

**THE PUBLIC AND THE POLICE
IN THE CITY OF CHICAGO**

by

Tabatha R. Johnson

The Chicago Community Policing Evaluation Consortium is located at the Institute for Policy Research, Northwestern University. It also includes faculty and students from Loyola University of Chicago, DePaul University, and the University of Illinois-Chicago. It is supported by grants from the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, the Chicago Community Trust, the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, and the National Institute of Justice, US Department of Justice.

August, 1993

THE PUBLIC AND THE POLICE IN THE CITY OF CHICAGO

by
Tabatha R. Johnson
Northwestern University

Police, more than any other public service agency, must have the support of the community if they hope to effectively perform their roles as service providers and crime fighters. Police work is mostly reactive. Since there are not enough police to patrol every street corner in America, the police rely on citizens to report crimes, emergencies and other information helpful to their investigations. Without the support of citizens and their willingness to come forward with information, the police would be incapable of doing their jobs on a day to day basis.

This report examines citizen's assessments of the police. It examines the impact of variables such as race, class, gender, victimization, perceptions of neighborhood, police visibility and experiences with the police. This report suggests that each of these factors has an important effect on how citizens evaluate police performance and activities. Together, they can provide us with a better understanding of the determinants of people's attitudes toward the police.

PAST RESEARCH

Personal Factors

Past research has identified several personal factors that are related to attitudes toward police. The most widely studied of these variables are race, age, income and gender. Earlier studies conducted by Gourley (1953) and Fultz (1959) found that while a majority of Americans maintain satisfactory images of the police, blacks were generally less satisfied than were whites and more likely to express negative attitudes regarding police conduct, effectiveness and courtesy. They were two to three times as likely to report that the police were roughing people up, being disrespectful, searching them without good reason and responding to incidents more slowly (Law Enforcement & Administration of Justice 1967; Campbell and Schuman 1968).

In America, the attitudes of other non-black minorities have not been studied as extensively as black attitudes. This is mostly due to the small number of persons in these groups that show up in survey data. Bayley and Mendelsohn (1968) studied the relationships between the police and minority groups in Denver. They found that the attitudes of hispanics toward the police most closely resemble the attitudes held by blacks. Both minority groups were overwhelmingly more likely than whites to complain about police harassment. Hispanics were also just as likely as blacks to believe that the treatment they receive from police is definitely prejudiced and unfriendly.

The attitudes of non-whites in Britain parallel attitudes of non-whites in the United States. Skogan (1991) found that while 44 percent of whites thought the police were doing a good job, only 27% of Afro-Caribbeans and 36% of Asians expressed such a sentiment. In Britain, as in the US, non-whites are more likely to indicate that they were stopped by the police, and when they initiated the contacts with the police, they were more likely to have a negative evaluation of these contacts.

The most frequently cited complaint waged against the police by minorities is their failure to provide adequate services and protection in neighborhoods that are predominantly non-white (Radelet 1986). Apple and O'Brien (1983) found that as the percentage of black persons residing in a neighborhood increases, so does the level of negative attitudes toward the police. Skogan (1992) plotted data on racial views toward police for 35 neighborhoods in seven different cities. He found that, in the aggregate, residents of non-white neighborhoods expressed much more negative views of police than residents of predominantly white neighborhoods. Recent studies of attitudes toward police tend to confirm these findings and have led many scholars to conclude that, by far, race is the most important individual level social correlate of attitudes toward police (Skogan 1991).

Several studies have noted the importance of age in determining attitudes toward the police. Generally, they have found that as age increases, attitudes toward the police become more positive (Walker et al 1972; Belson 1975; Courtis 1979; South 1983; and Brillion et al 1984; Komanduri et al 1990). Persons ages 15 to 39 are more likely to hold negative images of the police. It is likely that their attitudes are more negative because they are most likely to be involved in contacts with the police that are adversarial in nature. This age group is not only responsible for a disproportionate share of the crimes committed each year, they are also more likely (as we shall see below) to be the targets of police-initiated encounters. Furthermore, even though persons in this age group are among the most frequent consumers of police services, they are less likely to report having a compensatory encounter with police (Southgate and Ekblom, 1984).

Surprisingly, there has been a limited amount of research done on the effects of socio-economic status on attitudes toward the police. While myth would suggest that lower income and less educated citizens rely more heavily on police services, it was found that persons further up on the socio-economic scale contact the police more often than those at the bottom (Southgate and Ekblom 1984; Skogan 1991). Komanduri et al (1990), suggested that increasing occupational status, educational attainment and income were significantly related to positive images of the police. Their findings were not surprising given the fact that many police officers and their families reside in predominantly middle and upper class neighborhoods. The police identify more closely with middle and upper-class citizens because they are the ones from whom police seek positive evaluations and support (Preiss and Ehrlich 1966; Wilson 1983; Radelet 1986).

Researchers have cautioned that social status is strongly correlated with other factors that may arguably be more important in determining an individual's attitudes toward the police. While low status groups are less likely to contact the police and more likely to express disapproval of police actions; they are also more prone to have had negative encounters with the police (Walker et al 1972). Jacob (1971) and Schuman and Gruenberg (1972) also suggested that social class is strongly associated with neighborhood culture, and this contextual variable may be more important than individual level measures of social and economic status in determining attitudes toward police.

Studies of the effects of gender on attitudes toward the police have found little relationship between sex and attitudes. Generally, however, men express more negative opinions of the police than do women. One explanation for this finding is the fact that males have more contacts with the police, in their roles as both victims and perpetrators of crimes. Southgate and Ekblom (1984) found that, in Britain, an overwhelming majority of these contacts are adversarial. Research in the United States supports these findings, and further suggest that most of the disparity in attitudes toward the police can be attributed to differences in the experiences that people have with the police. These differences in experience are dominated by race and gender (Skogan 1992).

Experience with the Police

There are many sources of citizens's attitudes and opinions toward government and police. By far the most important is the actual encounters that they have with the police over the phone or face-to-face. Winfree and Griffiths (1971) partitioned the variance in ratings of police performance and found that most of the explained variation in attitudes toward the police could be attributed to citizen's direct experiences with the police.

Contacts between the police and citizens can occur two ways. They can be initiated by the citizens, as calls for protection, service or assistance; or they can be initiated by the police. Citizens contact the police for a variety of reasons. They call or visit police stations to report crimes, emergencies, suspicious persons, odd noises and events. They also contact the police in order to receive or give information about community concerns or other non-crime emergencies. Past studies have shown that a large majority of citizen initiated contacts with the police are made over the phone and are calls concerning non-crime and non-emergency problems (Jones et al 1986; Clarke and Hough 1984).

Decker (1981) distinguished between what he termed voluntary and involuntary contacts. He argued that voluntary contacts, those initiated by citizens, are classified as being more positive than involuntary (police initiated) contacts. He reasoned that police play a supportive role in citizen initiated contacts, while police initiated contacts are likely to be of a more suspicious and inquisitorial nature. Past research

has shown that direct experience with the police is generally related to lower levels of satisfaction with police performance and more negative assessments of the quality of service received. While Smith and Hawkins (1973) found that non-confrontational contacts resulted in fewer consequences than adversarial ones, they noted that any form of contact with the police resulted in attitudinal consequences that were quite negative.

Skogan (1990) found that 56 percent of the British citizens interviewed, as part of the 1988 British Crime Survey, indicated that they had initiated at least one contact with the police in the 14 months prior to their interview. Citizens were three times as likely to have initiated contacts with the police than be involved in a police initiated stop. While studies in the United States are less conclusive, results from national surveys indicate that about the same proportion of Americans come into contact with the police also (Skogan 1991). Higher income, occupational and educational groups are more likely to contact the police, but persons over 60, females and Asians are less likely to engage in any form of contact with the police. Whites and older persons are more likely to contact the police about disturbances. Victimization is strongly related with contact of the police. Over 70% of crime victims reported contacting the police compared to 47% of non-victims. In studying police initiated contacts, Skogan also found that young adults, single persons, males, Afro-Caribbeans, the unemployed and upper-income residents were more likely to be stopped by the police. The relationship between upper income status and being stopped is mainly due to the higher level of automobile ownership among this group (Skogan 1990).

Scaglione and Condon (1980) spoke about the importance of experience as a determinant of attitudes toward the police. They suggested that the way that people are treated or perceive being treated by the police is more significant than all of the socioeconomic variables taken together in determining attitudes toward the police. Jacob (1971; 1972) also suggested that the difference in encounters with the police accounts for a large portion of the disparity in racial differences in attitudes toward the police.

Victimization

Among the citizens most likely to initiate contact with the police are crime victims. They are valued participants in the criminal justice process and prime consumers of police services. Police rely on them to report criminal incidents and serve as witnesses in court proceedings. Skogan's (1990) examination of the rates at which victims and non-victims initiate contact with police in England and Wales found that 70% of victims and 47% of non-victims had reported contact with the police.

While victims are a useful source for information, their relationship with the police is very tenuous. Many victims report feeling that they are not taken seriously by the police and complain about the lack of knowledge and support that they

receive from police. Research on citizen-initiated contacts with police have found that of all citizen contacts, those who contact the police because they have been victimized are less satisfied than others as a result (Smith 1983; Walker, et al 1972; and Bordua and Tiff 1971).

The relationship between past victimization and attitudes toward the police is to a large degree dependent upon the quality of treatment that victims receive from police (Skogan 1989). Studies of victims attitudes that use survey data can only indirectly test this assertion because there is no real way to link a particular victimization with some specific police activity or follow-up contact. Smith and Hawkins (1973) found that perceptions of possible victimization did not affect attitudes toward the police, but those who had actually been victims of violent crimes possessed lower attitudes. They cautioned that this relationship was not significant. Skogan (1978) examined victimization and evaluations of police at both the local and national levels and found no relationship. He later suggested that "the heterogeneity of crime victims and their experiences tended to mitigate against any direct impact of victimization on assessments of policing (Skogan 1991)." Thus, there is less of a tendency for victims to blame police for their tragic experiences.

Southgate and Ekblom (1984), found that British citizens who had been victims of crimes were less inclined than non-victims to indicate that the police were generally helpful or pleasant. Crime victims in the United States and Great Britain identified the same reasons for their dissatisfaction with police. They cited lack of communication between the police and victims, in particular, victim frustration over the lack of feedback; and feelings that the police provided inadequate protection as reasons for their more negative attitudes.

While there have been contradictory findings on the relationship between victimization and citizen's attitudes toward the police, we would expect victims of crime to possess less positive images of police. Studies find that victims experience an increase in fear levels after their experience (Skogan, 1987). They are also likely to feel frustrated following their encounters with police. Parks (1976) drew a similar conclusion. He found that victims who were satisfied with the treatment that they received from the police were more likely to hold attitudes toward the police similar to those held by noncrime victims. Otherwise, victims were generally more negative about police performance.

Fear, Perceptions of Crime and Police Visibility

The relationship between fear of crime and attitudes toward the police have been hard to confirm. Studies by Black (1970) and Hawkins (1973), found little relationship between fear of crime and attitudes toward the police. Most important, the results of the Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment (Police Foundation, 1974) have been widely interpreted as evidence that "policing doesn't make any difference" with regard to fear of crime. However, correlational studies in Britain have shown that diminishing levels of support for the police and increased levels of

fear have gone hand in hand. Box, Hale and Andrews (1988) found that fear of crime was related to public confidence in the police, even when the effects of other variables were controlled. Tabulation of individual-level data for citizens in the United States also suggests that a relationship between the two may exist. Baker et al. (1973) found that residents who are less fearful also have a higher level of confidence in the police.

Some reassuring results, like those mentioned above have lead me to dismiss the general conclusion that no relationship exists among fear of crime and attitudes toward the police. Instead, I believe that further work should be done, since levels of fear are related to past victimization and perceptions of social disorder within the neighborhood. There is reason to believe that levels of fear should also be related to attitudes toward the police.

There has not been much work done on the relationship between police visibility, perceptions of crime and attitudes toward the police. While Zamble and Annesley (1987) failed to find a significant relationship between perceptions of crime and individuals' assessments of police performance, other researchers have linked perception of low levels of crime with reduced levels of fear. Correlational studies in the US have also found that police presence on the streets is associated with feelings of safety. In a quasi-experimental study of foot patrol in Newark, New Jersey; Pate et al. (1988) found that an increase in the number of foot patrols resulted in residents feeling less fearful. Trojanowicz (1986) and Bennett (1991) drew the same conclusion in their studies of police and levels of fear. These findings suggests that perceptions of crime and police visibility may indirectly affect attitudes toward the police by reducing or increasing levels of fear.

THIS STUDY

Citizens cannot help but be interested in the police. Many believe police work is important and that it can make a difference in their lives (Skogan 1990). Furthermore, they are inundated with coverage of police issues in the mass media. While the impact of this coverage on citizen's attitudes toward the police is not yet known, we can be sure that it helps place crime-fighting and the police high on the public agenda.

The public's image of police is directly related to the ability of the police to function efficiently. Police are overwhelmingly reactionary. The bulk of their work is derived from citizen initiated calls for service or assistance. Black (1970) found that over three-quarters of police activity in three US cities was initiated by calls from citizens. This finding clearly underscores the need for positive public attitudes regarding the police.

Skogan (1990) suggested that two of the most important roles for the public in combatting crime is reporting their own experiences of crime to the police and stepping forward as witnesses when they have seen a crime being committed.

Opinion surveys reveal that a majority of people are satisfied with the job that the police are doing (White and Menke 1983; Radelet 1986; and Skogan 1990). In these surveys, support for the police is fairly high, and the police rank higher in public confidence than legislatures, judges, lawyers and many other occupational groups. During the 1980's About 60 percent of the American public indicated that they have confidence in the police. The same percentage rated their general performance as good or excellent (Skogan 1991).

These views of public attitudes toward the police paint a picture in which all segments of the public are fairly satisfied with the work that the police in their communities are doing. This picture could not be further from the truth. The public's image of the police varies greatly for among the different groups in the community. Age, race, gender, class, education, and marital status all help determine how the public evaluates the police. Factors such as neighborhood crime, decay, and disorder also effect attitudes toward the police. Attitudes towards the police are also directly related to the experiences that citizens have with the police. This report examines attitudes toward the police among residents in the city of Chicago. It examines differences in attitudes among a variety of groups in Chicago. It focuses on the impact that citizens' perceptions of neighborhood problems, levels of fear, past victimization, police visibility and experiences with the police have on their assessments of police performance. Finally, this report addressed the relative strength of each of these groups of measures in accounting for the variation in peoples views of the police.

Methodology

The data in this study was collected as part of the first wave of an evaluation of Chicago's Alternative Policing Strategy (CAPS). CAPS was announced by Chicago Mayor Richard Daley in January of 1993. With the support of the MacArthur Foundation and the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (ICJIA), the first wave survey was conducted during the months of March and April, before the program began. It was conducted among English and Spanish speaking residents of five prototype CAPS police districts, and in four other parts of Chicago that were chosen as control areas for the prototype districts. Institutionalized populations and the mentally and severe physically disabled were not included in this study, which was conducted by telephone. The chosen districts include ethnically and culturally diverse areas as well as neighborhoods that are predominantly black, white and Hispanic. The districts feature a wide variety of crime problems, rates of home ownership, ages, income levels, and crime problems. In all, the survey covered about 50 percent of the area of the City of Chicago.

The surveys were conducted by the Northwestern University Survey Laboratory under the direction of Dr. Paul J. Lavrakas. The survey consisted of measures of levels of victimization and fear, satisfaction with and quality of police services, and residents assessments of the conditions of their neighborhoods. The data were gathered via a 25-minute questionnaire that was administered to randomly selected

household informants 18 years of age and older. Sample telephone numbers were selected through a combination of random-digit dialing and the use of a reverse directory. A summary of the results for each sampling frame is listed below (Table 1). A total of 9,574 numbers were included in our sampling pool. Sixty-eight percent (6,516) of these numbers reached households. Of the households that were reached, 75 percent were eligible to be questioned as part of the CAPS study. The remaining 25 percent were excluded because their residence did not fall within the geographically selected prototype and comparison areas. A total of 2,753 fully and partially completed interviews were gathered from our 4,765 geographically eligible households. The response rate, or the ratio of full and partial completions to the number of eligible households, for this survey was about 58 percent.

Table 1
Completion rates by Type of Sampling Frame

Sample	*Eligible Households	Full Completions	Completion Rate
Random Digit Dialing	2718	1292	47.1%
Reverse Directory	2047	1278	62.4%
Overall Completion Rate	53.9%		

* Does not include dispositions such as non-English /Spanish or disability, and only a portion of some other dispositions that are not all likely to be eligible.

There were approximately 2,570 fully completed interviews. One hundred interviews were conducted in Spanish. Only data gathered in these fully completed surveys will be utilized in the analyses presented in this report.

As noted above, researchers have identified multiple, interrelated determinants of citizen's attitudes toward the police. Measures have been created here for many of these factors, allowing us to statistically control for their effects. However, this by no means suggests that we have identified or developed measures for all of the sources of attitudes toward the police.

Several individual-level variables that are known to affect attitudes toward the police were included in this study: race, age, education, gender, marital status, employment, home ownership, and income levels. The coding scheme for these variables are listed in Table 2 below.

Analytic scales measuring attitudes toward the police, fear, perceived disorder and decay, and the extent of crime problems were created combining responses to several survey questions. All of these scales were single factored. They exhibited reliability coefficients or Cronbach's Alphas ranging from .68 to .92. Our dependent variable, attitudes toward the police consists of responses to several questions regarding the responsiveness of neighborhood police to community concerns, how good a job they are doing at dealing with community problems, working with the community, helping victims, preventing crime, and keeping order. It also includes citizens' assessments of police politeness, concern, helpfulness, and fairness when dealing with people in their neighborhood.

Table 2
Coding for Social Background Measures

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Coding</i>
RACE	0 = White, 1 = Black, 2 = Hispanic, 3 = Others (Asians, Middle-Easterners)
AGE	0 = (18 to 40), 1 = (41 to 60), 3 = (61 and over)
EDUCATION	
MARITAL STATUS	0 = Less than H.S., 1 = H.S. Diploma, 3 = College Degree
EMPLOYMENT	0 = Married, 1 = Single
HOME OWNERSHIP	0 = Employed, 1 = Unemployed
INCOME LEVEL	0 = Renters, 2 = Homeowners
	0 = \$20,000 and below, 1 = Over \$20,000

Fear was measured by questions asking about fear of unsafe areas, worry about crime, and fear of going out alone at night in their neighborhood. The measure of disorder includes responses to questions about "how big a problem" are disruptions around schools, truancy, drug dealing on the streets, gang violence, shootings and other activities in their neighborhood. Decay was measured by questions about problems with building abandonment, graffiti, litter, and abandoned cars. Perceptions of neighborhood crime were assessed by asking about problems with theft, vandalism of cars, burglary, robbery and sexual attacks.

The analysis also employed measures of people's experiences with the police during the year before the interview. Two measures of citizen's experiences were particularly useful. One sums the contacts respondents initiated with the police, while the other sums contacts initiated by the police. In addition, we examine the impact of specific types of citizen- initiated contacts: to get or give *information*, *report a crime*, *report an emergency*, and to *report a suspicious person, event or noise*. Police-initiated contacts were divided between automobile stops and pedestrian stops.

Crime victimization was measured in the survey using 17 screener items eliciting "yes-no" responses about completed or attempted victimizations in a variety of crime categories. The survey asked about victimizations that had occurred to respondents or members of their households within the past year. The personal victimizations encompassed rape, robbery, assault, purse snatching/pickpocketing, and threats. Property victimization including items measuring burglary, theft, vandalism and auto theft.

The survey also included questions assessing the visibility of police in the community and the familiarity of respondents with individual police officers. Two indicators of police visibility will be used in this study. The first measures the extent to which citizens have seen a police recently in their neighborhood, within the past twenty-four hours or the past week. The second measure combines reports of the sighting of a variety of law enforcement and other activities (such as patrolling the neighborhood or chatting with community members) during the past month. Personal familiarity with police was assessed by a question asking citizens if they were familiar with the name of an officer that worked in their neighborhood.

Bivariate and multivariate analyses will be used to examine the relationship between the variables in this study. Logistical regression will be used for analyses that involve dichotomous dependent variables.

CORRELATES OF ATTITUDES TOWARD POLICE

This section provides a detailed examination of the factors that are correlated with attitudes toward the police. First their relationships with the individual level variables race, age, gender, education, income, home ownership, marital status and

employment status are examined. Only significant findings will be presented. Then the results of bivariate analyses of citizens' attitudes toward police will be presented.

Victimization

Criminal victimization has been found to correlate with citizen's assessments of police performance. However, victimization is also strongly correlated with several of the individual level variables mentioned above, including gender, income, and race. Therefore, before providing results on the relationship between attitudes and victimization, it may be useful to ask, "who was victimized?" Indicators of both personal and property crime victimization were included in this study. The measure of personal victimization was devised by counting affirmative responses to six questions respondent's experience with attempted or completed robbery, personal theft, assault, threats and sexual assault. These questions ask only about the respondents personal experiences within the past year. The measure of property crime victimization was created using responses to ten questions about the experiences of respondents or household members during the past year. These questions focused on attempted or completed burglaries, household theft, household vandalism, theft from autos, auto vandalism, and automobile theft. A summary of the questions used to construct these two measures can be found in Boxes A and B in the Appendix. Table 3 examines the correlates of victimization in these two general crime categories.

Table 3 summarizes the rates of victimization for various groups in this study. Overall, 19 percent of the respondents in this survey reported having been a victim of a personal crime within the past year. A third (7 percent) of property crime victims were robbery victims. Property crime victimization was three times as common as personal crime victimization. A majority of our respondents, 58 percent, reported having been the victim of a property crime. The most frequent forms of property crime were theft (41 percent), followed by vandalism (33 percent).

Whites were less likely than non-whites to indicate that they had been a victim of a personal crime. Blacks and Hispanics were among those most likely to recall being a victim of a property crime. It should be noted, however, that racial differences in victimization were not significant once we controlled for the other variables in the table. Thus the likelihood of having racial differences in attitudes toward the police explained by variations in victimization is less plausible.

Further analyses indicates that males and persons below age 40 were overwhelmingly more likely to be victims of personal crime. The percentages of persons who recalled being a personal crime victim were also higher among persons with high school educations, and those with income levels above \$20,000. They were lower among single persons, homeowners and college graduates. The effects of all variables, except gender and age, disappeared after controlling for other variables in the table.

Table 3
Levels of Victimization

Group	Percent recalling		N
	personal crime victim	property crime victim	
ALL RESPONDENTS	19	58	(4956)
RACE			
whites	16*	57	(1510)
blacks	20	57*	(2464)
hispanics	21	67*	(692)
others	20	64	(242)
AGE			
CATEGORY	26*	65*	(2505)
18-40	12**	62*	(1400)
41-60	10**	39**	(1051)
61 and older			
INCOME			
CATEGORY	21	53	(1927)
under \$20,000	19*	63**	(2562)
over \$20,000			
EDUCATION			
no high school	18	55*	(1132)
high school	21*	60	(2739)
college grad	13*	60	(1048)
HOUSING		60	
rent home	21	58	(2252)
own home	16*		(2666)
MARITAL			
STATUS	22	58	(2532)
couples	15*	60	(2383)
others			
GENDER			
male	23	62	(2016)
female	16**	56*	(2383)
EMPLOYMENT			
working	18	55	(2162)
not working	19	61*	(2794)

Weighted data. **indicates significant multivariate relationship controlling for other factors in the table; *indicates a significant bivariate relationship.

Levels of property crime victimization were lowest among persons without a high school education, females, and the elderly (60 and over). Persons earning incomes greater than \$20,000 and unemployed persons reported higher levels of property crime victimization. Age and income were the only variables that remained significant after the all other variables in the table were controlled.

We can see that the most important individual level determinants of personal crime victimization are gender and age. Personal crime victims are less likely to be female and over the age of 40. However, property crime victimization is more

strongly related to income and age. Specifically persons under age 61 and those making above \$20,000 are more likely to be property crime victims. What this data shows us is that there are multiple, overlapping determinants of victimization. By separating personal and property crime victims, we can get a better understanding of attitudes toward the police, for they are related to people's victimization experiences.

Citizen-Initiated Contacts

Citizens initiate contact with the police for a variety of reasons. They call to report crimes, emergencies, suspicious persons, noises and other events. People also see the police as a vital community resource, one whom they can contact to receive or give important information or discuss community problems. In line with past studies, we find that some Chicago residents are more likely to contact the police than others, and that their experience plays an important role in shaping their attitudes toward them. This section examines the individual factors that are related to contacting the police.

Our first measure of citizen-initiated contact counts the number of different reasons why a person has contacted the police within the past year. These citizen-initiated contacts are also divided into four specific categories for detailed analysis: contacts to report accidents and emergencies; contacts to report crimes, contacts to receive; give information or discuss community concerns; and contacts to report suspicious persons, noises or events. A summary of the questions used to construct these measures are found in Box C in the appendix. Respondents were presented a check list of questions that assessed the extent to which they had initiated various types of contacts with the police. A summary of citizen initiated contacts for different groups is presented in Table 4.

Fifty-two percent of our respondents indicated that they had initiated contact with the police on at least one occasion during the past year. Most respondents reported contacting the police to give, receive information or discuss community concerns. Contact to report crimes was the second largest category of citizen initiated involvement with the police. Blacks, homeowners, single persons, those with high school educations or above, higher incomes and the unemployed were more likely to contact the police. Victims were overwhelmingly more likely than non-victims to have initiated contact with the police. The percentage of property crime victims who recalled initiating contact with the police was 63%; only 36% of non-property crime victims recalled doing so. The results for personal crime victims were as great: 71 percent of personal crime victims as compared with 47 percent of non-personal crime victims reported that they had initiated contact with the police within the past year. Persons over age forty reported significantly lower levels of contact with the police than younger persons, and females were less likely to contact the police than males. All of the variables mentioned above, except income and gender, were significant in a multivariate analyses predicting contact with police.

When citizen-initiated contacts are examined in greater detail a more differentiated pattern emerges. Examination of the relationships between four specific kinds of contact and individual level variables showed some interesting results. While there were no significant racial differences in citizen contacts initiated to report crimes or to report accidents and emergencies, racial differences were found in the extent to which groups contact the police to report suspicious events and get or give information. Hispanics were less likely than any other group to recall contacting the police to report suspicious circumstances. However, blacks were significantly more likely than others to contact the police to report a suspicious person, noise or event. The significant effect of being black remained even after the effects of all other variables were controlled. Bivariate results also indicated that more whites respondents recalled contacting the police to get or give information and to discuss community concerns.

Further analyses also revealed that for all types of contact, except contact to report a crime, persons ages 18 to 40 reported higher levels of citizen initiated contact with the police. Persons over age 60 were more likely to report significantly lower levels of contact. The category over 60 remained significant only in the multivariate analysis for citizen contacts to get and give information, or discuss community concerns. In bivariate analyses age was related in curvilinear fashion to contacting the police to report a crime. Persons between the ages of 41 and 60 were more likely than persons ages 18-40 to contact the police to report a crime. However individuals over 60 were less likely to initiate contact with the police for that reason. These results were not significant once the effects of other variables in the table were controlled.

Bivariate analyses of the relationships between income, education, gender and the four types of citizen initiated contacts produced the following results. Income was significant for all types of citizen initiated contacts except those initiated to report an accident or emergency situation. In each case, persons reporting an income above \$20,000 were more likely to initiate contact with the police. Education was related to every type of citizen initiated contact examined in this study. The proportions of persons with college degrees who recalled initiating contacts with the police to report crimes or share other information were higher than the proportion of persons without a high school education who recalled having these experiences. For groups contacting the police to report suspicious circumstances, increased education was related to higher levels of contact. However, for those who contacted the police to report an emergency situation, persons without a high school education reported lower levels of contact than all other educational groups. The difference between the higher educated groups was not significant. Gender was significant only in our analysis of crime related citizen initiated contacts. Females recalled initiating lower levels of contact than men. As stated above, these results pertain to bivariate analyses only.

Table 4
Distribution of Citizen-Initiated Contacts

Group	Percent Reporting a Contact				
	any reason	about a crime	about an emergency	suspicion	information
ALL RESPONDENTS	52	13	11	12	15
RACE					
whites	54	14	10	12	17*
blacks	52**	14	11	12**	14
hispanics	50	11*	10	15*	14
others	47	15	15*	6*	12
AGE CATEGORY					
18-40	58*	14	12*	14*	17*
41-60	54**	15*	10	14	15
61 and older	35**	9*	8*	8*	10**
INCOME CATEGORY					
under \$20,000	45	12	10	9	13
over \$20,000	59*	15*	12	15*	17*
EDUCATION					
no high school	41*	11*	9*	11*	11*
high school	53**	13	12*	12*	15
college grad	61**	16*	10	16*	19*
HOUSING					
rent home	50	13	11	11	14
own home	53**	13	10	13**	16
MARITAL STATUS					
couples	49	13	10	11	14
others	55**	13	11	14**	16
GENDER					
male	55	16	11	13	16
female	50*	12*	11	12	15
EMPLOYMENT					
working	44	10	11	10	13
not working	58**	16*	10	14*	17*
VICTIMIZATION					
Property Crime Victim					
no	36	7	10	8	12
yes	63**	18**	11*	16**	17**
Personal Crime Victim					
no	47	12	10	11	15
yes	71**	21**	15**	19**	16

Weighted data. **indicates significant multivariate relationship controlling for other factors in the table; *indicates a significant bivariate relationship.

The relationships between home ownership, being single and contacting the police were significant only for contacts initiated to report suspicious persons, noises or events. Homeowners and single persons were more likely to recall having

contacted the police for that reason. Home ownership and being single remained significant in the multivariate analysis of contacts to report suspicious circumstances.

Victimization remained an important determinant of citizen- initiated contact even after these contacts were divided into more specific groups. Personal crime victimization was significantly related to most types of citizen initiated contacts. The one exception involved contacts to get or give information to the police. In this case, personal crime victimization was not significant in either the bivariate or multivariate analyses. Overall, personal crime victims were more likely to recall initiating contact with the police. Property crime victimization was significantly related to citizen-initiated contacts for all reasons. However, property crime victimization failed to remain significant in the multivariate analysis of contacts to report emergencies. Property crime victims reported higher level of citizen-initiated contacts than non-property crime victims.

The above findings suggest that each type of citizen-initiated contact is determined by a different set of factors. As a result, failure to examine citizen-initiated contacts carefully can result in inaccurate conclusions being drawn about the behavior of different groups in our society. And, because these contacts have consequences for people's attitudes toward police, these differences in patterns of contact have wider ramifications.

Police Initiated Contacts

Contacts between the police and citizens are not only the result of actions taken by the public. Police initiate contacts with citizens for a variety of reasons. These encounters are imposed on the public and imply, to an extent, some degree of suspicion on the part of police. Police initiated stops can lead to potentially violent confrontations and therefore, police must be handle them in a professional manner. Past studies have noted that police are not likely to randomly stop citizens: some groups report higher levels of involvement in police initiated contacts than others. This section examines the distribution of police initiated contacts among various groups; later sections will tie these to their assessments of the quality of police service.

Two important ways that the police initiate contact with the public are by stopping individuals on the street while out walking and pulling them over while driving, and this study included separate measures of each of them. In addition, a summary measure of police-initiated contact was developed by combining 'yes' responses on these two questions. The questions used to develop these measures are reported in Box D of the appendix.

Table 5 presents a summary of the police initiated contacts by various groups in society. Overall, 27 percent of respondents reported involvement in a police-initiated contact within the past year. The majority of these were by persons who

had been stopped by the police while riding in a car (24 percent). Only seven percent of those interviewed indicated that they had been stopped while on foot.

Table 5
Police initiated contacts with citizens

Group	Percent reporting being stopped:			N
	any stop	while in car	while on foot	
ALL RESPONDENTS	27	24	7	(4956)
RACE				
whites	24*	22	3*	(1510)
blacks	29**	24**	9**	(2464)
hispanics	29	25	9*	(692)
others	29	24	7	(242)
AGE CATEGORY				
18-40	41*	35*	12*	(2505)
41-60	18**	16**	2**	(1399)
61 and older	9**	8**	1**	(1051)
INCOME CATEGORY				
under \$20,000	23	19	8	(1927)
over \$20,000	32*	28*	7	(2562)
EDUCATION				
no high school	22*	18*	7	(1132)
high school	30*	26*	9*	(2739)
college grad	29	26	4	(1048)
HOUSING				
rent home	29	26	7	(2252)
own home	26*	22*	6**	(2666)
MARITAL STATUS				
couples	30	26	9	(2532)
others	24*	22*	4*	(2383)
GENDER				
male	40	34	13	(2016)
female	19**	17**	3**	(2940)
EMPLOYMENT				
working	21	17	6	(2162)
not working	33*	29*	7	(2794)
OWN CAR				
no	15	10	----	(973)
yes	30**	27**		(3977)

Weighted data. **indicates significant multivariate relationship controlling for other factors in the table; *indicates a significant bivariate relationship.

Bivariate analyses revealed that, generally, the police were more likely to stop blacks, persons between the ages of 18 and 40, those with a high school education, and the unemployed. They were least likely to stop whites, persons over 40, homeowners, single persons, and females. Multivariate analyses controlling for the effects of all individual level variables and car ownership showed that blacks, males and persons under the age of 40 were still more likely to be involved in a police

initiated contacts. These findings also held for police initiated stops of citizens while they were riding in a car. The only difference was that in the bivariate analysis whites were just as likely as Hispanics and other minorities to report being stopped by the police while riding in a car.

Police initiated pedestrian stops were more common among blacks, Hispanics, persons under the age of 40, and high school graduates. They were least common among whites, persons over age 40, homeowner, and females. When the effects of all other variables were controlled; blacks, younger persons, males, and renters were still significantly more likely to be involved in a pedestrian initiated stop.

Police Visibility

The presence of police on the streets can be an important deterrent to crime. Highly visible police can lead to a drop in disorder and reduced levels of fear. Police visibility can also help to increase citizens' levels of satisfaction with their communities and the police. Recent sightings of the police gives citizens the impression that the police are routinely engaged in their protection and crime prevention functions.

This section examines the visibility of police to various groups over a one month period. Respondents were presented a check-list of seven specific situations in which they may have seen the police, and two measures of visibility of police activity were developed from their responses. The first measure utilized responses to questions concerning situations in which citizens had seen the police engaged in enforcement activities. These included seeing police pull someone over for a traffic ticket, searching, frisking or arresting persons, or breaking up groups. The second measure was a count based on responses to five questions about sightings of police engaged in patrol or community related activities. These questions asked about the visibility of police driving through the neighborhood, walking or standing on patrol, patrolling alleys checking garages and backs of buildings, and chatting or conversing in a friendly manner with people in the neighborhood. The questions used to create these measures are presented in appendix Box E (appendix). The results of these analyses are shown in Table 6.

Table 6
Visibility of Police Activity

Group	Percent who have seen the police engaged in ...	
	<i>enforcement</i>	<i>patrol</i>
ALL RESPONDENTS	66	94
RACE		
whites	69	93*
blacks	68	95
hispanics	72*	95
others	63	97
AGE CATEGORY		
18-40	77*	95*
41-60	68**	95
61 and older	47**	92*
INCOME CATEGORY		
under \$20,000	65	95
over \$20,000	73*	94
EDUCATION		
no high school	61*	94
high school	71*	95
college grad	68	94
HOUSING		
rent home	70	96
own home	67*	93**
MARITAL STATUS		
couples	70	94
others	67*	95
GENDER		
male	77	97
female	62**	93**
EMPLOYMENT		
working	63	94
not working	72*	95
OWN CAR		
no	60	94
yes	70*	94

Weighted data. **indicates significant multivariate relationship controlling for other factors in the table; *indicates a significant bivariate relationship.

Table 6 indicates that most citizens have seen the police engaged in some form of activity. However, the police are most frequently visible when engaging in non-enforcement activities. While 66 percent of the persons recalled seeing the police issuing traffic tickets, searching or arresting persons; an overwhelmingly larger number (94 percent) had seen the police engaged in some form of patrolling activities.

Bivariate analyses revealed that hispanic persons, those ages 18 to 40, the unemployed, high school graduates, and persons owning cars were most likely to

have seen the police engaged in enforcement activities. Females, non high school graduates, and older persons (41 and over) were least likely to recall having seen the police involved in enforcement activities. When all factors in the Table 6 were controlled, females and older persons were still significantly more likely to report lower levels of police visibility in enforcement activities.

Police visibility in patrol activities was highest among persons ages 18 to 40. It was lowest among whites, homeowners, females, and persons over the age of 60. In multivariate analyses being a female and home ownership were still found to be significantly related to lower levels of police visibility in patrol activities.

A measure of recent police visibility was also used to assess the impact of recent sightings of police on citizens attitudes toward the police. However, this section examines only the question, "How visible are the police to various groups in society." A measure was developed from two questions which asked if you had seen a police officer within the past 24 hours or within the past week. Person who responded no to both questions were listed as having not recently seen the police in their neighborhood. The two question used to created this scale can also be found in Box E. The results of this analysis is presented in Table 7.

Table 7
Analysis of Recent Police Visibility

Group	correlation with visibility
Blacks	+.01
Hispanics	+.003*
Other Minorities	-.05**
age	-.03*
high school graduates	-.002
college graduates	+.01
income above \$20,000	+.03
homeowners	-.07**
females	-.14**
single	+.03
unemployed	-.01
own a car	+.01
(N)	(2328)

Unweighted data. **indicates significant multivariate relationship controlling for other factors in the table; *indicates a significant bivariate relationship; p<.05.

Table 7 documents that several personal factors were related recent sightings of the police. In particular, Hispanics were more likely than blacks or whites to report that they had seen the police within the past week. However, those in the "other race" category were least likely to have seen the police within the past week. This effect remained significant even after the effects of all other variables had been controlled.

In the bivariate analyses, age was found to have a significant, negative relationship to the recent visibility of police. However, age was not found to be significant in the multivariate analyses. Both homeowners and females reported significantly lower levels of recent police visibility than renters and males. These effects were significant in both the bivariate and multivariate analyses.

What we see with regards to police visibility is that among our respondents the Chicago police are highly visible. They are most visible when engaging in patrol and community related activities. Over 80 percent of the respondents had recalled seeing the police within the last week. However, the police are not equally visible to all groups. In particular, older persons and females are least likely to recall seeing the police engaged in enforcement activities. Homeowners and females are less likely to have seen the police in recent days or on patrol in their neighborhoods.

Familiarity with the Police

The ability of persons to give the name of an officer who works in their community suggests to some degree that they have developed a sense of familiarity with that particular officer. They may have chatted with the officer while he was on patrol, eating lunch, or off duty. They could have also learned of an officers name from a friend or by attending a community meeting. Regardless of how this familiarity developed, it can help to contribute to greater confidence in the police and more positive assessments of their relations with the community.

How familiar are neighborhood police to the different citizens that they service in their beats? This is the question that is addressed in this section. In order to measure familiarity with police, citizens were asked to respond yes or no to a question asking if they knew the names of any of the police officers who worked in their neighborhoods. Logistic regression analysis were used to determine the groups who were more likely to know the names of a neighborhood officer. The results are presented in Table 8.

Table 8
Familiarity with the Police

Group	Percent able to name an officer	N
ALL RESPONDENTS	13	(4948)
RACE		
whites	20	(1506)
blacks	10**	(2460)
hispanics	12**	(692)
others	11**	(242)
AGE CATEGORY		
18-40	15*	(2504)
41-60	13	(1398)
61 and older	10**	(1046)
INCOME CATEGORY		
under \$20,000	9	(1923)
over \$20,000	17*	(2558)
EDUCATION		
no high school	8*	(1132)
high school	14	(2733)
college grad	17*	(1046)
HOUSING		
rent home	9	(2251)
own home	17**	(2659)
MARITAL STATUS		
couples	11	(2528)
others	16**	(2380)
GENDER		
male	17	(2013)(293
female	11**	6)
EMPLOYMENT		
working	12	(2156)
not working	14*	(2793)

Weighted data. **indicates significant multi-variate relationship controlling for other factors in the table; *indicates a significant bivariate relationship.

We found that familiarity with officers was most common among whites, persons ages 18-40, males, college graduates, homeowners, single persons and the unemployed. Non-whites, older persons, and females were less likely to know the name of a neighborhood police officer. The multivariate analyses revealed that even when we control for all variables in Table 8 race, gender, age, home ownership and marital status are all still significantly related to the familiarity with neighborhood police. Many of these relationships (for example, those with race, gender, age, employment and socio-economic status) might be the result of the greater involvement with police on the parts of these groups. We know from our analysis of citizen-initiated contacts that persons of higher socio-economic status and whites are more likely to initiate contacts with the police. We also know that

blacks, youth and the unemployed are more likely to be involved in police initiated contacts.

Perceptions of Decay and Disorder

Biderman, et al (1967) suggested that people's perceptions of their neighborhood is greatly dependent upon the visible signs of "disorderly and disreputable behavior" that can be seen in his community. Physical decay and social disorder correlate strongly and positively with one another. Increases in decay are associated with increases in disorder. The presence of neighborhood decay and disorder problems are also related to several other factors. Increases in neighborhood decay and disorder can lead to an increase criminal activity. This loss of social control and order may also result in greater feelings of uneasiness and fear among neighborhood residents. However, signs of decay and disorder are not equally distributed throughout a city. Gottfredson (1985) acknowledged, in his study of Baltimore, that litter, dilapidation and abandonment were most common in black, lower-income, lower-educated and high-rental areas. Skogan (1990) found that racial and linguistic minorities report the highest and most significant disorder problems.

The survey included a number of questions measuring perceptions of physical decay and social disorder problems in respondent's neighborhoods. Decay is measured here by a four-item scale of responses to questions about how big a neighborhood problem are vacant lots filled with trash, abandoned cars on streets, abandoned houses and empty buildings, and graffiti on walls and buildings. Social disorder was measured by a five item scale which assessed the degree to which there were problems with disruption around schools, truancy, drug dealing on the streets, gang shootings, violence and other gang activity in respondents neighborhoods. The questions used to create the above two scales are presented in Box F.

Table 9 displays the results from bivariate and multivariate analyses on the perception of neighborhood decay for a variety of different groups in our study. It can be seen that neighborhood decay is reported as a greater problem among blacks, Hispanics, younger persons, persons with a high school diploma, lower income persons, renters and single persons. It is perceived as less of a problem among those in the "other race" category, the college educated and homeowners. The multivariate analysis revealed that blacks, Hispanics, younger persons and those with incomes below \$20,000 were significantly more likely to report high levels of neighborhood decay.

Table 9
Perceptions of Neighborhood Decay

Group	correlation with physical decay
Blacks	+.20**
Hispanics	+.13**
Other Minorities	-.01*
age	-.15**
high school graduates	+.02*
college graduates	-.05*
income above \$20,000	-.04**
homeowners	-.02*
females	-.005
single	+.01*
unemployed	+.003
(N)	(2323)

Unweighted data. **indicates significant multi-variate relationship controlling for other factors in the table; *indicates a significant bivariate relationship; significance at $p < .05$.

The analyses for disorder are presented below in Table 10. These results suggest that the perception of neighborhood disorder is greater among blacks, Hispanics, younger persons, those with less education, higher income, renters and married persons. Perceptions of neighborhood disorder are significantly lower for those in the 'other race' category, the college educated and homeowners.

Table 10
Perceived Neighborhood Social Disorder

Group	correlation with social disorder
Blacks	+.26**
Hispanics	+.13**
Other Minorities	+.01*
age	-.24**
high school graduates	-.01*
college graduates	-.11**
income above \$20,000	-.01*
homeowners	+.004*
females	-.004
single	-.003*
unemployed	+.01
(N)	(2179)

Unweighted data. **indicates significant multi-variate relationship controlling for other factors in the table; *indicates a significant bivariate relationship; significance $p < .05$.

Controlling for all of the variables in the table resulted in findings of significantly higher levels of neighborhood disorder being reported by blacks, hispanics younger persons and the less educated. College educated persons are overwhelmingly less likely to perceive high levels of disorder in their communities. Generally we find that blacks, Hispanic and younger persons report perceptions of significantly higher levels of both decay and disorder.

Perceptions of Crime

Citizens perceptions of neighborhood crime problems are developed by weighing a variety of interrelated factors. Not only do they watch and listen for accounts of actual criminal activity. They also rely on assessments of the conditions of their neighborhoods, their past experiences as crime victims, as well as the visibility of the police in their neighborhood and the activities that the police are involved in.

In order to measure individuals' perceptions of crime in their neighborhoods, citizens were asked to evaluate how big a problem they thought things such as vandalism, auto theft, burglary, attacks, robberies, and sexual assaults were in there neighborhoods. These questions were combined to form a five-item scale measuring individuals' perceptions of crime levels. The questions used to create this scale are presented in Box G. The results of bivariate and multivariate analyses are presented in Table 11 below.

Table 11
Analysis of Perceived Neighborhood Crime Problem

Group	correlation with neighborhood crime
Blacks	-.16**
Hispanics	-.07**
Other Minorities	-.04**
age	-.02*
high school graduates	+.03*
college graduates	+.06**
income above \$20,000	+.02*
homeowners	-.02*
females	-.002
single	-.003
unemployed	+.04**
decay	+.22**
disorder	+.52**
property crime victims	+.08**
personal crime victims	+.06**
saw engaged in enforcement	+.03**
saw police on patrol	+.01
saw police recently	-.002
(N)	(2117)

Unweighted data. **indicates significant multi-variate relationship controlling for other factors in the table; *indicates a significant bivariate relationship; significance at $p < .05$.

Non-whites perceived crime to be less of a problem than did whites. Younger persons and homeowners were also less likely to perceive crime as a problem. However, past personal or property crime victimization and unemployment were related to perceptions of higher levels of crime. Persons earning incomes above \$20,000 and those with a high school education and beyond, were also more likely to perceive crime as a bigger problem in their neighborhood. Perceptions of crime was also higher among persons living in areas where decay and disorder were perceived to be more prevalent. All of the factors presented above remained significant in multivariate analyses, except for income, home ownership and education.

One interesting finding involved the relationship between police visibility and citizens perceptions of crime in their neighborhood. Our multivariate analyses showed that recent sightings of the police, and seeing the police engaged in patrol activities were not significantly related to perceptions of crime. However, those persons who recalled seeing the police engaged in enforcement activities reported significantly higher perceptions of neighborhood crime.

We can see that, by far, perceptions of neighborhood disorder and decay, as well as being black, were the strongest indicators of perceptions of neighborhood crime. Both property and personal crime victimization were also important factors in

citizens assessments of neighborhood crime. Our findings are in line with Biderman et al's (1967) findings that attitudes regarding crimes are less affected by past victimization than they are by the citizens perceptions of weakening social controls in their neighborhoods.

Neighborhood Safety

Citizen's assessments of the level of safety in their neighborhoods are related to the levels of disorder and decay that they see present, past victimizations, high levels of perceived crime problems, and the degree to which they believe the police are actively engaged in law enforcement and protection activities. High levels of fear have also been found in those who are less likely to be victimized such as women and the elderly.

Fear related attitudes are related to a variety of different factors. It is the task of this section to not only examine the relationships between fear our individual level variable, but also to explore the relationships between fear, past victimization, neighborhood decay, disorder, crime, and police visibility.

The measure of fear used in this study is a three item scale consisted of questions that assess the level of safety that individuals feel in their neighborhoods. The three question ask how safe you would feel being alone outside at night, if there are any place where you would be afraid to go alone, and how often does worry about crime prevent you from doing things you would like to do in your neighborhood. The correct question wordings and response selections can be found in the appendix in Box H.

Table 12 presents the multivariate and bivariate analyses of peoples feeling about the safety of their neighborhood. All of the individual level variables were related to feelings of safety in the bivariate analyses except for those in the "other race" category. Blacks and Hispanics reported significantly higher levels of fear than white and other minorities. Feelings of safety were also significantly lower among females and single persons. Age was found to be positively related with neighborhood safety. That is, as age increased there was also an increase in feelings of safety. Persons with less than a high school education and those who were college educated, both expressed higher levels of safety than persons with a high school education. Homeowners, persons with incomes above \$20,000 and unemployed persons also expressed feeling higher levels of safety than renters, persons making less than \$20,000 and employed persons. Race, age, home ownership, and gender all remained significant in the multivariate analyses.

There were also significant relationships between fear and victimization. Persons who had reported past victimizations were likely to report lower levels of safety than persons who did not have those experiences. In the multivariate analyses, both types of past victimization remained significant.

Table 12
Analysis of Neighborhood Safety

Group	correlation with safety
Blacks	-.09**
Hispanics	-.06**
Other Minorities	-.03
age	-.12**
high school graduates	-.003*
college graduates	+.03*
income above \$20,000	+.02*
homeowners	+.09**
females	-.23**
single	-.01*
unemployed	+.03*
perceived decay	-.19**
perceived disorder	-.18**
perceived crime	-.18**
property crime victims	-.08**
personal crime victims	-.06**
saw police engaged in enforcement	-.02*
saw police on patrol	+.01
saw police recently	+.05**
(N)	(2056)

Unweighted data. **indicates significant multivariate relationship controlling for other factors in the table; *indicates a significant bivariate relationship; significance at $p < .05$.

Perceptions of neighborhood disorder, decay and crime were strongly related to citizens perceptions of fear. Persons living in areas where they perceived bigger crime problems, and greater problems with decay and disorder overwhelming reported feeling lower levels of safety in their neighborhoods. The multivariate analyses revealed that even when the effects of all other variables were controlled, perceptions of decay, disorder and crime had significant independent effects on fear levels. In fact, these three variables had the largest impact on feeling safe in one's neighborhood.

The measure of recent police visibility was significantly related to levels of safety in both the bivariate and multivariate analysis. Persons who recalled seeing the police within the most recently reported feeling higher levels of safety. However, having seen the police engaged in enforcement activities was related in bivariate analyses to feeling of lower levels of safety.

The most important factor in determining citizens level of fear within their neighborhoods was their gender. Females were overwhelmingly more likely to report lower levels of safety than males. However, citizens assessments of

neighborhood decay, disorder and crime can also have a great impact on citizens' perception of safety in their neighborhood.

Attitudes Toward the Police

Past studies in the United States and Great Britain have shown that citizens' evaluations of the police are reflective of the experiences that they have had with the police, past victimization, the views of neighbors and friends, and the popular presentations of police that we see in the mass media. However, citizens' attitudes of the police may also be reflective of perceptions of their neighborhoods conditions and levels of fear. Several social characteristics such as race, class, age and gender have also consistently correlated with attitudes toward the police.

This section examines the relationship between attitudes toward the police and citizens' past experiences with the police, past victimization, police visibility and familiarity, perceptions of crime, decay, disorder, and levels of fear. It also looks at the relationship between attitudes and several individual level factors. Our purpose is to help get a better understanding of how people develop their attitudes about police.

Attitudes toward the police are measured by a ten-item scale consisting of questions that assess citizens' evaluations of police in their neighborhoods. The items ask about police responsiveness to neighborhood concerns, and how polite, helpful, concerned and fair are the police in dealing with people in your neighborhood. They also assess how good a job citizens believe the police are doing in their neighborhood at preventing crime, keeping order, dealing with people's problems, working together with residents, and helping people after they have been victims of crimes. A summary of these questions and response choices are present in detail in Box I of the appendix.

Overall, Chicago residents expressed positive attitudes toward the police. Seventy-five percent thought the police were somewhat or very responsive to community concerns and the same percentage felt that the police expressed concern when dealing with people's problems. Seventy percent of the respondents thought the police acted somewhat or very polite to people in their neighborhoods. Around 80 percent of respondents also thought the police were helpful and fair when dealing with people in their neighborhoods.

However, when respondents were asked how good a job the Chicago police were doing in their neighborhoods, the responses were more mixed. Forty-five percent of our respondents felt that the police were doing a good or very good job dealing with people in their neighborhoods, and only 39 percent believed the police were doing a good or very good job working with residents in their neighborhoods. Forty percent thought they police did a good or very good job at helping people after they had been victims of a crime. Citizens were also mixed on how good a job they thought the police were doing at preventing crime and keeping order. Forty-one percent

thought the police were doing a good job at preventing crime, while half felt they were doing good or very good at keeping order.

As noted, citizens responses to these ten questions were used to create a scale of attitudes toward the police. Bivariate analyses were then ran to determine which variables were significantly related to citizens overall evaluations of the police. The results of the bivariate and multivariate analyses are presented in Table 13.

Correlates of Attitudes Toward the Police

Minorities expressed more negative attitudes toward the police than whites. Attitudes toward the police were the most negative among persons with incomes above \$20,000, the unemployed, renters, married individuals, and persons with high school educations. Age was also found to be significantly positively related to attitudes toward the police. Increases in age were related to more positive evaluations of the police. The above findings were all significant in bivariate analyses of attitudes toward the police.

Victims of personal crimes and victims of property crimes both expressed more negative attitudes toward the police than non-victims. However, the mean attitude level of personal crime victims was lower than the attitude level of property crime victims. Victims of personal crimes were likely to evaluate the police more harshly than victims of property crimes.

Table 13
Analysis of Attitudes Toward the Police

Group	correlation with attitudes toward police
Blacks	-.16**
Hispanics	-.04*
Other Minorities	-.04**
age	+.16**
high school graduates	-.03*
college graduates	-.04*
income above \$20,000	-.06**
homeowners	+.02*
females	+.07**
single	+.01*
unemployed	-.02*
police initiated contact	-.05**
citizen initiated contact	-.02*
perceived decay	-.14**
perceived disorder	-.24**
perceived crime	+.01*
level of safety	+.16**
property crime victims	-.08**
personal crime victims	-.07**
saw police engaged in enforcement	+.06**
saw police on patrol	+.001*
saw police recently	+.15**
name an officer	+.06**
(N)	(2056)

Unweighted data. **indicates significant multivariate relationship controlling for other factors in the table
*indicates a significant bivariate relationship;
significance at $p < .05$.

Contacting the police also resulted in more negative evaluations of the police. There was a difference however, depending on the type of citizen-initiated contact that was involved. Persons who contacted the police to get or give information, were more positive in their assessments of the police than those who contacted the police to report an emergency. Contacting the police to report a crime or to report a suspicious person, event or noise were related to the most negative attitudes toward the police.

Respondents who had been targets of police initiated contacts also reported having less positive attitudes about the police than persons who had not been involved in such contacts. Persons who were stopped by the police while walking expressed significantly lower evaluations of the police than persons who were stopped while riding in a vehicle. Of all experiences with the police, being involved in a pedestrian stop resulted in the most negative assessments of the police. Recent

sightings of the police were positively related to attitudes toward them. Persons who had seen the police within the past 24 hours expressed the most positive attitudes toward the police; those who had not seen the police at all during the past week reported the most negative views.

Attitudes toward the police differed depending on the type of activity that citizens reported seeing the police involved in. Persons who reported seeing the police engaged in enforcement activities had more negative assessments of them. However, persons who had seen the police engaged in patrol activities reported more positive attitudes toward the police. Familiarity with the police, the ability to name an officer, was related with more positive evaluations of police.

Perceptions of neighborhood disorder, decay and crime all showed negative bivariate relationships with assessments of police service. However, higher levels of safety were related with more positive evaluations of the police.

These bivariate analyses indicate that simply looking at evaluations of police for the entire population can be very misleading. There are significant differences among groups in the opinions they hold about police. Socio-economic distinctions, race, neighborhood perceptions, fear, experiences with the police, police visibility and familiarity, and past victimization all significantly impact attitudes toward the police, in the bivariate analyses.

Multivariate Analyses

The results of a multivariate analyses that controlled for the effects of all the variables discussed thus far is also presented in Table 13. We can see that several of the variables used in this analyses continue to have independent effects upon attitudes toward the police. Race, age, income and gender have significant impacts on citizens evaluations of police. Blacks and other minorities continue to report more negative attitudes about the police. Females, in contrast to bivariate data, report more positive attitudes toward the police than do males. Individuals at higher income levels reported more negative attitudes than persons making less than \$20,000. Age continues to be an important factor in determining attitudes toward the police, with younger persons having more negative attitudes than older persons.

Experience with police-initiated contacts were still significantly related with more negative attitudes toward the police. However, the negative impact of citizen-initiated contacts disappeared in the multivariate analysis.

Citizens perceptions of their neighborhoods strongly impacted their overall attitudes toward the police. Persons living in areas where decay and disorder were perceived to be big problems, expressed more negative attitudes toward the police. Perceptions of neighborhood crime problems were not significant in determining

citizens evaluations of the police. Increased feelings of safety resulted in more positive assessments of the police.

Recent police visibility and seeing the police actively engaged in non law enforcement activities resulted in citizens evaluating the police in a more positive fashion. Also, respondents ability to name an officer who worked in their neighborhood had a positive impact on attitudes toward the police.

CONCLUSION

A majority of Chicago residents interviewed in early 1993 expressed generally positive attitudes regarding the police and police activity. However, their opinions were affected by a variety of different factors. Factors such as race, age, sex and income were among the basic determinants of their attitudes toward the Chicago police. Most disturbing were the racial differences in attitudes toward the police. Even after the effects of neighborhood problems, past experiences with the police and victimization have been controlled, blacks and those in the 'other race' category continue to hold negative views of the police. These negative assessments suggest that blacks and other minorities perceive inequity in the way the police distribute services. To the extent that negative attitudes toward the police continue, they may breed distrust and a tendency among minorities to refuse to cooperate with police regardless of the circumstances. This could lead many to raise questions regarding the ability of police departments, containing a majority of white officers, to adequately police areas with predominantly nonwhite residents.

Blacks, younger persons and minorities are among those most likely to be involved in police initiated contacts. We have seen that these experiences result in more negative attitudes toward the police. However, the strongest determinants of general attitudes toward the police are perceptions of neighborhood decay and disorder, and levels of safety. This suggests that citizens partially blame police for the low levels of social order and safety that exists within their neighborhood. Many people would prefer to remain in their neighborhoods even though these problems exist and would evaluate police less harshly if there were more visible signs suggesting that the police were at least trying to combat these problems.

The police departments over-emphasis on crime-fighting may have further increase tensions between the police and lower income communities. The police chose to focus on more 'serious' crime problems while simply ignoring many of the disorder problems that existed in these neighborhoods. Such a strategy may have led the police to see people living in these communities as more of a hinderance and exclude them from their crime prevention activities. What seemed to have developed is an "us versus them" mentality that is not productive in helping create better crime control and prevention activities in high crime neighborhoods.

The tensions between minority, low income communities and the police is a widespread continuing problem plaguing many American cities. It is a problem that cannot be alleviated without much thought, determination and good will on

the part of all those involved. Surely the police cannot solve all of the problems plaguing Chicago neighborhoods, but they can help to alleviate the fear of crime that exists. The police can also help citizens development of community organizations and help educate citizens in crime prevention. The police must also find ways to effectively deal with citizens of varying backgrounds, and promote the feeling that we are all in this together.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Apple, Nancy, and David J. O'Brien. 1983. "Neighborhood Racial Composition and Residents' Evaluation of Police Performance." Journal of Police Science and Administration, 11, 76-84.

Bayley, David H. and Harold Mendelsohn. 1968. Minorities and the Police. New York: The Free Press.

Bennett, Trevor. 1989. Contact Patrols in Birmingham and London: An Evaluation of a Fear Reducing Strategy. Cambridge: Institute of Criminology.

Biderman, Albert D., Louise Johnson, Jennie McIntyre, and Adrienne Weir. 1967. Report on a Pilot Study in the District of Columbia on Victimization and Attitudes Toward Law Enforcement. Studies in Crime and Law Enforcement in Major Metropolitan Areas, Field Surveys I, submitted to The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.

Brown, Lee and Mary Ann Wycoff. 1987. "Policing Houston: Reducing Fear and Improving Service." Crime and Delinquency, 33, 71-89.

Bordua, David, and Larry L. Tifft. 1971. "Citizen Interviews, Organizational Feedback, and Police-Community Relations Decisions." Law and Society Review, 6, 155-182.

Box, Steven, Chris Hale, and Glen Andrews. 1988. "Explaining Fear of Crime." British Journal of Criminology, 28, 340-356.

Campbell, Angus and Howard Schuman. 1968. "Racial Attitudes in Fifteen American Cities." Pp. 1-67 of Supplemental Studies for The National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.

Decker, Scott. 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.

Jacob, Herbert. 1971. "Black and White Perceptions of Justice in the City." Law and Society Review, 6, 69-90.

Jacob, Herbert. 1971. "Contact With Government Agencies: A Preliminary Analysis of the Distribution of Government Services." Midwest Journal of Political Science, 16, 123-146.

Pate, Antony M., Mary Ann Wycoff, Wesley G. Skogan, and Lawrence Sherman. 1986. Reducing Fear of Crime in Houston and Newark: A Summary Report. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice and The Police Foundation.

Pate, Antony M. 1986. "Experimenting with Foot Patrol: The Newark Experience." In Dennis Rosenbaum, ed. Community Crime Prevention. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 137-156.

Parks, Roger. 1976. "Police Response: Effects on Citizen Attitudes and Perceptions." In Wesley G. Skogan (ed.), Sample Surveys of the Victims of Crime. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger, 89-104.

Skogan, Wesley G. 1987. "Some Unexpected Effects of a Police Service for Victims." Crime and Delinquency, 33, 490-501.

Skogan, Wesley G. 1989 "Communities, crime and neighborhood organization." Crime & Delinquency, 35, 437-457.

Skogan, Wesley G. 1989. "The Impact of Police on Victims." In Emilio Viano (ed.), Crime and Its Victims. Washington, DC: Hemisphere Publishing Co, 71-78.

Skogan, Wesley G. 1990. Disorder and Decline: Crime and the Spiral of Decay in American Cities. New York: The Free Press.

Skogan, Wesley G. 1990. The Police and the Public in England and Wales. London: HMSO.

Skogan, Wesley G. 1992. "Community Policing in the United States." Address to the Conference on Policing Systems and Police Cooperation in Europe, sponsored by the French Ministry of the Interior, Paris (December).

Smith, David J. 1983. Police and People in London I: A Survey of Londoners. London: Policy Studies Institute.

Smith, Paul E. and Richard O. Hawkins. 1973. "Victimization, Types of Citizen-Police Contacts, and Attitudes Toward the Police." Law and Society Review, 8, 135-152.

Southgate, Peter, and Paul Ekblom. 1984. Contacts Between Police and Public. Home Office Research Study No. 77. London: HMSO.

Trojanowicz, Robert C. 1983. "An Evaluation of a Neighborhood Foot Patrol Program." Journal of Police Science and Administration, 11, 410-419.

Walker, Darlene, et al. 1972. "Contact and Support: An Empirical Assessment of Public Attitudes Toward the Police and the Courts." North Carolina Law Review, 51, 43-79.

Winfrey Thomas L. and Curt T. Griffiths. 1971. "Adolescent Attitudes Toward the Police." In Theodore Ferdinand (ed.), Juvenile Delinquency: Little Brother Grows Up. Newbury park, CA: Sage Publications, 1119-1124.

Box B

Questions used to measure *property crime victimization*

Next, I would like to ask you about some things which may have happened to you or your family [HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS] during the past year. As I read each one, please think carefully and tell me if it happened during the past year, that is since (March)(April) of 1992.

NO YES UNC

During the past year has anyone broken into your home or garage to steal something? 0 1 9

(Other than that), have you found any sign that someone tried to break into your home?

Have you had anything taken from inside your home by someone, like a visitor, during the past year?

To the best of your knowledge, has anything of value been stolen from your mailbox during the past year or has someone tried to?

In the past year has anyone damaged or vandalized the front or rear of your home, for example, by writing on the walls, or breaking windows?

Did anyone steal that (car)(truck), or try to, during the past year?

Other than that, did anyone take anything from inside your (car) (truck), or try to steal parts of it?

(Other than that), did anyone deliberately damage your (car)(truck) or vandalize it?

Did anyone steal, or try to steal that (motorcycle)(bicycle)?

Except for motorcycles or bicycles, have you had anything stolen that you left outside your home? 40

Box C

Questions used to measure *citizen initiated contacts*

Now, I would like to ask you about any contacts you may have had with the Chicago police in the past year, since (March) (April) of 1992. In the past year, have you . . .

UNCERTAIN
YES NO /NOT APPL.

reported a crime to the police?¹ 1 0 9

(Other than that), have you reported a traffic accident or a medical emergency to the police?²

In the past year have you reported a suspicious person who you thought might be connected to a crime?³

(Other than that), have you reported suspicious noises to the police?³

Since (March)(April) of 1992, have you reported any other event that you thought might lead to a crime?³

Have you contacted the police about any other neighborhood concerns or problems?⁴

(Other than that), have you contacted the police to ask for advice or information?⁴

Have you contacted the police to give them any information?⁴

(Other than that), did you report any other sort of problem or difficulty to the police?⁴

¹Refers to citizen initiated contacts to report a crime.

²Refers to " " to report an accident or emergency.

³Refers to " " to report a suspicious person, noise or event.

⁴Refers to " " to get or give information or report neighborhood concerns, problems or difficulties.

Box D

Questions used to measure *police initiated contacts*

In the past year, since (March)(April) of 1992, have you been in a car or on a motorcycle that was stopped by the police?

- YES 1
- NO..... 0
- UNCERTAIN 9

In the past year, have you been stopped and questioned by the police when you were out walking?

- YES 1
- NO..... 0
- UNCERTAIN 9

Box E
Questions used to measure *police visibility*

<p>Have you seen a police officer in your neighborhood within the last 24 hours?³</p> <p>YES 1 [SKIP NEXT QUESTION]</p> <p>NO 0</p> <p>UNCERTAIN 9</p>
<p>What about in the past week? Have you seen a police officer in your neighborhood within the past week?³</p> <p>YES 1</p> <p>NO 0</p> <p>UNCERTAIN 9</p>
<p>Here are a few specific situations in which you might have seen the police in the <u>past month</u>. During the past month, have you seen. . .</p> <p style="text-align: center;">UNCERTAIN</p> <p style="text-align: center;">YES NO /NOT APPL.</p> <p>a police car driving through your neighborhood?²</p> <p style="text-align: center;">1 0 9</p> <p>A police officer walking or standing on patrol in the neighborhood?²</p> <p>What about in the nearest shopping area? Have you seen any officers walking on patrol in the nearest shopping area during the past month?²</p> <p>Have you seen a police officer pull someone over for a traffic ticket in your neighborhood, during the past month?¹</p> <p>During the past month, have you seen police officers patrolling in the alley, or checking garages or in the back of buildings?²</p> <p>Have you seen police officers searching or frisking anyone here in your neighborhood, breaking up any groups, or arresting anyone?¹</p> <p>Have you seen a police officer chatting or having a friendly conversation with people in the neighborhood?²</p>

¹Persons seeing the police engaged in enforcement activities.

²Persons seeing the police engaged in patrol activities.

³Refers to recent visibility of the Chicago Police.

Box F

Questions used to measure *neighborhood decay and disorder*

Now I am going to read a list of things that you may think are problems in your neighborhood. After I read each one, please tell me whether you think it is a big problem, some problem, or no problem in your neighborhood.

PROBLEM LEVEL

BIG SOME NO UNC

The first is vacant lots filled with
trash and junk?¹ 3 2 1 9

Abandoned cars in the streets and
alleys?¹

Public drinking?¹

Abandoned houses or other empty
buildings in this area?¹

Graffiti, that is, writing or painting
on walls or buildings?²

Disruption around schools; that is,
youths hanging around making noise,
vandalizing, or starting fights?²

Truancy; that is, kids not being in
school when they should be?²

Drug dealing on the streets?²

Gangs trying to take over the neigh-
borhood?²

¹Refers to perceptions of neighborhood decay.

²Refers to perceptions of neighborhood disorder.

Box G

Questions used to measure *perceptions of neighborhood crime*

Now I will read you another list of some things that might be problems in your neighborhood. After I read each one, please tell me whether you think it is a big problem, some problem, or no problem in your neighborhood.

PROBLEM LEVEL
BIG SOME NO UNC

Cars being vandalized -- things like windows or radio aerials being broken? 3 2 1 9

Cars being stolen?

People being attacked or robbed?

Rape or other sexual attacks?

Box H

Questions used to measure *levels of neighborhood safety*

How safe would you feel being alone outside in your neighborhood at night?

Would you feel . . .

very safe. 4
somewhat safe. 3
somewhat unsafe, or. 2
very unsafe? 1
DON'T GO OUT AT NIGHT¹ 5
UNCERTAIN. 9

Is there any particular place in your neighborhood where you would be afraid to go alone either in the day or after dark?

YES 1
NO. 0
UNCERTAIN 9

How often does worry about crime prevent you from doing things you would like to do in your neighborhood? Would you say . . .

very often. 4
somewhat often. 3
rarely, or. 2
never at all? 1
UNCERTAIN 9

¹Response with this number were coded 2.5 in the analyses.

Box I

Questions used to measure *general attitudes toward the police*

Now, let's talk about the police in your neighborhood. How responsive are the police in your neighborhood to community concerns? Do you think they are . . .

- very responsive. 4
- somewhat responsive. 3
- somewhat unresponsive, or. 2
- very unresponsive? 1
- UNCERTAIN. 9

How good a job are the police in your neighborhood doing in dealing with the problems that really concern people in your neighborhood? Would you say they are doing a . . .

- very good job 4
- good job 3
- fair job, or. 2
- poor job? 1
- UNCERTAIN 9

How good a job are the police doing in working together with residents in your neighborhood to solve local problems? Would you say they are doing a . . .

- very good job 4
- good job 3
- fair job, or. 2
- poor job? 1
- UNCERTAIN 9

How good a job do you think the police in your neighborhood are doing in helping people out after they have been victims of crime?

- very good job 4
- good job 3
- fair job, or. 2
- poor job? 1
- UNCERTAIN 9

How good a job do you think they are doing to prevent crime in your neighborhood?

- very good job 4
- good job 3
- fair job, or. 2
- poor job? 1
- UNCERTAIN 9

How good a job are the police doing in keeping order on the streets and sidewalks?

- very good job 4
- good job 3
- fair job, or. 2
- poor job? 1
- UNCERTAIN 9

Box I (cont.)

In general, how polite are plice in you neighborhood when dealing with people in your neighborhood? Are they ...

- very polite. 4
- somewhat polite. 3
- somewhat impolite, or. 2
- very impolite? 1
- SOME ARE/SOME AREN'T¹. 5
- UNCERTAIN. 9

When dealing with people's problems in your neighborhood, are the police generally ...

- very concerned 4
- somewhat concerned 3
- not very concerned, or 2
- not concerned at all
- about their problems?. 1
- SOME ARE/SOME AREN'T¹. 5
- UNCERTAIN. 9

In general, how helpful are the police when dealing with people in your neighborhood? Are they ...

- very helpful 4
- somewhat helpful 3
- not very helpful, or 2
- not helpful at all?. 1
- SOME ARE/SOME AREN'T¹. 5
- UNCERTAIN. 9

In general, how fair are the police when dealing with peoplde in your neighborhood? Are they ...

- very fair. 4
- somewhat fair. 3
- somewhat unfair, or. 2
- very unfair? 1
- SOME ARE/SOME AREN'T¹. 5
- UNCERTAIN. 9

¹All responses with this number were coded 2.5 in the analyses.