regards,

<Disguised>

Name
Title
Address
City
(XXX) XXX-XXXX
XXX@XXX.XXX
WWW.XXX.XXX
Dear Name:

My name is Demosthenes Long and I am a doctoral candidate at St John Fisher College, Ralph C. Wilson, Jr. School of Education. I am currently working on my doctoral dissertation. I am exploring the association between environmental factors in City neighborhoods and interpersonal conflict. One of the environmental factors that I plan to study is the relationship between the socioeconomic status of City neighborhoods and interpersonal conflict.

I am writing to you because during my research, I found the 2010 City Child Fatality Report. You are listed as the City employee in this publication. This report “analyzes individual and neighborhood disparities in fatal childhood injuries, highlights factors that may place some children at greater risk than others.” The report discusses the City Child Fatality Review Team’s creation and use of a socioeconomic (SES) index to help conduct their research. I am interested in speaking with you or someone else familiar with the methodology used to create the SES index. Since my study also
includes an examination of the SES of City neighborhoods, the guidance I receive from you or a member of your staff concerning this matter will better prepare me to undertake this aspect of my study.

I want to thank you for taking the time to read this letter. Any advice or guidance you can offer on the creation of the SES index would be greatly appreciated. I can be reached by phone at (xxx) xxx-xxxx or by e-mail at xxx@xxx.xxx

Sincerely,

Demosthenes Long
Hello Demonsthenes,

Thanks for your interest in our SES index from the 2010 report. You are quite welcome to use our ranking methodology for your analyses. What we simply did was rank each geographic unit (in our case, community districts) from 1 to 4 based on GIS mapping of quartile distributions of data procured from the U.S. Census from the Dept. of City Planning’s website.

There are 3 sources of information in the report that should provide you with how to replicate what we did: An explanation of neighborhood-level analyses on pg 5, Appendix B on pg 33, and the Mapping/SES index section in the Technical Appendix on pg 35. Through some examples, let’s take a look at what we did:

First, we ranked the values for education (% high school graduates), employment (employment rate), income (annual income), and % black and then found the quartile breaks for each variable. You can do this either through GIS or SAS. The highest quartile was assigned 4 (H), the next 3 (M), then next 2 (L) and the lowest 1 (VL). Then we had to create a score for the SES composite indicator — simple addition as shown with these 2 examples:

Area 1
Education = VL = 1
Employment = VL = 1
Income = VL = 1
% Black = M = 3

SES composite indicator = 1+1+1+3 = 6  β Now what’s the assignment for this CD? H, M, L, VL? Depends on what this score is relative to all other CDs.

Area 2
Education = H = 4
Employment = H = 4
Income = H = 4
% Black = L = 1

SES composite indicator = 4 + 4 + 4 +1 = 13 <- Same question as above. Obviously, it is much higher than Area 1. Need to rank score among all other CDs.

So we repeated these calculations for each community district. The “score” for SES composite indicator in each of the Areas was next ranked by quartile so that a relative “assignment” of H, M, L, VL could be assigned. Our coordinator is out on maternity leave so I don’t have access to her exact files to check about the actual quartile breaks be
her data is protected, but again, you can do this yourself either by plotting in GIS or by plotting and running in SAS. I believe a box plot will give you the quartile breaks.

I hope this helps you.

Good luck,

Name

Name

Title

City Department

Address

City

Did you know each year more City older adults are hospitalized for FALLS than pneumonia/influenza?
Want to learn more about this and other injuries? Check out http://xxx