



SCHOOL of
GRADUATE STUDIES
EAST TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY

East Tennessee State University
Digital Commons @ East
Tennessee State University

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Student Works

12-2004

Juveniles' Attitudes toward the Police as Affected by Prior Victimization.

Joshua A. Hardin

East Tennessee State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hardin, Joshua A., "Juveniles' Attitudes toward the Police as Affected by Prior Victimization." (2004). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 937. <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd/937>

This Thesis - Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Works at Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. For more information, please contact digilib@etsu.edu.

Juveniles' Attitudes Toward the Police as Affected by Prior Victimization

A thesis
presented to
the faculty of the Department of Criminal Justice
East Tennessee State University

In partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree
Master of Arts in Criminal Justice and Criminology

by
Joshua A. Hardin
December 2004

Dr. Stephen Brown, Chair
Dr. Larry Miller
Dr. Wayne Gillespie

Keywords: Attitudes, Delinquency, Juveniles, Police, Victimization

ABSTRACT

Juveniles' Attitudes Toward the Police as Affected by Prior Victimization

by

Joshua A. Hardin

The purpose of this study was to analyze juveniles' attitudes toward the police and how their attitudes were affected by prior victimization and delinquency, controlling for race, gender, and city of residence. All variables used in this study came from the Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T.) data collected by Esbensen (1999). The analysis indicated that females held more favorable attitudes toward the police than males, Whites held more favorable attitudes toward the police than non-Whites, and juveniles living in small rural/suburban areas held more favorable attitudes than those living in large urban areas. The major finding of this study was that a spurious relationship existed between prior victimization and attitudes toward the police with delinquency being the true predictor of juveniles' attitudes. A possible explanation for this finding is that those juveniles at the greatest risk of victimization are the same ones committing the majority of the delinquent acts.

CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	2
LIST OF TABLES	5
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	6
Race/Ethnicity	6
Gender.....	8
Victimization	9
Juveniles.....	9
Juveniles' Race/Ethnicity	10
Juveniles' Gender.....	10
Juvenile Victimization.....	11
Effects of Delinquency and Residential Area	11
Purpose of the Current Study.....	12
Hypotheses.....	13
2. REVIEW OF THE PRIOR RESEARCH	14
Adults' Attitudes Toward the Police	14
Victimization	24
Juveniles' Attitudes Toward the Police	31
3. METHODOLOGY	37
Data... ..	37
Variables	38

Dependent Variable	39
Independent Variables.....	39
Delinquency Scales	41
Analytic Strategy	42
4. RESULTS	46
Summary Statistics	46
Mean Differences on ATP scale	51
Correlation between Variables	54
ANOVA of Race and ATP	59
ANOVA of City of Residence and ATP	60
Regression Equation One.....	63
Regression Equation Two.....	65
5. DISCUSSION	69
Hypotheses	69
Limitations and Weaknesses	75
Implications	77
REFERENCES	80
VITA	87

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Past Findings Concerning Adults' Attitudes Toward Police (ATP)	15
2. Prior Studies of Adults' Attitudes Toward police (ATP) That Included Victimization	16
3. Prior Studies of Juveniles' Attitudes Toward Police (ATP)	32
4. Summary Statistics	47
5. t-test Comparisons of Juveniles' ATP by Gender and Prior Victimization	54
6. Pearson's Correlations between the ATP Scale and All Independent Variables.....	58
7. Analysis of Variance Comparison of Juveniles' Attitudes Toward Police by Race	60
8. ANOVA Comparison of Juveniles' ATP by City of Residence	62
9. Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Attitudes Toward Police ..	64
10. Summary of Regression Analysis when Delinquency Measures were Included.....	67

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Police officers must perform their duties on a public stage. Their profession requires them to deal effectively with the problems of private citizens. For this reason they are subject to the perceptions and reactions of not only the citizens they interact with but also of the citizens who observe them on a daily basis. It is imperative that police officers have public support in order to execute their duties effectively. Without the help of witnesses and informants, the task of a police officer would prove much more difficult. For these reasons police departments and government officials began to evaluate citizens' attitudes toward the police. The first police service rating scale was developed by Arthur Bellman (1935) as way for citizens to rate police performance in their communities. Over the years the interest in citizens' attitudes toward the police has increased. Since the 1960s countless researchers have studied this phenomenon through use of citizen surveys; the majority of these studies have focused on the attitudes of adults.

Race/Ethnicity

One of the most widely studied factors in relation to attitudes toward the police has been how an individual's race/ethnicity affects their attitude. The majority of attitudes toward police (ATP) studies have found that the respondents' attitudes toward police vary significantly based on their race/ethnicity, although there has been conflicting results on the direction of the variation. Most of the prior research indicates that Whites hold more favorable attitudes toward the police than non-Whites (Albrecht & Green, 1977; Brandl et al., 1994; Cheurprakobkit, 2000; Correia, Reisig, & Lovrich, 1996; Furstenberg & Wellford, 1973; Jesilow, Meyer, & Namazzi, 1995; Maxson, Hennigan, & Sloane, 2003; Murphy & Worrall, 1999; Reisig & Parks, 2000; Smith,

Steadman, Minton, & Townsend, 1999; Smith & Hawkins, 1973; Sullivan, Dunham, & Alpert, 1987; Tuch & Weitzer, 1997; Webb & Marshall, 1995). On the other hand, several studies have reported no difference among the races in terms of their attitudes toward the police (Brandl, Frank, Woolderedge, & Watkins, 1997; Cao, Frank, & Cullen, 1996; Chandek, 1999; Hawdon & Ryan, 2003; Kusow, Wilson, & Martin, 1997; Poister & McDavid, 1978; Reisig & Giacomazzi, 1998). Although very few in numbers, other studies have reported that non-Whites had more positive attitudes toward the police than Whites (Dunham & Alpert, 1988; Frank, Brandl, Cullen, & Stichman, 1996; Sims, Hooper, & Peterson, 2002).

The race/ethnicity of respondents has historically been the most common variable in all ATP studies. The most common reason given to account for Whites holding more positive attitudes toward the police than non-Whites is the perceived differential treatment of minorities by police. For example, the United States Department of Justice issued a report claiming that blacks were over 10 times more likely than persons of other races to have been in jail in 2002 (United States Department Of Justice, 2003). Studies that have reported no significant differences among the races in terms of their attitudes toward the police show that these racial differences disappear when other factors are controlled for. For example, the study by Kusow, Wilson, and Martin (1997) found no significant differences in attitudes toward the police among the races when residential location was controlled for. Studies that have reported non-Whites having more favorable attitudes toward the police than Whites suggest several reasons. For example, the study by Sims et. al. (2002) suggested that blacks possessed more favorable ATP because they represent the majority of criminal victims and by the fact that their study did not include juvenile respondents, who are more likely to have negative contacts with the police.

Gender

Another factor often included in these studies has been the gender of the respondents. The majority of these studies confirm that gender plays a major role in attitudes toward police although the direction of the variation differs. There is very little consensus on how gender affects attitudes toward the police. Several previous studies have found that females possess more favorable attitudes toward the police than males (Cao et al., 1996; Cheurprakobkit 2000; Hawdon & Ryan, 2003; Reisig & Giacomazzi, 1998; Sims et al., 1999; Webb & Marshall, 1995). Although very few in numbers, other studies have reported that males hold more favorable attitudes toward the police than females (Correia et al., 1996). There have also been several studies that reported no difference among male and female attitudes (Benedict, Brown, & Bower, 1999; Brandl et al., 1994; Brandl et al., 1997; Chandek, 1999; Dunham & Alpert, 1988; Frank et al., 1996; Jesilow et al., 1995; Kusow et al., 1997; Murphy & Worrall, 1999; Parker, Onyekwulje, & Murty, 1995; Poister & McDavid, 1978; Reisig et al., 2000; Zamble & Annesley, 1987).

Caution should be used in making predictions solely on the basis of gender. Much of the variation in attitudinal differences between male and female respondents could be due to other factors. Factors such as marital status, family composition, socioeconomic status, and city of residence can affect the attitudes of males and females. However, some variation in attitudes between males and females still exists when all of these other factors are controlled for. For example, the study conducted by Cao et al. (1996) reported that females were more likely than males to hold positive attitudes toward the police even when factors such as victimization, fear of crime, income, education, and community disorder were controlled for.

Victimization

Another variable sometimes included in these studies has been prior victimization.

Victimization refers to being the victim of a crime. It can either be a violent crime such as rape or robbery or a non-violent crime such as having something stolen. Victimization as included in these studies seeks to take into account the effect that any prior crimes committed against a person may have on their attitude toward the police. Some of these studies have found the effects of prior victimization to be a significant factor affecting confidence in the police.

The majority of prior studies assessing the effects of victimization on attitudes toward the police have found that prior victims hold more negative attitudes than non-victims (Brandl et al., 1994; Carter, 1985; Chandek, 1999; Dull & Wint, 1997; Frank et al., 1996; Homant, Kennedy, & Fleming, 1984; Koenig, 1980; Kusow, Wilson, & Martin, 1997; Maxson et al., 2003; Poister & McDavid, 1978; Priest & Carter, 1999; Reisig & Giacommazzi, 1998; Smith et al., 1999). While there have been no studies to date that suggest victimization produces a more favorable ATP, several studies have reported that prior victimization does not have a significant effect on ATP (Cao et al., 1996; Hawdon & Ryan, 2003; Smith & Hawkins, 1973). Studies that reported victimization had no significant impact on attitudes toward police show that the effect of victimization diminishes when other factors are controlled for. For example, in the study by Cao et al. (1996) the effect of prior victimization was significant until community disorder and informal collective security was included in the analysis.

Juveniles

Several studies have been conducted that focus solely on juveniles' attitudes toward the police (Amorso & Ware, 1983; Cox & Falkenberg, 1987; Giordano, 1976; Hurst & Frank, 2000;

Hurst, Frank, & Browning, 2000; Jackson, 2002; Lieber, Nalla, & Farnworth, 1998; Moretz, 1980; Taylor, Turner, Esbensen, & Winfree, 2001). Some of these studies, like those conducted on adults, have focused on the effects of race, gender, and victimization. Also, a few of these studies have also examined the effects that residential location and involvement in delinquent acts has on attitudes toward the police. Recently there has been an increase in interest concerning juveniles' attitudes toward the police. These studies are important because juveniles are responsible for a significant portion of the crimes committed in this country every year. For example, the United States Department of Justice reported that juveniles were arrested for 12% of all violent crimes and 30% of all property crimes that were reported in 2001, with a total of 2.3 million juveniles arrested that year (United States Department of Justice, 2003). It is obvious that there are large numbers of police-juvenile contacts every year. This research is interested in examining how those contacts affect the juveniles' attitudes toward the police.

Juveniles' Race/Ethnicity

The race/ethnicity of juveniles has been infrequently included in studies of juveniles' attitudes toward the police. The majority of prior studies that controlled for gender have reported that White juveniles had more favorable ATP than non-White juveniles (Hurst & Frank, 2000; Hurst et al., 2000; Lieber et al., 1998; Taylor et al., 2001). This finding is consistent with the literature on adults' attitudes toward the police.

Juveniles' Gender

The gender of the respondents is often controlled for in studies of juveniles' attitudes toward the police. The effect of gender in these studies has been somewhat inconsistent. Some of the prior studies has reported that females hold more positive ATP than males (Hurst et al., 2000;

Jackson, 2002; Taylor et al., 2001). Some studies have reported no difference between male and female attitudes toward the police (Moretz, 1980). There have also been findings that suggest that males hold more positive attitudes toward police than females (Hurst & Frank, 2000). Although the inconsistency of how gender affects juveniles' ATP is similar to that for adults, there simply is not enough literature pertaining specifically to juveniles to reach a definitive conclusion on the affect that gender has on juveniles' attitudes toward the police.

Juvenile Victimization

Yet another segment of research has sought to apply the concept of prior victimization to juveniles' attitudes toward the police. This area of research is important because the U.S. Department of Justice reported that while 12-17 year olds made up only 10% of the population in 1997, they accounted for 22% of all violent crime victims and 21% of all robbery victims (United States Department of Justice, 1997). Some examples of this research include the work of Hurst & Frank (2000) and Hurst et al. (2000). Both of these studies report that juveniles who have been prior victims of crime hold more negative attitudes toward the police than do non-victims. This conclusion is also consistent with the majority of the adult research.

Effects of Delinquency and Residential Area

The effect that juveniles' delinquent activities have on attitudes toward the police has rarely been studied. However, the studies that have controlled for delinquent activities have reported significant results. All of the studies assessing juveniles' attitudes toward the police that controlled for delinquent activities have found that involvement in these activities was correlated with negative attitudes toward the police (Cox & Falkenberg, 1987; Giordano, 1976; Hurst & Frank, 2000; Jackson, 2002; Leiber et al., 1998). These findings are consistent with the sub-cultural theories of

delinquency. These theories assert that juveniles who are involved in delinquent activities tend to form their own group or subculture with a different set of beliefs and values than the larger culture. Therefore, the juveniles in these delinquent subcultures hold more negative attitudes toward the police than juveniles who do not belong to these subcultures because their attitudes and values conflict with those of the police and society in general.

There have only been three studies to date that have controlled for residential area when assessing juveniles' attitudes toward police. All of these studies found that juveniles living in less populated rural/suburban areas had more positive ATP than those living in large urban areas (Hurst & Frank, 2000; Hurst et al., 2000; Taylor et al., 2001). However, in all three of these studies the actual effects of living in a large city or a rural area seemed to be less important than the racial composition of the area.

Purpose of the Current Study

The purpose of this study is to analyze juveniles' attitudes toward the police and how their attitudes are affected by prior victimization and delinquency, controlling for race, gender, and city of residence. All of the variables used in this study will come from the Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T.) data collected by Esbensen and Osgood (1999). The use of secondary data allows a researcher to forego the collection of new data and instead focus on analyzing existing data in a new way. Secondary data is especially useful for students or other researchers who may lack the time and money to collect large amounts of data on their own. The data used in this study were collected in 1999 from a sample of 5,935 eighth grade students in 11 different U.S. cities. This amount of data far exceeds the amount that could be collected by a single researcher.

Conducting secondary analysis on a data set this large allows the researcher to more accurately measure the desired phenomena and generalize the findings to a larger population.

Hypotheses

It is expected that the results of this study will coincide with the majority of the prior research on this topic. Following this logic, the specific research hypotheses for this study are as follows:

H1: Females are expected to have more favorable attitudes towards the police than males.

H2: Whites are predicted to have more favorable attitudes toward police than non-whites.

H3: Prior victims will hold more negative attitudes toward the police than non-victims.

H4: Juveniles residing in large urban areas will hold more negative attitudes toward the police than those residing in non-urban areas.

H5: Juveniles who have committed delinquent acts will hold more negative attitudes toward the police than those who have not committed delinquent acts.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE PRIOR RESEARCH

This chapter provides a review of the research pertaining to the attitudes toward the police of adults and juveniles. The first two sections of this chapter discuss adult ATP studies in general and adult ATP studies that analyzed the effect of prior victimization (see Tables 1 and 2). Also, for the purposes of this review, studies that included both adult and juvenile respondents were classified as adult studies. The third section of this chapter discusses the prior research that focused solely on juveniles' attitudes toward the police (see Table 3). The studies in each section are discussed in the chronological order in which they were published.

Adults' Attitudes Toward Police

The research concerning adults' attitudes toward the police is extensive (see Tables 1 and 2). Since the explosion of interest in this topic in the 1960s, there has been an abundance of studies undertaken to examine what factors influence an individual's attitude toward the police. What follows is a discussion of some of the important studies on this topic.

Albrecht and Green (1977) analyzed the relationship between attitudes toward the police and attitudes toward other governmental institutions. The data were collected in different areas within the state of Utah through face to face style interviews conducted in the respondents' homes. The sample was drawn from three separate areas classified as rural, semi-rural, and urban by the U.S. census. The total number of respondents was 398. Five different attitudinal scales were constructed and compared. The scales included: attitudes toward the police, attitudes relating to the economics of legal service delivery, attitudes toward courts and judges, political alienation attitudes, and political activity. Their findings were that those holding the least favorable ATP

Table 1
Past Findings Concerning Adults' Attitudes Toward Police (ATP)

Researcher(s)	Year	N	Findings		
			Sex	Race	Other Variables
Albrecht & Green	1977	398	males	-	Negative ATP was correlated with negative attitude toward court system
Sullivan, Dunham, & Alpert	1987	601	-	whites	Younger respondents had more favorable ATP
Zamble & Annesley	1987	317	N.D.	-	Conservative political views was correlated with positive ATP
Dunham & Alpert	1988	997	N.D.	Non-whites	Low socioeconomic status was correlated with negative ATP
Jesilow, Meyer, & Namazzi	1995	480	N.D.	whites	Contacts with the police resulted in more negative ATP
Webb & Marshall	1995	790	females	whites	No police contact was correlated with positive ATP
Correia, Reisig, & Lovrich	1996	892	males	whites	Perceived unfair treatment by police resulted in more negative ATP
Tuch & Weitzer	1997	-	-	whites	Publicized police brutality incidents was correlated with negative ATP
Murphy & Worrall	1999	1005	N.D.	whites	Officer residency requirements negatively impact ATP
Sims, Hooper, & Peterson	1999	700	females	Non-whites	Younger respondents indicated more negative ATP than older ones
Benedict, Brown, & Bower	2000	205	N.D.	-	Females reported higher fear of crime, but ATP equal to males
Cheurprakobkit	2000	251	females	whites	Reported contacts with police as most important ATP determinant
Reisig & Parks	2000	5361	N.D.	whites	Reported neighborhood conditions as most important ATP determinant

Note: N.D. = no significant difference was found.

Table 2

Prior Studies of Adults' Attitudes Toward Police (ATP) that Included Victimization

Researcher(s)	Year	N	Findings		
			More Positive ATP		
			Race	Gender	Victimization
Smith & Hawkins	1973	1407	Whites	-	N.D.
Poister & McDavid	1978	423	N.D.	N.D.	Non-victims
Koenig	1980	907	-	-	Non-victims
Homant, Kennedy, & Fleming	1984	143	-	-	Non-victims
Carter	1985	356	-	-	Non-victims
Brandl, Frank, Worden, & Bynum	1994	398	Whites	N.D.	Non-victims
Cao, Frank, & Cullen	1996	934	N.D.	Females	N.D.
Frank, Brandl, Cullen, & Stichman	1996	560	Non-whites	N.D.	Non-victims
Dull & Wint	1997	1000	-	-	Non-victims
Kusow, Wilson, & Martin	1997	2420	N.D.	N.D.	Non-victims
Reisig & Giacomazzi	1998	365	N.D.	Females	Non-victims
Chandek	1999	122	N.D.	N.D.	Non-victims
Priest & Carter	1999	338	-	-	Non-victims
Smith, Steadman, Minton, & Townsend	1999	10449	-	-	Non-victims
Hawdon & Ryan	2003	130	N.D.	Females	N.D.
Maxson, Hennigan, & Sloane	2003	714	Whites	-	Non-victims

Note: N.D. = no significant difference was found.

were poor minorities living in urban areas. They also found that negative attitudes toward the police were very closely related to negative attitudes toward the court system.

Decker (1981) compiled and discussed all of the attitudes toward the police literature available to him at the time. He then summarized the findings of the prior studies in terms of how individual and contextual level variables affected attitudes toward the police. The conclusions drawn were that among the individual level variables the two most significant predictors of ATP were age and race. More specifically, juveniles and minorities had the most negative attitudes. Among the contextual level variables, he concluded that neighborhood culture and police contacts negatively affected attitudes toward the police while prior victimization had very little effect.

Marenin (1983) analyzed the attitudes toward the police of citizens who voted on whether or not to build a new police department. Questionnaires were sent out to one quarter of the citizens who voted yes or no. This resulted in 563 completed returned questionnaires. The dependent variable of attitudes toward police was measured via the responses to five items concerning police performance. The findings were that the most favorable attitudes belonged to older, working, upper middle-class residents of the community with conservative political views.

Sullivan et al. (1987) compared the ATP of different ethnic and age groups. Their sample was drawn from five neighborhoods in Miami, Florida. The adult sample consisted of 219 respondents who were interviewed in person. The student sample consisted of 382 high school juniors and seniors who were given questionnaires. The dependent variable, attitudes toward police, was a scale consisting of 22 items about the police that the respondents answered on a Likert scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Their findings were that age and

ethnicity were significant factors affecting ATP. Younger and minority respondents held less favorable attitudes than older and white respondents.

Zamble and Annesley (1987) analyzed attitudes toward the local police and towards the police in general. The sample consisted of 317 Canadian citizens who were approached in shopping malls and agreed to complete a questionnaire. The dependent variable included in the study was attitudes toward the functioning of the police, which was a scale consisting of items such as having respect for the police. The study reported that there were no significant differences between attitudes toward the local police and attitudes toward the police in general. The most significant predictor was conservatism, with those holding more conservative political views viewing the police more favorably.

Dunham and Alpert (1988) examined neighborhood differences in attitudes toward policing practices. The total sample size for this study was 997. The sample consisted of 250 residents from five distinct neighborhoods in Miami, Florida who completed face-to-face interviews. It also included 451 high school students and 296 police officers who completed surveys. The dependent variable, attitudes toward policing practices, was a scale consisting of 30 items. Although separate analyses were conducted for each of the three populations of citizens, police, and students, the results for each group were combined because they were so similar. Thus the results were ultimately reported at the neighborhood level. The conclusion was that significant differences existed between the neighborhoods concerning attitudes toward police practices. The two most important factors affecting attitudes toward policing practices were ethnicity and socioeconomic status. Contrary to the majority of research, this study reported that non-Whites held more favorable attitudes toward police than Whites.

Jesilow et al. (1995) explained what factors were associated with the respondents' positive or negative attitudes toward the police. This study was conducted in Santa Ana, California at the request of the local police department. It was conducted using telephone and face-to-face style interviews consisting of several open-ended questions with a total of 480 residents of Santa Ana. Two dependent variables were created to assess the respondents' attitudes toward the police. One of the variables consisted of all of the positive items about the police mentioned by the respondents, while the other consisted of all of the negative items about the police mentioned by the respondents. They found that "whites and minorities did not differ in their likelihood of saying negative things about the police.... positive attitudes toward the police, however, were related to ethnicity" (Jesilow et al., 1995, p.74). The study found no difference in attitudes toward the police based on gender. Their general finding based on age was that older residents typically had more favorable attitudes toward the police. Their study also found a significant effect on attitudes toward police based on the respondent's educational level. Another finding was that attitudes were not affected by the length of time the resident had lived there. They also found significant differences in attitudes toward the police based on the residents' contacts with the police and their general feelings about their neighborhood.

Parker et al. (1995) examined the effects of income, sex, age, residence, marital status, and neighborhood crime rate on African Americans' attitudes toward the police. The dependent variable, "attitudes toward the police", was a four-question scale rating police officers in terms of their honesty, intelligence, friendliness, and kindness. The sample, which was drawn from four communities each in Atlanta, Georgia and Washington, DC consisted of 585 African American respondents. The study showed significantly different attitudes toward the police based on the

factors of neighborhood crime rate, income status, and marital status. The single best predictor of attitudes toward police found in this study was the neighborhood crime rate, with a higher crime rate correlated with less favorable attitudes toward the police.

Webb and Marshall (1995) examined the effect of race on attitudes toward police. The sample was comprised of 790 residents of Omaha, Nebraska who responded via telephone interviews. There were five scales used to measure attitudes toward police: officer demeanor, responsibility for crime control, discretion, active patrol strategies, and officer characteristics. The results were that overall race was the most significant predictor of attitudes toward the police, with Whites having more favorable attitudes. Age, gender, and police contact were also found to have significant effects on ATP, with older, female, and respondents not stopped by police having more favorable attitudes.

Correia et al. (1996) analyzed citizens' perceptions of state police in Washington. The sample for the study consisted of 892 respondents who completed and returned surveys through the mail. The dependent variable, perception of the state police, was measured through the response to a single question assessing whether or not the citizens felt the state police do a good job performing their mission. The study reported several significant effects. Males viewed the state police more positively than females, Whites had more positive attitudes toward police than minorities, and individuals age 18-35 viewed police more negatively than any other age category. The study also reported significant findings based on the citizens' perceptions of fair treatment by state police with those who felt they were treated unfairly holding more negative attitudes.

Brandl et al. (1997) analyzed citizens' satisfaction with the police. The sample consisted of 298 residents in Cincinnati, Ohio who were randomly interviewed over the telephone. The

dependent variable, satisfaction with the police, was a scale consisted of five items assessing satisfaction with the police in general and within the neighborhood and the community. The study reported no significant differences in satisfaction with the police.

Tuch and Weitzer (1997) analyzed racial differences in attitudes toward the police. They used trend data from the National Opinion Research Center (NORC), Gallup, and the Los Angeles Times. Each of these polls asked questions relating to attitudes toward the police, and the results were broken down by the respondent's race only. The findings were that highly publicized incidents of police brutality significantly lowered support for the police at local and national levels, with Blacks reporting much less support than Whites.

Murphy and Worrall (1999) examined the relationship between police residency requirements and citizens' confidence in the police. The residency requirement data for this study came from the 1993 Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics (LEMAS) survey. The citizen survey was completed by a random sample of 1,005 households nationwide. The dependent variable, confidence in the police, was a scale consisting of three items assessing the citizens' confidence in the police to protect, solve, and prevent crime. The study reported significant effects on confidence in police based on the race and age of the respondents, with whites and older citizens having more confidence in the police. The study also found that requiring a police officer to live within the municipality or county where he/she works negatively impacts confidence in the police.

Sims et al. (2002) looked at the factors affecting citizens; attitudes toward the police. The sample consisted of 700 residents of Harrisburg, Pennsylvania who were randomly interviewed over the telephone. The dependent variable, attitudes toward police, was a scale consisting of four

items rating the performance of the police officers in Harrisburg. This study proved contradictory of much of the prior research in that younger respondents and minorities reported more positive ATP than older and white respondents. The explanation given for why younger respondents viewed police more favorably than older respondents in this study was that all of the respondents were at least 18 years old, and, therefore, the attitudes of juveniles who disproportionately view police negatively were not included in the young category. As for the reason Blacks viewed the police more favorably than Whites in this study, the authors suggest that “while Blacks might constitute a disproportionate percentage of arrestees; they also constitute a disproportionate percentage of the victim pool” (p.465). This results in Blacks having to rely on police for help more than Whites.

Benedict et al. (2000) analyzed the fear of crime and perceptions of police in a small rural town. The sample consisted of 205 respondents who completed questionnaires issued through the mail. The respondents were asked questions to gauge their fears concerning the safety of their families, their homes, and their property. They were also asked whether or not they felt the police were doing a good job in their community. The results were that even though females reported much higher levels of fear of crime, both males and females reported nearly identical support for the practices of the police.

Cheurprakobkit (2000) performed a study of attitudinal differences toward police between Hispanics and all other races. This study focused specifically on the effect that police contact had on the respondents’ attitudes toward the police. Two hundred fifty-one individuals who had been subject to some sort of police contact in the last two years were surveyed. They were then asked to rate the satisfaction with their police experience by rating the police on 15 police attributes. The

responses were then divided into negative experiences, positive experiences, and both. Her study concluded that age and a positive experience with the police were significantly correlated with positive attitudes toward the police. She also found that gender, a negative contact with the police, and the number of contacts were significantly related with negative attitudes toward the police. The overall conclusion from this study was that the encounters with the police, whether positive or negative, were the most important factor in determining a person's attitude toward the police.

In their study, Reisig and Parks (2000) examined how attitudes toward police are affected by experiences with police, quality of life, and factors within a respondent's neighborhood. They were also interested in the effect that race has on attitudes toward the police. The dependent variable called "satisfaction with the police" was a scale constructed by combining respondents' scores on three police service items. The sample consisted of 5,361 citizens from over 50 neighborhoods in Indianapolis, Indiana. Their study found significantly different attitudes toward police based on the race of the respondents. In general, they found that Caucasians had more positive attitudes toward the police than African Americans. They also found that while sex produced no real differences in attitudes toward police, age was a significant factor. Younger respondents had more negative attitudes toward the police than older ones. Neighborhood conditions were found to be the strongest predictor of respondents' attitudes toward the police. This variable consisted of the sum of the respondents' scores on a single item asking them to rate their neighborhood as a place to live on a scale of 1 to 4, with 1 being "fair" and 4 being "excellent".

Weitzer (2000) analyzed the affect that the race of a police officer has on citizens' assessments. The data for this study were collected via face to face interviews with 169 residents

from three neighborhoods in Washington, DC. One hundred sixty-nine more interviews were conducted in three other neighborhoods: Spartanburg, Merrifield, and Cloverdale. The respondents were asked if there were differences in the behavior of Black and White officers toward residents in each community. The Spartanburg sample, which was predominantly Black, reported differences in police officer behavior and viewed Black officers more favorably than the other two neighborhoods. The respondents were also asked which officer ethnicity they would prefer in their neighborhood. To this question the majority of the respondents reported that it did not matter or that the officers should be paired in racially-mixed teams.

Brown and Benedict (2002) updated and expanded the work of Decker's (1981) earlier work. They summarized the findings of over 100 studies concerning the attitudes toward the police of adults and juveniles. Their conclusions were that age, race neighborhood, and contacts with the police are the only individual level variables that have been shown to consistently affect ATP. The authors claim that "there is still no consensus about the effects of education, gender, socioeconomic status, victimization or fear of victimization on perceptions of the police" (2002, p.567). They also concluded that there has not been enough research to make generalizations about the effects of residential location or delinquency.

Victimization

Furstenberg and Wellford (1973) analyzed victims' evaluations of police service. The sample for the study consisted of 819 respondents who were interviewed by police and civilians. The dependent variable, satisfaction with the police, was scored by the responses to four items asking respondents to rate police officers on their courtesy, understanding, capability, and concern

about their problems. The study found that Whites hold more positive attitudes toward the police than non-Whites, and that slower response times by police also result in more negative attitudes.

Smith and Hawkins (1973) studied the effects that victimization had on attitudes toward the police. The sample consisted of a random sampling of 1407 residents of Seattle, Washington. The dependent variable, attitudes toward the police, was measured by the responses to five items rating police officers. The study reported that younger respondents held more favorable ATP than older ones, and Whites held more favorable ATP than non-Whites. The study also reported no significant difference in attitudes toward the police between victims and non-victims.

Poister and McDavid (1978) analyzed victims' evaluations of police performance. The sample consisted of 423 respondents from Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, of whom 111 had reported being victimized to the police in the past 15 months. The dependent variable, satisfaction with police performance, was comprised of the response to one question assessing the victims' overall satisfaction. Surprisingly, the study concluded that respondents with lower income were more satisfied with police performance than respondents with higher income. Response time, satisfaction with response time, and satisfaction with the investigation were all correlated with satisfaction with police performance.

Koenig (1980) explained the effects of victimization and police contacts on attitudes toward the police. The sample for the study consisted of 907 randomly selected adults in British Columbia. The dependent variable, attitudes toward police, was measured by the responses to a single question rating the police on a scale from very good to very bad. Victimization within the past year were correlated with more negative attitudes toward the police. The most significant factor

leading to negative attitudes toward the police was the experiencing or observing of improper police practices.

Homant et al. (1984) also analyzed the effect that victimization had on attitudes toward the police. The sample consisted of 143 residents of a Detroit suburb who completed and returned questionnaires through the mail. The dependent variable, attitudes toward the police, was measured by the responses to five items rating the performance of the police. The study reported no significant findings based on any of the demographic variables. The study did report significant findings based on victimization, with non-victims holding more positive attitudes toward the police than victims.

Carter (1985) evaluated Hispanics' perceptions of police performance. The sample consisted of 356 Hispanics living in Texas who completed and returned surveys through the mail. The respondents were asked to rate the performance of the police as good, average, or poor. The study reported that respondents with a higher level of fear of crime viewed the police more negatively than those with a low level of fear of crime. The study also reported that victims of crime held more negative attitudes toward the police than non-victims. The final conclusion of the study was that Hispanics in general view the police negatively.

Brandl et al. (1994) compared global and specific attitudes toward the police. The sample consisted of 398 residents of a large Midwestern city who participated in a three wave panel survey. Global attitudes toward police were measured by the responses to a single question assessing the respondents' general satisfaction with the police. Specific attitudes were determined by responses to four items assessing the respondents' attitudes when they were requesting information from the police, when requesting assistance, when stopped and questioned, and when

victimized. The study found that positive global attitudes toward the police are significantly correlated with positive specific attitudes toward the police, but this relationship is not true when reversed. The study also found that Whites hold more positive attitudes toward the police than non-Whites and non-victims hold more positive attitudes than victims.

Cao et al. (1996) sought to identify which factors influenced attitudes toward police. The sample consisted of 934 respondents from Cincinnati who completed surveys by mail. The dependent variable, “confidence in the police”, was measured via a five-item scale assessing the respondents’ views on police responsiveness, care about neighborhood safety, ability to maintain order, and ability to protect residents against crime. One conclusion drawn from the study was that race, gender, age, and income were all statistically significant predictors of the respondents’ confidence in the police when evaluated by themselves. Specifically, they found that older individuals had more confidence in the police than younger individuals, and females had more confidence in the police than males. They also found that White individuals had more confidence in the police than non-Whites, and that a higher income was related to more confidence in the police. These variables remain significant even after the introduction of several crime related variables. However, when variables concerning the order and security of the community were introduced into the equation, the only remaining significant predictor of confidence in the police was the respondent’s gender. Prior victimization was not a significant predictor of confidence in the police in the final equation.

A study by Frank et al. (1996) was conducted in order to examine the impact of race on attitudes toward police. The study used the answers provided by 560 residents of Detroit through telephone surveys. An overall scale was constructed in order to assess the respondents’ overall

attitudes toward the police. The scale consisted of three items that analyzed the respondents' overall satisfaction with the police, the job being done in their neighborhood, and the job being done in controlling the drug problem. This study proved contradictory of other studies in terms of how the respondent's race affected their attitude toward the police; in this study Blacks were found to have more favorable attitudes toward the police than Whites. However, it should be noted when considering these findings that African Americans make up the majority of Detroit's population, hold a large portion of government offices, and comprise about half of the police force. It could be argued that these factors greatly influence African Americans attitudes toward the police in this particular area. The study also reported significant relationships between attitudes toward the police, age, and prior victimization. Younger respondents and those who had been victims of crime held more negative attitudes toward the police.

Dull and Wint (1997) examined the effects of victimization on justice attitudes. The study used a random sample of 1,000 college students who answered questionnaires as incoming freshmen at a university and again completed them as seniors. The researchers were interested to see if the segment of the sample that had been victimized during this time period would have different attitudes toward the criminal justice system than those who had not. There were three dependent variables evaluating the respondents' attitudes toward police in terms of crime fighting ability, courteousness, and equality. The study found that there was a significant difference between victims and non-victims in their attitudes toward police, with non-victims possessing more favorable attitudes.

Kusow, Wilson, and Martin (1997) studied determinants of satisfaction with the police. The sample consisted of 219 respondents from a large metropolitan county who completed and

returned questionnaires through the mail. The dependent variable, satisfaction with the police, was the response to a single question. The study reported that respondents over age 60 were more satisfied with the police than younger respondents. The most significant finding was that residential location significantly impacted satisfaction with police. This was found to be the underlying cause of racial differences in satisfaction with the police because Black residents who lived in the suburbs were more satisfied with the police than white residents living in urban areas and vice versa.

Reisig and Giacomazzi (1998) studied the factors that affect attitudes toward the police. The sample consisted of 365 residents of a small town in a Midwestern state who completed and returned surveys through the mail. The respondents' attitudes toward the police were measured on a five-item scale assessing if they felt that officers were fair, courteous, honest, treated citizens equally, and showed concern. The study reported significant findings based on age and gender, with older and female respondents holding more favorable attitudes toward the police. The study also reported that high levels of fear of crime and being the victim of a crime also resulted in negative attitudes toward the police.

Chandek (1999) examined the factors affecting evaluations of police performance. The sample for this study was drawn from complaint records from a Midwestern police department. There were 416 robbery and burglary victims, of whom 122 agreed to participate in the study. The dependent variable, overall satisfaction with the police, was measured by the response to a single question. The study reported higher satisfaction with the police for the oldest age group tested. Satisfaction with the police was also higher for victims who reported a faster response time by police than expected, victims who perceived more positive police behaviors, and victims who felt that the police performed a greater number of investigative activities. Also, victims whose

expectations of police officers efforts were fulfilled expressed higher satisfaction with the police than those whose expectations went unfulfilled.

Priest and Carter (1999) analyzed African Americans' evaluations of police performance. The sample consisted of 338 black residents of Charlotte, North Carolina who completed telephone interviews. The dependent variable, attitudes toward police, was measured by the responses to a single question assessing the overall performance of the police. The study reported that older respondents, those with more education, those who felt safe in their neighborhood, and those who reported the police response time was good in their neighborhood had more positive attitudes toward the police. The study also found that non-victims held more favorable attitudes toward the police than those who had not been the victim of a crime.

Smith et al. (1999) identified the influence that criminal victimization had on attitudes toward the police. The dependent variable used was "satisfaction with the police", which was measured on a Likert scale ranging from very satisfied to very dissatisfied. The sample consisted of random telephone surveys conducted in twelve U.S. cities of 10,449 citizens age 16 and above. In each of the twelve cities the respondents who had been victims of a violent crime were less likely to be satisfied with their local police.

Hawdon and Ryan (2003) attempted to explain satisfaction with the police based on interactions between citizens and the police. The study was primarily concerned with testing the assertions of community policing. The dependent variable of police effectiveness was measured by the respondents' ranking of this single item from 0 to 10, with 0 being "not at all effective" and 10 being "extremely effective." The sample included 130 residents of a small community in South Carolina who were interviewed over the telephone. Among the significant findings were the

independent variables of extent to which police patrol, trust in police officers, sex, and fear of being victimized. The conclusion drawn from this study was that police contact was not a significant factor in the residents' ratings of police effectiveness. Prior victimization was not found to be a significant factor in predicting police effectiveness, although hearing of the victimization of a neighbor was.

Maxson et al. (2003) examined the factors that influence public opinion of the police. The sample consisted of 714 residents of Los Angeles, California who completed and returned surveys through the mail. The study used three separate dependent variables as measures of attitudes toward police; job evaluation, demeanor, and use of force. The only demographic variable that proved significant was the respondents' race. Whites were found to possess more favorable attitudes toward the police than non-Whites. Respondents who had not been the victim of a crime reported more positive attitudes toward the police than respondents who had been the victim of a violent or a property crime. Also, respondents who reported that violent crime is a problem in their neighborhood, that disorder existed in their neighborhood, or that they were fearful of crime in their neighborhood had negative attitudes toward the police.

Juveniles' Attitudes Toward Police

The research on juveniles' attitudes toward the police is far less thorough than the research for adults even though juveniles commit a large number of crimes each year and account for a significant portion of the contacts between citizens and the police. Thus the importance of juveniles' attitudes toward the police is evident. However, very few researchers have focused solely on the attitudes of juveniles toward the police. This section summarizes the findings of the

prior research that has been conducted concerning juveniles' attitudes toward the police (see Table 3). The studies are discussed in the chronological order in which they were published.

Table 3
Prior Studies of Juveniles' Attitudes Toward Police (ATP)

Researcher(s)	Year	Findings				
		Sex	Race	Victimization	Residential Location	Delinquency
Giordano	1976	-	-	-	-	Non-delinquents
Moretz	1980	N.D.	-	-	-	-
Cox & Falkenberg	1987	-	-	-	-	Non-delinquents
Lieber, Nalla, & Farnworth	1998	-	Whites	-	-	Non-delinquents
Hurst & Frank	2000	Males	Whites	Non-victims	Rural	Non-delinquents
Hurst, Frank, & Browning	2000	Females	Whites	Non-victims	Suburban	-
Taylor, Turner, Esbensen, & Winfree	2001	Females	Whites	-	Rural	-
Jackson	2002	Females	-	-	-	Non-delinquents

Note. N.D. = no significant difference was found

Giordano (1976) analyzed juveniles' reactions to the justice system. The sample was made up of 119 juveniles who had been in contact with the justice system and another 31 who had not. The sample of juveniles that had been in contact with the justice system was drawn from official records, and the non-contact group was comprised of a random sample of a single high school in

the Midwest. The dependent variable, attitudes toward police officers, was measured by the responses to 10 items concerning the perceived behaviors and characteristics of police officers. The study also collected the self-reported amount of delinquent involvement of the juveniles and concluded that involvement in delinquent activities was correlated with negative attitudes toward the police.

Moretz (1980) conducted a study to determine the way that juveniles viewed police officers. The sample consisted of 237 students from 14 different high schools located in a suburb of a major city. The subjects were all juniors and seniors who were randomly selected by school officials. The respondents were asked to rate the police in four areas: activity, potency, understandability, and value. The gender of the respondents was compared for each of the four areas. The study failed to produce any significantly different findings between males and females.

Amoroso and Ware (1983) examined the relationship between juveniles' attitudes toward the police and their attitudes toward their parents, teachers, and themselves. The sample consisted of 1,667 juveniles from 30 different schools in Canada who completed questionnaires in class. The dependent variable, attitudes toward the police, was measured by the responses to 13 evaluative statements about police. Similar scales were constructed to measure the juveniles' attitudes toward their parents, teachers, and themselves. The study reported that the juveniles' attitudes toward the police were highly correlated with their attitudes toward their teachers. Thus it was concluded that the juveniles held negative attitudes toward both because they were impersonal authority figures.

Cox and Falkenberg (1987) analyzed adolescents' attitudes toward police based on the delinquency measures of alcohol and marijuana. The sample for this study consisted of 972 high school students from rural areas of Kentucky who completed self-report surveys. The study

reported that the juveniles who were involved in alcohol and marijuana related delinquency possessed less favorable attitudes toward the police than those who were not involved in these types of delinquency. It was also found that juveniles who had contact with the police were more likely to hold negative attitudes toward them.

A study conducted by Leiber et al. (1998) intended to explain the difference in juveniles' attitudes toward the police. The sample for the study consisted of 337 male juveniles. Three separate dependent variables were used to assess the respondents' attitudes toward the police. These variables were: respect for the police, perceptions of police fairness, and perceptions of police discrimination toward minorities. Among their findings was that race was a significant predictor of attitudes toward the police, with Whites having the most favorable attitudes. Other factors that can predict juveniles' attitudes toward police include social environment, delinquent subcultures, and police contacts. Juveniles who belonged to delinquent subcultures were found to have more negative attitudes toward the police than those that were not involved in delinquency. However, the most consistent predictor of juveniles' attitudes was race, with Whites holding more positive attitudes than non-Whites.

A study conducted by Hurst et al. (2000) was designed to distinguish between the attitudes toward police of Black and White juveniles. The data were collected for this study through the use of surveys completed by 852 high school students in Ohio. The respondents' perceptions of policing were obtained through answers to a 9-item scale rating the job the police officers do. They found that Whites and Blacks vary significantly in their attitudes toward the police with Whites holding more favorable attitudes. They also found that teenagers do not feel the police effectively perform their duties. Their study also produced significantly different results based on a juvenile's

gender and school; girls and suburban students held more favorable attitudes toward the police. Finally, they concluded that juveniles who had been the victim of a crime held more negative attitudes toward the police than those who had not.

Hurst and Frank (2000) analyzed the determinants of juveniles' attitudes toward the police in their study. The sample for the study consisted of 852 high school students from Ohio who completed surveys. The respondents' attitudes toward the police were obtained through their answers to an 11-item scale consisting of items assessing police effectiveness. They found that, as a whole, juveniles do not have a high level of support for the police. They also found significant differences in juveniles' attitudes toward the police based on race and gender. The finding that Whites held more favorable attitudes toward police than non-Whites is consistent with prior research. However, their finding that females held less favorable attitudes toward the police contradicts most prior research. The study also found significant differences in attitudes based on neighborhood crime related variables and prior victimization, with prior victims holding less favorable ATP than non-victims. They also found that juveniles residing in more rural areas had more positive attitudes than those living in urban areas.

Taylor et al. (2001) examined the differences in juveniles' attitudes toward the police. This study used the Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T.) data collected by Esbensen and Osgood (1999). Their study consisted of a sample of 5,477 students in 11 different U.S. cities. The data were collected via questionnaires administered to the students. The respondents' attitudes toward police were obtained by scoring their responses via a Likert scale to a seven-item scale analyzing their attitudes. They found that juveniles' attitudes toward the police varied significantly by race, with Whites having the most positive attitudes. They also found that gender

significantly affects attitudes, with females having significantly more favorable attitudes toward the police than males. The study also concluded that there is a significant difference among juveniles' attitudes toward the police based on the city in which they reside, with those living in more rural areas holding more favorable ATP than those in urban areas.

Jackson (2002) analyzed the effect that the presence of school resource officers had on students' attitudes toward the police. The sample for the study consisted of 271 students from four different schools in Missouri. There were scales constructed consisting of eight items each to assess the students' perceptions of the police and their opinions concerning the seriousness of delinquency. The study reported significant differences based on gender, with females holding more positive attitudes toward the police than males. It was also found that juveniles involved in delinquent activities held more negative attitudes toward the police than those who were not involved in delinquent activities. The study also reported that the presence of school resource officers had no affect on their attitudes toward the police in general.

This chapter has provided a review of the past studies concerning the attitudes toward the police of adults and juveniles. While the review was not exhaustive, some of the most important and relevant studies were discussed. Three tables were included to summarize the findings of the studies discussed in this chapter. The next chapter discusses the methods that were used to conduct the current study.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to analyze juveniles' attitudes toward the police and how those attitudes are affected by prior victimization and delinquency, controlling for race, gender, and city of residence. It was predicted that significant differences in attitudes toward police would be found based on the gender of the juveniles, with females holding more positive attitudes toward the police than males. Also, it was predicted that significant differences would be found based on the race of the juveniles, with Whites holding more positive attitudes toward the police than non-Whites. It was further predicted that the juveniles who had been victims of a crime would generally hold more negative attitudes toward the police than non-victims. It was also expected that juveniles residing in large urban areas would hold more negative attitudes toward the police than those residing in non-urban areas, and juveniles who had committed delinquent acts would hold more negative attitudes toward the police than those who had not committed delinquent acts. This chapter describes the data used for this study. It also describes the variables used to test the hypotheses, and the analytic strategy.

Data

The data used for the current study is archived on the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data (NACJD), which can be accessed through the University of Michigan's website. The NAJCD collects and archives data in order for individuals to conduct secondary statistical analysis on previously collected data. The data used in the current study were collected in 1995 as part of an effort to evaluate the success of the Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T.)

program. The data were collected through the use of a cross-sectional survey administered to eighth grade students in schools where the G.R.E.A.T. program had been taught to seventh grade students the previous year. The sites where the surveys were administered were chosen based on records provided by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms (ATF) that identified the schools where officers had taught the G.R.E.A.T. program the previous year. There were 42 schools in 11 different U.S. cities that met the criteria for the study. These cities included Las Cruces, NM; Omaha, NE; Phoenix, AZ; Philadelphia, PA; Kansas City, MO; Milwaukee, WI; Orlando, FL; Will County, IL; Providence, RI; Pocatello, ID; and Torrance, CA. The researchers' objective was to administer the surveys to all eighth grade students in the selected schools, but the final number of students in the sample was restricted due to such factors as varying attendance rates among the schools and refusal of parents to sign consent forms. Therefore, the sample for this data consisted of 5,935 eighth grade students. Because the respondents either participated in G.R.E.A.T. or they did not, the sample for this data was not random, but was selected to be nationally representative of all eighth graders. (Esbensen & Osgood, 1999).

Variables

This section provides a detailed description of the dependent and independent variables used to examine the hypotheses in the present study. The dependent variable used in the study was a seven-item scale intended to measure the juveniles' attitudes toward police (ATP). There were 25 independent variables examined in the study. These variables were used to examine the effects that gender, race, city of residence, and prior victimization had on a juvenile's attitude toward the police. There were also three delinquency scales constructed out of 18 individual variables to examine what effect various delinquent activities had on a juvenile's attitude toward the police.

Dependent Variable

In order to assess the juveniles' overall attitudes toward the police (ATP), an attitude toward police scale was constructed using seven items (Alpha = .85). The scale consisted of the following seven items: 1) I feel that police are honest; 2) I feel that police are rude; 3) I feel that police are hard working; 4) I feel that police are friendly; 5) I feel that police are courteous; 6) I feel that police are respectful to people like me; and 7) I feel that police are prejudiced against minorities. Although one might expect the responses to items 6 and 7 by minority respondents to affect the reliability of the scale when both items are included, removal of item 6 or 7 from the scale produced no appreciable difference in the scale reliability. This seven-item scale has also been used in two prior studies (Taylor et al., 2001; Webb & Marshall, 1995). For these reasons all seven items were included in the scale.

All seven items in the scale used a Likert scale response method. The responses for items 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 were scored as follows: 1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3= neither agree nor disagree, 4= agree, 5= strongly agree. The responses for items 2 and 7 were reverse scored. Therefore, a higher overall score on the scale represents a more favorable attitude toward the police than a lower overall score, with an overall possible range from 7 to 35.

Independent Variables

The first independent variable controlled for the effect of the respondents' gender (Male= 1; Female= 0). The next variables were used to control for the respondents' race. The original race variable included in the G.R.E.A.T. data consisted of seven different racial categories. For the purposes of this study the original race variable was recoded into four separate variables. It was first recoded into a new variable as follows: 1= White; 2= Black; 3= Hispanic; 4-7= other. It was

also recoded into four dummy variables as follows: (1= White; 0= non-White) (2= Black; 0= non-Black) (3= Hispanic; 0= non-Hispanic) (4-7= other; 0= White, Black and Hispanic). This was done in order to examine the effects of each respondent's race separately.

The next variables were included to control for the effect of the respondents' city of residence. The original variable for the respondents' city of residence (School) included in the G.R.E.A.T. data consisted of 42 different schools spread throughout the 11 different cities. For the purposes of this study all of the different schools within each city were collapsed into one, which combined all of the responses of each school into a single set of responses that represent the entire city. This new variable (City) was coded as follows: 1= Pocatello; 2= Omaha; 3= Las Cruces; 4= Phoenix; 5= Philadelphia; 6= Torrance; 7= Providence; 8= Kansas City; 9= Orlando; 10= Milwaukee; 11= Will County. It was also recoded into 11 separate dummy variables as follows (1= Pocatello; 0= all others) (1= Omaha; 0= all others) (1= Las Cruces; 0= all others) (1= Phoenix; 0= all others) (1= Philadelphia; 0= all others) (1= Torrance; 0= all others) (1= Providence; 0= all others) (1= Kansas City; 0= all others) (1= Orlando; 0= all others) (1= Milwaukee; 0= all others) (1= Will County; 0= all others). This was done in order to examine the effect of each city of residence separately.

The next four independent variables assessed whether or not the respondents had been the victim of a crime. The first such variable, Have you ever been hit by someone (1= no, 2= yes), was derived from the questionnaire item that asked "Have you ever been hit by someone trying to hurt you?". The second variable, Have you ever been robbed (1= no, 2= yes), was derived from the questionnaire item that asked "Have you ever had someone use a weapon or force to get money or things from you?". The third such variable, Have you ever been attacked (1=no, 2= yes), came

from the questionnaire item that asked “Have you ever been attacked by someone with a weapon or someone trying to seriously hurt or kill you?”. The final variable assessing prior victimization, Have you ever had something stolen (1=no, 2= yes), was derived from the questionnaire item that asked “Have you ever had some of your things stolen from you?”.

Delinquency Scales

There were 18 independent variables used to determine whether or not the respondents had participated in any delinquent activities. These variables were divided in three different categories of offenses, and a scale was constructed for each category. The three scales included property offenses, crimes against persons, and drug offenses.

The first delinquency scale was constructed using seven items to represent property offenses (Alpha= .77). The scale consisted of the following seven items: 1) Have you ever avoided paying for things such as movies, bus or subway rides? (Ever not paid for things); 2) Have you ever purposely damaged or destroyed property that did not belong to you? (Ever destroy property); 3) Have you ever illegally spray painted a wall or a building? (Ever spray painted); 4) Have you ever stolen or tried to steal something worth less than \$50? (Ever stole less than \$50); 5) Have you ever stolen or tried to steal something worth more than \$50? (Ever stole more than \$50); 6) Have you ever gone into or tried to go into a building to steal something? (Ever go into building to steal); and 7) Have you ever stolen or tried to steal a motor vehicle? (Ever stolen motor vehicle). All of the responses to these items were coded 1= no, 2= yes.

The second delinquency scale was constructed using four items to represent crimes against persons (Alpha= .69). The scale consisted of the following four items: 1) Have you ever attacked someone with a weapon? (Ever attack someone with weapon); 2) Have you ever used a weapon or

force to get money or things from people (Ever armed robbery); 3) Have you ever been involved in gang fights? (Ever involved gang fights); and 4) Have you ever shot at someone because you were told to by someone else? (Ever shot at when told to). All of the responses to these items were coded 1=no, 2= yes.

The third and final delinquency scale was constructed using seven items to represent drug offenses (Alpha= .77). The scale consisted of the following seven items: 1) Have you ever sold marijuana? (Ever sold marijuana); 2) Have you ever sold other illegal drugs such as heroin, crack, cocaine, or LSD? (Ever sold illegal drugs); 3) Have you ever used tobacco products? (Ever used tobacco); 4) Have you ever used alcohol? (Ever used alcohol); 5) Have you ever used marijuana? (Ever used marijuana); 6) Have you ever used paint, glue or other things you inhale to get high? (Ever inhaled paint); and 7) Have you ever used other illegal drugs? (Ever used illegal drugs). All of the responses to these items were also coded 1= no, 2= yes.

Analytic Strategy

To test the hypotheses in this study, several statistical tests were computed and reported. At the univariate level, frequency and descriptive statistics for each of the independent variables and scales and the ATP scale were included. These statistics included the mean, median, mode, standard deviation, and range of the responses to each item along with the frequency of the responses for each of the variables.

At the bivariate level, a Pearson's correlation matrix was constructed to analyze the correlation between the attitude toward police scale, the demographic variables of gender and race (4 dummy variables), the four prior victimization variables, and the three delinquency scales.

Bivariate correlation is a statistical test that is used to study the relationship between two variables.

“A frequently used measure of correlation is Pearson’s product moment correlation coefficient or Pearson’s r ...which is a measure of a linear or straight-line relationship between two variables” (Miller & Whitehead, 1996. p.322). The lowest possible Pearson’s r is -1 (perfect negative relationship) and the highest possible Pearson’s r is 1(perfect positive relationship). The strength of a relationship that falls between these two extremes can be interpreted many different ways, but as the r moves further away from zero in either direction the correlation becomes stronger. The Pearson’s r was the measure of correlation used in this study.

Independent samples t-tests were also conducted between the ATP scale and each of the four prior victimization variables along with the variable controlling for the respondents’ sex. This statistical test is used to compare the means of two groups. In this study this test was used to compare the differences in mean scores on the ATP scale. This allowed for an examination of which groups held the most favorable attitudes toward the police and which groups held the least favorable attitudes toward the police.

Also at the bivariate level, two analysis of variance (ANOVA) tests were conducted to analyze the differences in attitudes among each racial group and among each city of residence. ANOVA is a statistical test used to compare the means of three or more groups. In this study the ANOVA tests were used to examine the differences in the mean scores on the ATP scale between the four different racial/ethnic groups and between the 11 different residential locations.

Finally, at the multivariate level an ordinary least squares regression (OLS) model was constructed. This statistical test was used to analyze the effect that each individual independent variable had on a respondent’s overall attitude toward the police while controlling for all of the remaining independent variables in the model. A regression coefficient (Beta) was reported for

each of the independent variables in the equation which indicates how much change there was in attitudes toward the police for every one unit change in each of the independent variables. Two different regression equations were estimated in this study. The first equation included the variables of sex, race, city of residence, and the four prior victimization variables. Then the three delinquency scales were added to form the second equation.

Regression analysis is only typically supposed to use interval/ratio level data. However, variables measured at the nominal and ordinal levels can also be included in a regression analysis through the use of dummy variables. Dummy variables are created by assigning numerical values to each of the different groups within each variable. For the purposes of this study dummy variables were created in order to examine the effects of gender and city of residence on ATP. When conducting a regression analysis with dummy variables you must leave out one of the variables from each group that was dummy coded as a comparison group. For this reason the racial group of “other” and the results from Torrance were not included in the regression equation.

A final area of concern that must be addressed when conducting a regression analysis is multicollinearity. “Multicollinearity means simply that there are strong linear relationships among the independent variables” in a regression model (Allison, 1999, p.140). If two or more of the independent variables in a regression model are strongly correlated, then it is very difficult to accurately predict the regression coefficients because the error term for each coefficient becomes much larger.

Two methods were used in order to check for multicollinearity between the independent variables in this study. First of all, a correlation matrix was constructed to analyze the correlations between each pair of independent variables. Most researchers agree that if the correlations

between any of the independent variables are at or near 1.0 then there is a problem with multicollinearity. In this study the strongest correlation among the independent variables was a .634, which indicates that there is no problem with multicollinearity between the independent variables in this study. In order to further test this conclusion, the tolerance levels of each of the independent variables were examined. The tolerance level is calculated by subtracting the total explained variance by each independent variable from one. Problems with multicollinearity arise when the tolerance level for a particular variable is below .40 or so. None of the independent variables in this study possessed tolerance levels at or below .40; therefore, it can safely be assumed that there are no problems with multicollinearity in this study.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to analyze juveniles' attitudes toward the police and how their attitudes are affected by prior victimization and delinquency controlling for race, gender, and city of residence. It was predicted that significant differences in attitudes toward police would be found based on the gender of the juveniles, with females holding more positive attitudes toward the police than males. Also, it was predicted that significant differences would be found based on the race of the juveniles, with Whites holding more positive attitudes toward the police than non-Whites. It was further predicted that the juveniles who had been victims of a crime would generally hold more negative attitudes toward the police than non-victims. It was also expected that juveniles residing in large urban areas would hold more negative attitudes toward the police than those residing in non-urban areas, and that juveniles who had committed delinquent acts would hold more negative attitudes toward the police than those who had not committed delinquent acts. This section includes descriptions of the results for all of the statistical tests that were conducted in this study.

Summary Statistics

Table 4 contains summary statistics for all of the independent variables and the dependent variable (ATP scale) used in the current study. This table indicates the number of males and females that participated in the study, the respondents' race, the respondents' answers to the four prior victimization variables, and the respondents' city of residence. The table also provides

summary statistics for the respondents' answers on the ATP scale, the drug offenses scale, the property offenses scale, and the crimes against persons scale.

Table 4
Summary Statistics

	Frequency	Mean	Median	Mode	S.D.	Range
Gender		.48	.00	.00	.50	0-1
Female	3054					
Male	2830					
Race		2.07	2.00	1.00	1.08	1-4
White	2355					
Black	1544					
Hispanic	1098					
Other	835					
Ever been hit by someone		1.50	1.00	1.00	.50	1-2
No	2926					
Yes	2893					
Ever been robbed		1.09	1.00	1.00	.29	1-2
No	5295					
Yes	526					
Ever been attacked		1.12	1.00	1.00	.33	1-2
No	5114					
Yes	699					
Ever had something stolen		1.66	2.00	2.00	.47	1-2
No	1953					
Yes	3869					
City of residence		5.84	6.00	2.00	3.28	1-11
Attitude Toward Police scale		20.66	21.00	21.00	5.85	7-35
Drug Offences scale		8.64	8.00	7.00	1.77	7-14
Property Offences scale		8.65	8.00	7.00	1.85	7-14
Crimes Against Persons scale		4.43	4.00	4.00	.88	4-8

The categories of gender, race, and city of residence included in Table 4 comprise the demographic variables. Out of 5,884 respondents who answered, 51.9% were female and 48.1% were male. There was a total of 5,832 respondents who indicated their race. Of those, 40.4% were White, 26.5% were Black, 18.8% indicated that they were Hispanic, and 14.1% reported their race as other.

Turning to prior victims of a crime, 50.3% reported that they had not been hit by someone prior to taking the survey and 49.7% reported that they had been hit. Ninety-one percent of the respondents reported that they had never been robbed, and only nine percent reported that they had ever been robbed. Eighty-eight percent of the respondents reported that they had never been attacked by someone while twelve percent reported that they had been attacked. Finally, 33.5% reported that they had never had something stolen from them and 66.5% reported that they have had something stolen.

The final section of Table 4 provides the mean, median, mode, standard deviation, and range of responses to the items that make up the ATP scale, the drug offenses scale, the property offenses scale, and the crimes against persons scale. The ATP scale was made up of seven individual items that when combined measured the respondents' overall attitudes toward the police. Their responses to the individual items were scored on a Likert scale as follows: 1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3= neither agree nor disagree, 4 = agree, and 5= strongly agree. Therefore each respondent's score on the scale can range from a score of 7 (indicating very negative attitudes toward the police) to a score of 35 (indicating very favorable attitudes toward the police). The mean score or arithmetic average of the responses to the items constituting the scale was 20.66. This means that the average response to the items that make up the scale was "neither agree nor

disagree”, so the conclusion to be drawn is that the average juvenile does not support or oppose the police. The median or middle score of the scale was a 21.0. Therefore, a score of 21.0 represents the exact middle of the scale. The mode or most frequently occurring score was a 21.0, which indicates that most of the responses to the seven individual items comprising the scale were “neither agree nor disagree”. It should be noted that all three measures of central tendency were very close, which indicates that the juveniles’ answers to the scale items are nearly perfectly distributed. Finally, the standard deviation or dispersion around the mean for the responses to the scale items was 5.85. This means that 68% of the scores on the scale fall between 14.81 and 26.51 (one standard deviation below and above the mean), while 95% of the scores fall between 8.96 and 32.36 (two standard deviations below and above the mean).

The drug offenses scale was made up of seven individual items that when combined measured the respondents’ participation in drug activities. Their responses to the individual items are scored as follows: 1= no, 2= yes. Therefore, each respondents score on the scale can range from a score of 7 (indicating that they have not committed any drug offenses) to a score of 14 (indicating that they have committed all of the drug offenses measured in this study). The mean score of the responses to the items that make up the scale was 8.64. This means that on average the juvenile respondents in this study had committed around two of the seven measured drug offenses. Further analysis revealed that the majority of the juveniles reported using alcohol (n= 3166), slightly less than half reported using tobacco (n= 2188), and nearly one third of the respondents reported using marijuana (n= 1712). The median of the responses to the items that make up this scale was 8, indicating that an answer of one drug offense committed was the center point of the responses. The mode of the responses to the scale items was 7, which means that the

most frequent response to the seven individual items that comprise the scale was “no”. This does not mean that the majority of the respondents reported no drug offenses, but only that they had not committed the majority of the seven distinct offenses. The scale had a standard deviation of 1.77, which means it is estimated that 68% of the respondents in the underlying population would score between 7 and 10.41 on the scale (one standard deviation above the mean), while 95% of the scores would fall between 7 and 12.18 (two standard deviations above the mean).

The property offenses scale was also made up of seven individual items that collectively measured the amount of property offenses committed by the respondents. Their responses to the individual items are scored as follows: 1= no, 2= yes. Therefore, each respondent’s score on the scale can range from a score of 7 (indicating that they have not committed any property offenses) to a score of 14 (indicating that they have committed all of the property offenses measured in this study). The mean score of the responses to the items that make up the scale was 8.65. This indicates that the average respondent reported committing slightly less than two of the seven property offenses measured in this study. The median of the responses was 8, indicating that an answer of one property offense committed was the center point of the responses. The mode of the responses to the scale items was 7, which means that the most frequent response to the seven individual items that comprise the scale was “no”. This does not mean that the majority of the respondents reported no property offenses, but only that “no” was the most frequent answer given. There were seven distinct offenses for which the respondents indicated they either had or had not committed; so if a respondent answered “no” to five items and “yes” to only two items then “no” would be the most frequent answer given even though the respondent had committed two property offenses. The standard deviation for the responses to the scale items was 1.85, which means it is

estimated that 95% of the respondents in the underlying population would score between 7 and 12.35 on the scale.

The crimes against persons scale was made up of four individual items that when combined measured the amount of crimes against persons that the respondents have committed. Their responses to the individual items are scored as follows: 1= no, 2= yes. Therefore, each respondent's score on the scale can range from a score of 4 (indicating that they have not committed any crimes against persons) to a score of 8 (indicating that they have committed all of the crimes against persons measured in this study). The mean score of the responses to the items that make up the scale was 4.43. This means that on average the respondents reported committing less than one of these offenses, so obviously some of the juveniles committed one or maybe two of these offenses while most of them did not commit any of them. The median of the responses to the scale items was 4. The mode of the responses was 4, which means that most of the respondents answered "no" to the majority of the items. Also, the standard deviation for the responses to the scale items was .88, which means it is estimated that 95% of the respondents in the underlying population would score between 4 and 6.19 (two standard deviations above the mean) on the scale.

Mean Differences on ATP Scale

Table 5 indicates the results from the independent samples t-test comparisons of juveniles' attitudes toward the police by gender and prior victimization. The table presents the means and standard deviations of the respondents' scores on the ATP scale. The mean score on the ATP scale for female respondents was 21.39, while the mean for male respondents was 19.89. This indicates that females have a higher score on the ATP scale on average than males do. The average female answer to the items that comprise the ATP scale was slightly above a neutral answer, while the

average male answer fell on the negative side of the scale. These mean scores were found to be significantly different at the .01 level. This finding provides support for the hypothesis that females have more favorable attitudes toward the police than males, and coincides with most of the previous literature (Cao et al., 1996; Cheurprakobkit, 2000; Hawdon & Ryan, 2003; Reisig & Giacomazzi, 1998; Sims et al., 1999; Webb & Marshall, 1995).

The mean scores on the ATP scale for the respondents to the ever been hit by someone item were 21.42 for those who responded no, and 19.90 for those who responded yes. This indicates that the respondents who reported never being hit by someone had a higher average score on the ATP scale than respondents reporting that they had been hit by someone. The average response to the scale items for a respondent who reported being hit was slightly above neutral, while the average response for a respondent who had been hit was negative. Although these mean scores were not found to be significantly different, they were in the direction predicted in the hypothesis that prior victims will hold more negative attitudes toward the police than non-victims.

The mean score for those who said they had never been robbed was 20.90, while the mean score for those who had been robbed was 18.24. This indicates that the respondents who reported never being robbed had a higher average score on the ATP scale than respondents reporting that they had been robbed. The average response to the scale items for a respondent who reported being robbed was neutral, while the average response for a respondent who had been robbed was negative. These mean scores were found to be significantly different at the .01 level. These findings provide tentative support for the hypothesis that prior victims hold more negative attitudes toward the police than non-victims.

The mean score on the ATP scale for respondents reporting they had never been attacked was 21.17, while the mean score for those who had been attacked was 17.04. This indicates that the respondents who reported never being attacked had a higher average score on the ATP scale than respondents reporting that they had been attacked. The average response to the scale items for a respondent who reported being attacked was slightly positive, while the average response for a respondent who had been attacked was negative. These mean scores were found to be significantly different at the .01 level. This finding provides the strongest bivariate support for the hypothesis that prior victims will hold more negative attitudes toward the police than non-victims.

The mean scores for the respondents to the “ever had something stolen” item were 21.03 for those who had never had something stolen, and 20.48 for the ones who reported having something stolen. This indicates that there was very little difference in the responses to the ATP scale items between respondents who reported having something stolen and those who had not had something stolen. Respondents from both groups on average responded with neutral answers to the scale items. These mean scores were not found to be significantly different, and provide no support for the prediction that prior victims of crime will hold more negative attitudes toward the police than non-victims.

For each of the four prior victimization items, respondents who indicated that they had been the victim of a crime had a lower average score on the ATP scale than those indicating that they had not been the victim of a crime. These findings provide tentative support for the hypothesis that prior victims will hold more negative attitudes toward the police than non-victims. However, these findings alone do not provide enough support to accept the hypothesis. These findings only show how the mean scores on the ATP scale were affected when a respondent indicated that he/she had

been a prior victim. These findings do not take into account all of the other factors that may influence a juvenile's attitude toward the police. In order to fully understand this relationship it is important to conduct multivariate analysis. Multivariate analysis allows a researcher to assess how multiple independent variables affect a single dependent variable while controlling for all other independent variables. In the present study this means that we can see how race, sex, delinquency, and city of residence affect the juveniles' ATP. Examining the effects of all of these variables simultaneously allows us to more accurately explain the factors that determine whether a juvenile's ATP will be positive or negative.

Table 5
t-test Comparisons of Juveniles' ATP by Gender and Prior Victimization

		Mean	S.D.
Gender*	Female	21.39	5.42
	Male	19.89	6.18
Ever been hit by someone	No	21.42	5.75
	Yes	19.90	5.82
Ever been robbed*	No	20.90	5.76
	Yes	18.24	6.05
Ever been attacked*	No	21.17	5.64
	Yes	17.04	5.96
Ever had something stolen	No	21.03	5.93
	Yes	20.48	5.78

Note. ATP = attitudes toward police

*P<.01

Correlation Between Variables

Bivariate correlation is a statistical test that is used to study the relationship between two variables. It is also an important step in establishing causation. Causation refers to definitively

showing that one thing causes another. In order to establish causation you must show three things: 1) two variables are correlated; 2) the variable that you predict is the cause must come before the effect in time; and 3) no other variables affect the relationship. Bivariate correlation allows you to complete the first requirement of causation by determining if two variables are correlated. After you determine that two variables are correlated then you must move on to a regression analysis to make sure that no outside variables are affecting the relationship.

Table 6 reports the Pearson's correlation coefficients (Pearson's r) between the ATP scale and all of the independent variables. All of the prior victimization variables were negatively correlated with the ATP scale. This means that a response of yes to any of these items resulted in a more negative ATP than a response of no. Also, all four of the items were significant at the .01 level, although none of the correlations were very strong. The reason that weak correlations such as these can be significant is due in part to the large sample size used in this study. As the sample size grows larger so do the degrees of freedom. Degrees of freedom are "the number of freely varying values in a given data set" (Miller & Whitehead, 1996, p.446). As the degrees of freedom go up the value of r that is needed for significance goes down. Thus a data set with a large sample size allows smaller r values to be significant when they would not be in a smaller sample.

These findings provide some support for the hypothesis stated earlier that prior victims would hold more negative ATP than non-victims. The largest Pearson's r among the prior victimization items (-.231) was between the ATP scale and the item asking the respondents if they have ever been attacked. This indicates a weak negative linear relationship between this item and a respondent's ATP. This score can also be squared to obtain the coefficient of determination (r^2).

The r^2 for this variable would be .05, which indicates that only five percent of the variability in ATP is explained by the relationship to a respondent being attacked.

The items asking if someone had ever hit the respondents, or if they had ever been robbed were also negatively correlated with ATP with correlation coefficients of -.130 and -.131 respectively. These weak linear relationships produce an r^2 of .01, which indicates that these variables explain only around one percent of the variability in ATP. The smallest Pearson's r among the prior victimization items (-.044) was between the ATP scale and the item asking the respondents if they had ever had something stolen, which indicates a very weak negative linear relationship.

Among the demographic variables, the largest Pearson's r (.219) was between the ATP scale and the racial category of White, which indicates a weak positive linear relationship between these two variables. This indicates that a White respondent was more likely to hold a positive ATP than a respondent of any other race, which lends support to the hypothesis that Whites hold more favorable ATP than non-Whites. The r^2 for this variable is .04, indicating that around four percent of the variability in ATP can be explained by a respondent being White. A negative linear relationship existed between the ATP scale and the Black racial category with a Pearson's r of (-.194). This indicates that a Black respondent would be more likely to have a negative ATP. The r^2 for this variable is .03, which means that only about three percent of the variability in ATP is explained by this variable.

A very weak negative linear relationship also existed between the ATP scale and the Hispanic racial category with a Pearson's r of (-.057). The smallest Pearson's r of (-.005) was between the ATP scale and the racial category of "other", indicating basically no linear relationship

between these two variables. This indicates that respondents in the racial category of “other” do not hold significantly different ATP than respondents from the other three racial categories. The final demographic variable assessing the respondents’ gender produced a negative linear relationship with the ATP scale with a Pearson’s r of (-.128). Because the variable assessing the respondents’ gender was coded 0= female; 1= male, this means that being a female resulted in a more positive ATP. This finding provides support for the hypothesis that females hold more positive ATP than males. The r^2 for this variable is .01, which means that only about one percent of the variability in ATP is explained by the respondents’ gender. All of the demographic variables produced results that were statistically significant at the .01 level even though the correlations were weak.

The final three variables on Table 6 show the correlations between the ATP scale and each of the three delinquency scales. All three of these correlations indicated that moderate negative linear relationships existed. The largest Pearson’s r (-.430) was between the ATP scale and the drug offenses scale. This indicates that a juvenile who has committed drug offenses would be more likely to have a negative ATP than a respondent who had not committed or had committed less drug offenses. The r^2 for this variable is .18, which means that about 18% of the variability in ATP is explained by the respondents’ participation in drug offenses. Very similar relationships held true for property offenses and crimes against persons. The Pearson’s r between the ATP scale and the property offenses scale was (-.427). This is a moderate negative linear relationship. The r^2 for this variable is .17, which means that about 17% of the variability in ATP is explained by the respondents’ participation in property offenses. The Pearson’s r between the ATP scale and the crimes against persons scale was (-.383). This is also a moderate negative linear relationship. The

r^2 for this variable was .14, indicating that about 14% of the variability in ATP is explained by the respondents' commission of crimes against persons.

Table 6
Pearson's Correlations between the ATP Scale and All Independent Variables

	ATP
Sex	-.128**
White	.219**
Black	-.194**
Hispanic	-.057**
Other	-.005
Ever been hit by someone	-.130**
Ever been robbed	-.131**
Ever been attacked	-.231**
Ever had something stolen	-.044**
Drug offences	-.430**
Property offences	-.427**
Crimes against persons	-.383**

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level.

** Correlation is significant at the .01 level.

The three delinquency scales produced stronger correlations with ATP than any of the other independent variables, and all of the correlations were negative. Thus the bivariate analysis suggests that prior delinquency plays the largest role in explaining ATP. These findings provide support for the hypothesis that juveniles who have committed delinquent acts will hold more

negative attitudes toward the police than those who have not committed delinquent acts. These findings are also supported by the findings of other researchers such as Cox and Falkenberg (1987), Giordano (1976), Hurst and Frank (2000), Jackson (2002), and Leiber et al. (1998).

ANOVA of Race and ATP

Table 7 displays the analysis of variance of the mean scores of the juvenile respondents' on the ATP scale based on each of the four racial groups. The mean score on the ATP scale for the White respondents was (22.22), which indicates that their responses to the seven items comprising the scale were generally positive. The White respondents were also the group with the highest average score on the ATP scale, which means that they held the most positive attitudes toward the police. The mean score on the scale for the Black respondents was (18.74), which indicates that their responses to the scale items were generally negative. The Black respondents were the group possessing the most negative attitudes toward the police. The mean score for the Hispanic respondents was (19.95), which indicates that their responses to the scale items were slightly less negative than the responses of Blacks. The mean score for the respondents that make up the "other" category was (20.59), which indicates that their responses to the scale items were generally neutral. These findings lend further support to the prediction that White respondents would hold more favorable ATP than non-White respondents.

Table 7 also shows which comparisons were significantly different through use of the Tukey's HSD test, which compares the mean score of each racial category to the mean scores of all other racial categories. White respondents had the highest mean score on the ATP scale and their attitudes toward the police were significantly different at the .05 level from the attitudes of the respondents comprising the other three racial categories. Black respondents had the lowest mean

score on the ATP scale and their attitudes toward the police were also significantly different at the .05 level from the attitudes of respondents from all other racial categories. Hispanic’s attitudes toward the police were significantly different at the .05 level from the attitudes of the White and Black respondents, and the attitudes of the respondents comprising the “other” racial category were significantly different at the .05 level from those of White and Black respondents. These findings provide support for the hypothesis that White respondents would hold more favorable attitudes toward the police than non-White respondents. The findings are also supported by several prior studies such as Correia et al. (1996), Maxson et al. (2003), Reisig & Parks (2000), and Sullivan et al. (1987).

Table 7
Analysis of Variance Comparison of Juveniles’ Attitudes Toward Police by Race

Race	Mean
White (N= 2355)	22.22** *** *****
Black (N= 1544)	18.74* *** *****
Hispanic (N= 1098)	19.95* **
Other (N= 835)	20.59* **

Note. All comparisons made using Tukey’s HSD test
 * P < .05, Whites as comparison.
 ** P < .05, Blacks as comparison.
 *** P < .05, Hispanics as comparison.
 **** P < .05, other as comparison.

ANOVA of City of Residence and ATP

Table 8 displays the analysis of variance of the mean scores of the juvenile respondents’ on the ATP scale based on each of the eleven U.S. cities. The highest mean score on the ATP scale (22.92) belonged to the respondents from Pocatello, which indicates that their responses to the

scale items were mostly positive. This also means that respondents from Pocatello had the most positive attitudes toward the police on average. The mean score on the scale for the respondents from Omaha was (20.73), which indicates that their responses to the scale items were generally neutral, and therefore their attitudes toward the police on average are neither positive nor negative. The mean score for the respondents from Phoenix was (19.74), which indicates that their responses to the scale items were slightly negative. The lowest mean score on the ATP scale (18.52) belonged to the respondents from Kansas City, which indicates that their responses to the seven items comprising the scale were mostly negative. This also indicates that respondents from Kansas City held the most negative attitudes toward the police on average.

Table 8 also shows which comparisons were significantly different through utilization of the Tukey's HSD test, which compares the mean score on the ATP scale for each city to the mean scores of all other cities. The table shows that some significant differences existed between all of the cities. However, the two cities whose mean scores on the ATP scale were significantly different from most other cities at the .05 level were Pocatello and Will County.

The findings shown in Table 8 provide support for the hypothesis that juveniles residing in large urban areas will hold more negative attitudes toward the police than those residing in non-urban areas. The two highest mean scores on the ATP scale, and, therefore, the two cities with the most positive attitudes toward the police, were for Pocatello and Will County. Pocatello is "a small racially homogenous (i.e. White) city... with fewer than 100,000 inhabitants" (Esbensen & Osgood, 1999, p.202). Will County is "a rural community in which 80 percent of the student population is White" (p.202), with a population below 25,000. The two lowest mean scores and, therefore, the two cities with the most negative attitudes toward the police were for Kansas City

Table 8
ANOVA Comparison of Juveniles' ATP by City of Residence

City	Mean
Pocatello (N= 504)	22.92 ** *** ***** ! # @ % ^
Omaha (N= 856)	20.73 * ! \$ @ ^ +
Las Cruces (N= 490)	21.19 * ***** ! @ ^ +
Phoenix (N= 501)	19.74* *** \$ +
Philadelphia (N= 501)	19.14 * ** *** \$ # +
Torrance (N= 628)	21.93** ***** ! # @ % ^
Providence (N= 408)	20.58 * ! \$ @ ^ +
Kansas City (N= 420)	18.52 * ** *** \$ # % +
Orlando (N= 432)	20.20 * \$ @ ^ +
Milwaukee (N= 573)	18.71 * ** *** \$ # % +
Will County (N= 622)	22.55 ** *** ***** ! # @ % ^

Note. All comparisons made using Tukey's HSD test

Note. ATP = Attitudes toward Police

* P < .05, Pocatello as comparison.

** P < .05, Omaha as comparison.

*** P < .05, Las Cruces as comparison.

**** P < .05, Phoenix as comparison.

! P < .05, Philadelphia as comparison.

\$ P < .05, Torrance as comparison.

P < .05, Providence as comparison

@ P < .05, Kansas City as comparison.

% P < .05, Orlando as comparison.

^ P < .05, Milwaukee as comparison.

+ P < .05, Will County as comparison.

and Milwaukee. Both Kansas City and Milwaukee are “large, urban areas with a majority of

students belonging to a racial or ethnic minority” (201), with populations over 500,000. Although

the respondents from smaller less urban areas hold more favorable ATP, the findings could be based more on racial composition than location or population density as suggested by several prior studies (Hurst & Frank, 2000; Hurst et al., 2000; Taylor et al., 2001).

Regression Equation One

Table 9 displays the results of the OLS Regression analysis for the variables predicting juveniles' attitudes toward the police, not including delinquency measures. The overall equation was significant at the .01 level with an f of (48.861). The largest regression coefficient (Beta) in this equation of (-.160) was for the item asking whether or not the respondents had ever been attacked. This indicates that being the victim of an attack has the most impact on a respondent's ATP. The Beta for this item is negative and indicates that being the victim of an attack decreases a respondent's score on the ATP scale by (.160). The Beta for the item asking if someone had ever hit the respondents was (-.073), and the Beta for the item asking if the respondents had ever been robbed was (-.028). All three of the previously mentioned victimization items produced results that were significant at least at the .05 level. The fourth victimization item asking if the respondents had ever had something stolen was the only one that was not significant. The Beta for this item was (.002), which basically indicates that having something stolen has no effect on ATP.

Turning to the demographic predictors in the regression equation, the second largest Beta (-.126) in the equation was for respondents from Milwaukee. This indicates that living in Milwaukee negatively impacts a respondents overall attitude toward the police. The third largest Beta (.119) in the equation was for the White racial category. This indicates that being from the White racial category is the third strongest predictor of ATP, and results in more positive attitudes. The Beta for the Hispanic racial category was (-.043), which indicates that being Hispanic on average

produces a more negative ATP. The Black racial category has a Beta of (-.061), which indicates that being Black on average produces a more negative ATP. The final demographic variable of respondents' sex had a Beta of (-.089), which indicates that being female on average produces a more positive ATP. All five of the demographic variables produced results that were significant at the .01 level, with the exception of the Hispanic racial category which was significant at the .05 level. Of the 11 U.S. cities, only Pocatello residents were more likely to hold positive attitudes toward the police.

Table 9
Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Attitudes Toward Police

Variable	B	t	Beta
Sex	-1.045	-7.000	-.089**
White	1.416	6.004	.119**
Black	-.813	-3.008	-.061**
Hispanic	-.643	-2.295	-.043*
Ever been hit by someone	-.852	-5.468	-.073**
Ever been robbed	-.567	-2.028	-.028*
Ever been attacked	-2.876	-11.631	-.160**
Ever had something stolen	.023	.140	.002
Pocatello	.339	.988	.016
Omaha	-1.394	-4.548	-.083**
Las Cruces	-.500	-1.414	-.024
Phoenix	-.996	-2.735	-.047**
Philadelphia	-1.709	-4.560	-.080**
Providence	-.983	-2.731	-.042**
Kansas City	-2.089	-5.418	-.091**
Orlando	-1.208	-3.330	-.054**
Milwaukee	-2.490	-7.255	-.126**
Will County	-.128	-.387	-.007

Note. R2 = .135

* P < .05

** P < .01

Most of the findings from the regression analysis shown in Table 9 support the hypotheses of the study. It shows that Whites hold more positive ATP than non-Whites, and females hold a more positive ATP than males. Table 9 also shows that three of the four prior victimization variables impacted ATP in the predicted direction, with the “ever had something stolen” item being the only exception. The equation also shows that being from large urban areas such as Milwaukee and Kansas City negatively impacts ATP, while being from smaller less urban areas such as Pocatello and Will County either positively impacts ATP or has no effect.

Regression Equation Two

Table 10 displays the results of the OLS Regression analysis for the variables predicting juveniles’ attitudes toward the police, including delinquency measures. The overall equation was again significant at the .01 level, but with a considerably larger f of 112.538. The largest regression coefficient (Beta) in this equation of (-.288) was for the drug offenses scale. This indicates that being involved in drug activities has the most impact on a respondent’s ATP. The Beta for this item is negative and indicates that being involved in drug activities reduces a respondent’s score on the ATP scale by (.288). The second largest Beta in this equation (-.167) was for the property offenses scale. This indicates that respondents who have committed property offenses were more likely to have a negative attitude toward the police. Also, the Beta for the crimes against persons scale was (-.80). This indicates that respondents who have committed property offenses were more likely to have a negative attitude toward the police. All three of the delinquency scales produced results that were in the predicted directions and significant at the .01 level.

In this equation the only two victimization variables that remain significant are the ones assessing if the respondents have ever been hit or had something stolen. However, the Beta’s for

these two items are now positive, contrary to initial predictions. This indicates that a spurious relationship exists between the prior victimization items and ATP. A spurious relationship is “a coincidental statistical correlation between two variables, shown to be caused by some third variable” (Babbie, 2004, p.91). The coincidental correlation in this study was found between prior victimization and attitudes toward the police, with the third variable that was the cause of this relationship being delinquency. The nature of this relationship became apparent when the delinquency measures were included in the regression equation. The reason that prior victimization reduced ATP in the first equation was because the juveniles that reported being victimized also reported participation in delinquent acts. Therefore, it can be assumed that the juveniles who reported being victimized in this study also reported participation in delinquent activities, and this delinquency was the real reason that their attitudes toward the police were negative. Thus the major finding that must be reported from this study is that the relationship between prior victimization and ATP was spurious, with delinquency being the true predictor of ATP.

A similar relationship was found between prior victimization and ATP when neighborhood disorder variables were included in a study by Cao et al. (1996). Their study was very similar to the present study because it too sought to identify what factors influenced attitudes toward police. One conclusion drawn from the study was that prior victimization was a statistically significant predictor of the respondents' attitudes toward the police. In their original equation prior victimization was significant at the .001 level with a Beta of $-.149$. However, when variables concerning community disorder were introduced into the equation prior victimization was no longer significant and the Beta dropped to $.041$. Thus a spurious relationship existed between prior

victimization and attitudes toward the police in their study just as the one that was found in the current study.

Table 10
Summary of Regression Analysis when Delinquency Measures were Included

Variable	B	t	Beta
Sex	-.716	-5.104	-.061**
White	1.274	5.898	.107**
Black	-1.383	-5.553	-.103**
Hispanic	-.418	-1.620	-.027
Ever been hit by someone	-.049	-.336	-.004
Ever been robbed	.435	1.656	.021
Ever been attacked	-.462	-1.896	.025*
Ever had something stolen	.327	2.208	.026*
Pocatello	.432	1.388	.021
Omaha	-.742	-2.641	-.044**
Las Cruces	.270	.834	.013
Phoenix	-.197	-.586	-.009
Philadelphia	-1.511	-4.398	-.071**
Providence	-1.065	-3.245	-.046**
Kansas City	-1.060	-2.973	-.045**
Orlando	-.714	-2.157	-.032*
Milwaukee	-1.561	-4.955	-.078**
Will County	.230	.766	.012
Drug offences	-.953	-18.331	-.288**
Property offences	-.532	-10.095	-.167**
Crimes against persons	-.545	-5.143	-.080**

Note. R² = .306

* P < .05

** P < .01

Of the 11 U.S. cities, only residents of Pocatello, Las Cruces, and Will County were more likely to hold positive ATP in this equation. These findings provide support for the hypothesis that juveniles residing in large urban areas will hold more negative attitudes toward the police than those residing in non-urban areas. Also, the variables of sex, White, and Black remained significant in the expected directions in this equation with Beta's of (-.061), (.107), and (-.103) respectively.

This chapter has provided a discussion of the findings produced from this study. One such finding was that females were shown to hold more favorable attitudes toward the police than males. Results were also reported indicating that White respondents held more favorable ATP than non-White respondents, and juveniles residing in large urban areas held more negative attitudes toward the police than those residing in non-urban areas. The major finding of this study was that a spurious relationship existed between prior victimization and attitudes toward the police. Although the initial results showed that prior victims held more negative attitudes toward the police than non-victims, further analysis revealed that delinquency accounted for this relationship. The next chapter provides further interpretation of the results and a discussion of the implications and conclusions to be drawn.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to analyze juveniles' attitudes toward the police and how their attitudes were affected by prior victimization and delinquency controlling for race, gender, and city of residence. It was predicted that significant differences in attitudes toward police would be found based on the gender of the juveniles, with females holding more positive attitudes toward the police than males. Also, it was predicted that significant differences would be found based on the race of the juveniles, with Whites holding more positive attitudes toward the police than non-Whites. It was further predicted that the juveniles who had been victims of a crime would generally hold more negative attitudes toward the police than non-victims. It was also expected that juveniles residing in large urban areas would hold more negative attitudes toward the police than those residing in non-urban areas and juveniles who had committed delinquent acts would hold more negative attitudes toward the police than those who had not committed delinquent acts. This section will provide further interpretation of the results discussed in the previous chapter and a discussion of the implications and weaknesses of this study.

Hypotheses

This study produced findings that supported four of the five hypotheses stated in the introduction. One such hypothesis was that juveniles' ATP would vary significantly based on gender, with females holding more favorable ATP than males. Findings supporting this hypothesis were found in the results of the independent samples t-test comparisons (see Table 5), the Pearson's correlation between the ATP scale and the respondents' sex variable (see Table 6), and

the regression analysis for the variables predicting juveniles' ATP (see Tables 9 & 10). These findings were consistent with the findings of many of the prior ATP studies that examined the effects of gender (Cao et al., 1996; Cheurprakobkit 2000; Hawdon & Ryan, 2003; Reisig & Giacomazzi, 1998; Sims et al., 1999; Webb & Marshall, 1995).

Although many of the prior studies have found that females view the police more favorably than males, there is definitely not a consensus. There have been just as many studies that have reported no difference in attitudes among males and females, and a few studies that have reported males viewing the police more favorably than females. The studies that have found that females view the police more favorably than males have offered several possible explanations. One possibility is that males have more negative contacts with the police because they are more likely to be involved in criminal activities. This disproportionate amount of contact with the police leads to males viewing the police more negatively than females. Other possible reasons given by prior research is that females are traditionally raised to be more passive and respectful to authority figures than males, and that females tend to rely more on the police for personal protection because they have a higher fear of crime than males.

Another hypothesis for which this study provided support predicted that juveniles' ATP would vary significantly based on race, with White respondents having more favorable ATP than non-White respondents. Findings supporting this hypothesis were found in the results of the Pearson's correlation between the ATP scale and the respondents' race variable (see Table 6), the analysis of variance comparison of juveniles' ATP by race (see Table 7), and the regression analysis for the variables predicting juveniles' ATP (see Tables 9 & 10). These findings were consistent with the majority of the prior ATP studies that examined the effects of race (Albrecht & Green,

1977; Brandl et al., 1994; Cheurprakobkit, 2000; Correia et al., 1996; Furstenberg & Wellford, 1973; Jesilow et al., 1995; Maxson et al., 2003; Murphy & Worrall, 1999; Reisig & Parks, 2000; Smith et al., 1999; Smith & Hawkins, 1973; Sullivan et al., 1987; Tuch & Weitzer, 1997; Webb & Marshall, 1995).

While the majority of the prior literature on attitudes toward the police suggests that Whites view the police more favorably than non-Whites, the reasons given for these findings are varied. One segment of the research has suggested that minorities have more negative contacts with the police than Whites. These negative contacts over a period of time lead to more negative attitudes. It has also been suggested that the attitudes of minorities are negatively affected by the conditions of the neighborhoods where they live. The typical inner city neighborhood, where a large percentage of the minorities live, consists of run-down buildings covered with graffiti, streets littered with garbage, and rampant gang and drug activity. If these conditions persist over time, then the residents who are subject to these living conditions begin to hold the police responsible. If these residents perceive the police as uncaring or unwilling to help them then their attitudes will become increasingly more negative. Other research has suggested that as more and more minorities populate an area there is a greater chance that the negative attitudes toward the police will spread.

The third hypothesis supported by the results of this study predicted that juveniles' ATP would vary significantly based on city of residence, with juveniles residing in large urban areas holding more negative attitudes toward the police than those residing in non-urban areas. Findings supporting this hypothesis were found in the results of the analysis of variance comparison of juveniles' ATP by city of residence (see Table 8), and the regression analysis for the variables predicting juveniles' ATP (see Tables 9 & 10). There have only been three other studies to date

that have examined the affects of residential area when assessing juveniles' attitudes toward police. All of these studies found that juveniles living in less populated rural/suburban areas had more positive ATP than those living in large urban areas (Hurst & Frank, 2000; Hurst et al., 2000; Taylor et al., 2001).

The results of this study were consistent with the results of all of the previous studies that examined the affects of residential location on attitudes toward the police. Several possibilities have been offered to explain these attitudinal differences among different residential locations. One possibility is the percentage of minority residents in an area. As the number of minority residents increases, the attitudes toward the police often become more negative. Another possible explanation is the population density of the area. As the population in a particular residential area increases, more and more conflicts and problems are created. These problems often become to numerous for the police to manage. As a result the area may become more crime prone and the residents begin to hold the police responsible for the living conditions in their area.

The fourth hypothesis supported by the results of this study predicted that Juveniles who have committed delinquent acts will hold more negative attitudes toward the police than those who have not committed delinquent acts. Findings supporting this hypothesis were found in the results of the Pearson's correlations between the ATP scale and the three delinquency scales (see Table 6), as well as in the regression analysis for the variables predicting juveniles' ATP (see Table10). These findings are consistent with all of the prior studies assessing juveniles' attitudes toward the police that controlled for delinquent activities (Cox & Falkenberg, 1987; Giordano, 1976; Hurst & Frank, 2000; Jackson, 2002; Leiber et al., 1998).

Most of the prior studies have concluded that these findings are consistent with the sub-cultural theories of delinquency. These theories assert that juveniles who are involved in delinquent activities tend to form their own group or subculture with a different set of beliefs and values than the larger culture. Therefore, the juveniles in these delinquent subcultures hold more negative attitudes toward the police than juveniles who do not belong to these subcultures because their attitudes and values conflict with those of the police and society in general.

The only hypothesis not supported by this study predicted that juveniles' ATP would vary significantly based on prior victimization, with prior victims holding more negative ATP than non-victims. Some preliminary evidence was found in support of this hypothesis through analysis of the independent samples t-tests computed for each of the four prior victimization variables (see Table 5), the Pearson's correlations between the four prior victimization variables and the respondents' ATP (see Table 6), and the regression equation that did not include delinquency measures (see Table 9). However, when measures of delinquent activities were included in the regression equation the significance of the four prior victimization variables was greatly affected.

In the original regression equation two of the four prior victimization variables were significant at the .01 level and one was significant at the .05 level. The variable that had the greatest impact on ATP was the item asking whether or not the respondent's had ever been attacked. This variable had a Beta of $-.160$, indicating a decrease of $.160$ on the ATP scale when prior victims of attack had their responses included. The second most influential victimization variable asked the respondents if they had ever been hit. This variable had a Beta of $-.073$, which indicates a decrease of $.073$ on the ATP scale when the answers of respondents who had been hit by someone were included. The item assessing whether the respondents had ever had something

stolen had a Beta of $-.028$, which indicates a decrease of $.028$ on the ATP scale when the answers of respondents who had been the victims of theft were included. The only victimization variable that had no significant effect was whether or not the respondents had ever had something stolen.

In the second regression equation, which included delinquency measures, the effects of prior victimization on ATP were reversed. Two of the four victimization items remained significant, but their effects were reversed from the first equation. The two variables “ever had something stolen” and “ever been attacked” were statistically significant at the $.05$ level and had Betas of $.026$ and $.025$ respectively, both of which indicate an increase on the ATP scale when the answers of the respondents who answered yes to these items are included. The Betas of the other two victimization variables were also positive but not statistically significant. Thus, once involvement in delinquency is controlled for, respondents who had been prior victims of crime had more positive ATP than non-victims.

The earlier negative relationship between prior victimization and ATP in this study was revealed as spurious once delinquency measures were included in the regression equation. Prior victimization reduced ATP in the first equation because the juveniles that reported being victimized also tended to report participation in delinquent acts. In other words, the real reason that the prior victims of crime in this study had more negative attitudes toward the police than non-victims was because they were also disproportionately involved in delinquent activities. This relationship is consistent with the observation that juveniles who are most at risk for victimization are the same ones who are likely committing delinquent acts.

The spurious relationship found between attitudes toward police and prior victimization in this study was unexpected. It was originally hypothesized that prior victims of crime would hold

more negative ATP than non-victims. Even though no support was found for this hypothesis, the spurious relationship that was found was consistent with previous research on attitudes toward police. As discussed earlier, Cao et al. (1996) found a similar relationship. Their study reported a spurious relationship between prior victimization and ATP. While the current study found involvement in delinquency to be the third variable causing the apparent relationship between victimization and ATP, the relationship in their study was discovered when neighborhood disorder variables were included.

The relationship between prior victimization and ATP in the current study became positive when delinquency was included in the equation. Therefore, it becomes necessary to speculate on the reason why this happened. The most obvious reason would be that the juveniles had a positive experience with the police as a result of the victimization. That is, instead of holding the police responsible for their victimization, the juveniles called on the police for help and the police resolved the situation. Therefore, a juvenile who may have viewed the police negatively or neutrally before a victimization could have come to view the police positively afterwards.

Limitations and Weaknesses

This study was impacted by some limitations and weaknesses. One of the limitations faced was inherent in the use of secondary data. While the data examined in this study were designed very well to serve its original purpose, it was not as well conceptualized for the analysis conducted in this study. The result was a lack of variables to thoroughly study the effects that different types of victimization had on ATP. A more complete analysis would have included many different types of property crime and violent crime victimizations in addition to those in this study. Examples of more violent victimizations would include juveniles who had been raped or molested, and those

who had been abused or neglected. The study could have also incorporated respondents who had been victims of different property crimes including those whose house had been vandalized or broken into, and respondents whose families' vehicles or other personal property had been vandalized, broken into, or stolen. This would have allowed for a comparison of how more violent victimizations and more serious property violations affected ATP. Also, the use of more victimization variables could have possibly reduced or eliminated the spurious relationship that was found between prior victimization and ATP.

This data set also lacked some important variables that one would expect to impact a respondent's attitude toward the police. These variables include measures of police contacts, socioeconomic status, and different types of schools. Several prior studies have shown that negative police contacts result in more negative attitudes toward the police. The inclusion of police contact measures could have significantly impacted this study. Another important variable that could have impacted juveniles' attitudes toward the police in this study is socioeconomic status. Inclusion of this variable would have allowed for a comparison of attitudes toward the police based on different income levels of the juveniles' parents. Lastly, a comparison of different types of schools, such as public versus private, would have allowed for a comparison of how each setting affected the juveniles' attitudes toward the police.

Another limitation of this study was due to the use of cross-sectional data. Although parts of the G.R.E.A.T. data set contain longitudinal data, the specific data used in this study were cross-sectional. This means that the data were collected from a single observation in time. The respondents were given only one survey. A more complete study could be conducted using longitudinal data in which the respondents' ATP could be examined before and after a treatment

effect such as a community-policing program. This would allow the researcher to assess the changes this type of program had on the respondents' ATP.

The final topic that should be addressed was the large sample size used in this study. The size of the sample was so large that some minor differences produced statistically significant results. This happens because as the sample size grows larger the size of effects that are needed for significance goes down. As a result, a data set with a large sample size such as this one allows smaller r values to be significant when they would not be in a smaller sample. For this reason a lot of caution had to be used in interpreting the results. However, it should be noted that large sample sizes are required whenever you are trying to generalize results to the entire population. This is true in this study because it attempts to make generalizations about the ATP of all juveniles.

Implications

The implications of this study are important. First of all, this study shows that juveniles in general do not hold positive attitudes toward the police. Although this is true for both sexes, males typically view the police more negatively than females. This finding is important when you consider that juveniles play a major role in the crime problem in this country. The policy implications of this finding could be to implement more community and school based programs that focus more on building positive relationships between young kids and adults instead of the existing programs that mainly focus on drug and gang prevention.

This study also suggests that White juveniles tend to view police more positively than non-White juveniles, and that juveniles living in large urban areas tend to view the police more negatively than those living in less populated rural/suburban areas. These findings are discussed together because it has been suggested by previous researchers such as Hurst et al. (2000) that they

are interrelated. The differences in ATP by city of residence that has been reported by several prior studies could in fact be due in large part to the racial composition of the area. Thus the relationship between the police and minorities becomes much more important than residential location or population density. However, this relationship was not shown to exist in this study because differences in ATP were found between different residential locations even when race was controlled for.

The final and most important finding of this study was the spurious relationship between prior victimization and attitudes toward the police. The apparent reason that prior victims of crime in this study viewed police more negatively than non-victims was because they were also involved in delinquent activities. The juveniles' involvement in these delinquent activities was a much better predictor of ATP than prior victimization, and their inclusion in the study reversed the effect of prior victimization. Therefore, the most important policy implication suggested by this study focuses on delinquency and not prior victimization.

The attitudes toward the police held by juveniles are not solely the responsibility of the police. However, it is true that the police can do their part to ensure that juveniles view them positively. This can be done by methods such as increasing police activities within the schools and communities where significant problems exist in order to ensure that juveniles view the police with confidence and respect. However, it is extremely difficult for the police to change the attitudes of juveniles who are already involved in criminal activity. The strongest predictor of negative attitudes toward the police reported by this study was delinquency. Programs such as D.A.R.E. and G.R.E.A.T. have achieved some successes in the schools. These programs have helped to educate juveniles on the dangers of drugs and gangs while building a positive relationship with police

officers. More community based programs such as these should be offered to help build positive relationships between children, their parents, and police officers within the communities. Programs such as these could even potentially change some of the negative attitudes that juveniles already involved in delinquent activities may hold toward the police if they can see the police actively participating and making a difference in their community. Perhaps one way to increase the odds that juveniles will view the police positively and steer clear of criminal activities is to build positive helping relationships between the police and the community.

The limitations of this study should serve as a guide for researchers to better design future studies on juveniles' attitudes toward the police. First of all, future studies should have a longitudinal design in order for researchers to assess the factors that affect juveniles' attitudes toward the police over time. Secondly, studies that analyze the effects of prior victimization should include many more different types of property crime and violent crime victimizations in addition to those in this study. This would have allowed for a more complete comparison of how more violent victimizations and more serious property violations affected ATP. Finally, future research should include measures of police contacts between the police and juveniles, socioeconomic status of the juveniles' parents, and the effects of different types of school environments. All of these design improvements will allow future researchers to more accurately examine the factors that affect juveniles' attitudes toward the police.

REFERENCES

- Albrecht, S.L., & Green, M. (1977). Attitudes toward the police and the larger attitude complex. *Criminology*, *15*, 67-86.
- Allison, P.D. (1999). *Multiple regression: A primer*. Thousand Oaks, California: Pine Forge Press.
- Amorso, D.M., & Ware, E.E. (1983). Youth's perception of police as a function of attitudes towards parents, teachers and self. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, *25*, 191-199.
- Babbie, E. (2004). *The practice of social research (10th ed.)*. Victoria, Australia: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Bellman, A. (1935). A police service rating scale. *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology*, *26*, 74-114.
- Benedict, W.R., Brown, B., & Bower, D.J. (1999). Perceptions of the police and fear of crime in a rural setting: Utility of a geographically focused survey for police services, planning, and assessment. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, *11*, 275-298.
- Brandl, S.G., Frank, J., Wooldredge, J., & Watkins, C. (1997). On the measurement of public support for the police: A research note. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, *20*, 473-480.
- Brandl, S.G., Frank, J., Worden, R.E., & Bynum, T.S. (1994). Global and specific attitudes toward the police: Disentangling the relationship. *Justice Quarterly*, *11*, 119-134.
- Brown, B., & Benedict, W.R. (2002). Perceptions of the police: Past findings, methodological issues, conceptual issues and policy implications. *Policing: An*

- International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 25, 543-580.
- Cao, L., Frank, J., & Cullen, F. T. (1996). Race, community context and confidence in the police. *American Journal of Police*, 15, 3-22.
- Carter, D.L. (1985). Hispanic perception of police performance: An empirical assessment. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 13, 487-500.
- Chandek, M.S. (1999). Race, expectations and evaluations of police performance: An empirical assessment. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 22, 675-695.
- Cheurprakobkit, S. (2000). Police-citizen contact and police performance attitudinal differences between Hispanics and non-Hispanics. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 28, 325-336.
- Correia, M.E., Reisig, M.D., & Lovrich, N.P. (1996). Public perceptions of state police: An analysis of individual-level contextual variables. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 24, 17-28.
- Cox, T.C., & Falkenberg, S.D. (1987). Adolescents' attitudes toward police: An emphasis on interactions between the delinquency measures of alcohol and marijuana, police contacts and attitudes. *American Journal of Police*, 6, 45-62.
- Decker, S.H. (1981). Citizen attitudes toward the police: A review of past findings and suggestions for future policy. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 9, 80-87.
- Dull, R. T., & Wint, A. V. N. (1997). Criminal victimization and its effect on fear of crime and justice attitudes. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 12, 748-758.

- Dunham, R.G., & Alpert, G.P. (1988). Neighborhood differences in attitudes toward policing: Evidence for a mixed-strategy model for policing in a multi-ethnic setting. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 79, 504-521.
- Esbensen, F., & Osgood, D.W. (1999). Gang resistance education and training (GREAT): Results from the national evaluation. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 36, 194-225.
- Frank, J., Brandl, S. G., Cullen, F. T., & Stichman, A. (1996). Reassessing the impact of Race on citizens' attitudes toward the police: A research note. *Justice Quarterly*, 13, 321-334.
- Furstenberg, F.F., Jr., & Wellford, C.F. (1973). Calling the police: The evaluation of police service. *Law and Society Review*, 7, 393-406.
- Giordano, P.C. (1976). The sense of injustice: An analysis of juveniles' reactions to the justice system. *Criminology*, 14, 93-112.
- Hawdon, J., & Ryan, J. (2003). Police-resident interactions and satisfaction with police: An empirical test of community policing assertions. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 14, 55-74.
- Homant, R.J., Kennedy, D.B., & Fleming, R.M. (1984). The effect of victimization and the police response on citizens' attitudes toward the police. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 12, 323-332.
- Hurst, Y.G., & Frank, J. (2000). How kids view cops: The nature of juvenile attitudes toward the police. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 28, 189-202.
- Hurst, Y.G., Frank, J., & Browning, S.L. (2000). The attitudes of juveniles toward the police: A comparison of black and white youth. *Policing: An International Journal of Police*

- Strategies & Management*, 23, 37-53.
- Jackson, A. (2002). Police-school resource officers' and students' perception of the police and offending. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 25, 631-650.
- Jesilow, P., Meyer, J., & Namazzi, N. (1995). Public attitudes toward the police. *American Journal of Police*, 14, 67-88.
- Koenig, D.J. (1980). The effects of criminal victimization and judicial or police contacts on public attitudes toward local police. *Journal of criminal Justice*, 8, 243-249.
- Kusow, A.M., Wilson, L.C., & Martin, D.E. (1997). Determinants of citizen satisfaction with the police- The effects of residential location. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 20, 655-664.
- Lieber, M. J., Nalla, M. K., & Farnworth, M. (1998). Explaining juveniles' attitudes toward the police. *Justice Quarterly*, 15, 151-173.
- Marenin, O. (1983). Supporting the local police: The differential group basis of varieties of support. *Police Studies*, 6, 50-56.
- Maxson, C., Hennigan, K., & Sloane, D.C. (2003). *Factors that influence public opinion of the police*. (NCJ 197925) U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice. Retrieved May 8, 2004, from <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/ascii/cvpcs98.txt>
- Miller, L.S., & Whitehead, J.T. (1996). *Introduction to criminal justice research and statistics*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson
- Moretz, W.J., Jr. (1980). Kids to cops: "We think you're important, but we're not sure we

- understand you.” *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 8, 220-224.
- Murphy, D.W., & Worrall, J.L. (1999). Residency requirements and public perceptions of the police in large municipalities. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 22, 327-342.
- Parker, K. D., Onyekwuluje, A. B., & Murty, K. S. (1995). African Americans’ attitudes toward the local police. *Journal of Black Studies*, 25, 396-409.
- Poister, T.H., & McDavid, J.C. (1978). Victims’ evaluations of police performance. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 6, 133-149.
- Priest, T.B., & Carter, D.B. (1999). Evaluations of police performance in an African American sample. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 27, 457-465.
- Reisig, M.D., & Giacomazzi, A.L. (1998). Citizen perceptions of community policing: Are attitudes toward police important? *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 21, 547-561.
- Reisig, M. D., & Parks, R. B. (2000). Experience, quality of life, and neighborhood context: A hierarchical analysis of satisfaction with the police. *Justice Quarterly*, 17, 607-629.
- Sims, B., Hooper, M., & Peterson, S.A. (2002). Determinants of citizens’ attitudes toward the police: Results of the Harrisburg citizen survey-1999. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 25, 457-471.
- Smith, P.E., & Hawkins, R.O. (1973). Victimization, types of citizen-police contacts, and attitudes toward the police. *Law and Society review*, 8, 135-152.
- Smith, S. K., Steadman, G. W., Minton, T. D., & Townsend, M. (1999). *Criminal*

- victimization and perceptions of community safety in 12 cities.* (NCJ 173940)
- U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Retrieved May 9, 2004, from <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov>
- Sullivan, P.S., Dunham, R.G., & Alpert, G.P. (1987). Attitude structures of different ethnic and age groups concerning police. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 78, 177-196.
- Taylor, T. J., Turner, K. B., Esbensen, F., & Winfree, T. L. (2001). Coppin' an attitude- Attitudinal differences among juveniles toward police. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 29, 295-305.
- Tuch, S.A., & Weitzer, R. (1997). Racial differences in attitudes toward the police. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 61, 642-664.
- United States Department of Justice. Office of Justice Programs. (2003). *Prisoners in 2002*. Retrieved May 5, 2004, from <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/pdf/p02.pdf>
- United States Department of Justice. Office of Justice Programs. Bureau of Justice Statistics. (1997). *Age patterns of victims of serious violent crime*. Retrieved May 11, 2004 from <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/ascii/apvsvc.txt>
- United States Department of Justice. Office of Justice Programs. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. (2003). *Juvenile Justice Bulletin*. Retrieved May 5, 2004, from <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/ojjdp>
- Webb, V.J., & Marshall, C.E. (1995). The relative importance of race and ethnicity on citizen attitudes toward the police. *American Journal of Police*, 14, 45-66.

- Weitzer, R. (2000). White, black, or blue cops? Race and citizen assessments of police Officers. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 28, 313-324.
- Yolander, G. H., & Frank, J. (2000). How kids view cops the nature of juvenile attitudes toward the police. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 28, 189-202.
- Yolander, G. H., Frank, J., & Browning, S. L. (2000). The attitudes of juveniles toward the police: A comparison of black and white youth. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 23, 37-53.
- Zamble, E., & Annesley, P. (1987). Some determinants of public attitudes toward the police. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 15, 285-290.

VITA

Joshua A. Hardin

Personal Data: Date of Birth: February 4, 1982
Place of Birth: Johnson City, Tennessee
Marital Status: Single

Education: Public Schools, Elizabethton, Tennessee
East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee;
Criminal Justice and Criminology, B.S., 2003
Criminal Justice and Criminology, M.A., 2004

Professional
Experience: Graduate Assistant, East Tennessee State University, College of
Arts and Sciences, 2003 - 2004

Honors and
Awards: Graduated magna Cum Laude
East Tennessee State University.