

Marquette University
e-Publications@Marquette

Social and Cultural Sciences Faculty Research and
Publications

Social and Cultural Sciences, Department of

1-1-1999

Race, Expectations and Evaluations of Police Performance: An Empirical Assessment

Meghan S. Stroshine

Marquette University, meghan.stroshine@marquette.edu

Accepted version. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*, Vol. 22, No. 4
(1999): 675-695. DOI. © 2018 Emerald Publishing Limited, Used with permission.
Meghan Stroshine was affiliated with Michigan State University at the time of publication.

Marquette University

e-Publications@Marquette

Social and Cultural Sciences Faculty Research and Publications/Department of Social and Cultural Sciences

This paper is NOT THE PUBLISHED VERSION; but the author's final, peer-reviewed manuscript. The published version may be accessed by following the link in the citation below.

Policing: An International Journal, Vol. 22, No. 4 (1999): 675-695. [DOI](#). This article is © Emerald and permission has been granted for this version to appear in [e-Publications@Marquette](#). Emerald does not grant permission for this article to be further copied/distributed or hosted elsewhere without the express permission from Emerald.

Race, Expectations and Evaluations of Police Performance: An Empirical Assessment

Abstract

The purpose of the current study is two-fold. First, using data obtained from a sample of crime victims (n = 122), this study empirically assesses the effect that police officer race has on evaluations of the police. Second, this study provides a greater specification of the effect that expectations regarding police performance have on evaluations of the police. ANOVA and Ordered Probit analyses indicate that police officer race does not influence victim evaluations of police performance. However, expectations do significantly influence evaluations of the police and furthermore, expectations of police performance differ across racial lines. Possible explanations for these findings and directions for future research are offered.

Keywords

[Crime](#), [Performance measurement](#)

Introduction

The police in the USA have a long history of conflict with minorities (Walker *et al.*, 1996). This conflict has been particularly well documented in studies that examine attitudes toward the police, which have consistently shown that minorities (particularly African-Americans) are more critical of the police than are whites (Bayley and Mendelsohn, 1969; Cao *et al.*, 1996; Carter, 1985; Correia *et al.*, 1996; Hahn, 1971; Jacob, 1971; Peek *et al.*, 1978; Scaglione and Condon, 1980; Thomas and Hyman, 1977; Webb and Marshall, 1995; but see Frank *et al.*, 1996).

Many researchers have attempted to understand the reasons behind these less-than-favorable evaluations of the police on the part of minorities. Research would suggest that these poor evaluations are not surprising, given the type and nature of contact that minorities have with the police. Specifically, research has documented that minorities are more likely to have contact with the police than are whites, especially negative (Murty *et al.*, 1990) or involuntary contacts (Carter, 1985). When minorities do have contact with the police, it has been shown that they are disproportionately more likely to suffer verbal abuse and harassment (Carter, 1985), be hassled without cause (Browning *et al.*, 1994), be the victims of racial discrimination in police shootings (Walker *et al.*, 1996), be the recipients of excessive force by the police (Radelet, 1980), and be arrested (Brown, 1977; Smith *et al.*, 1984).

Other researchers have suggested that minorities' unfavorable evaluations of the police may be the consequence of unfulfilled expectations (Bordua and Tifft, 1971; Carter, 1985). According to this line of reasoning, all individuals possess expectations of police performance and evaluations of the police are made using expectations as a baseline. In particular, police performance is evaluated on the basis of whether it falls short of, meets, or exceeds expectations (Chandek and Porter, in press; Percy, 1980). Carter (1985) expanded this argument, contending that expectations of police performance are culturally determined, and that these expectations may be:

... significantly more diverse for Hispanics – or any other culturally distinct group – than the police, who predominantly consist of, and are administered by, members of the dominant society, anticipate (p. 490).

Statement of the problem

The extant research clearly documents lower evaluations of the police by minorities; however, this literature is lacking in two very important respects. First, most research simply assumes that lower evaluations of the police on the part of minorities are a consequence of racial antagonism between the police and minority groups. No research exists, however, that attempts to clarify the race of the police officer and thus provide empirical evidence that this explanation is, in fact, correct. Second, although research has suggested that lower minority evaluations are the result of unfulfilled expectations, there is no research that has examined the impact of race on expectations of the police or determined whether the police are failing to meet the expectations held by minorities. Each of these voids in the literature will be discussed in greater detail below.

As stated previously, no studies have attempted to empirically assess the impact of officer race on evaluations of the police. Instead, previous research has taken for granted that, to minorities, the police represent "... oppression by a white power structure" (Joyner, 1977, p. 112). The police are

clearly over-represented in their racial composition by white officers (Walker *et al.*, 1996). However, the finding that minorities are less likely to evaluate the police favorably may largely be a function of the type of attitude under examination in these studies. The majority of these studies have examined global attitudes toward the police, such as perceptions of police fairness (Smith and Hawkins, 1973), the equality of police protection (Hahn, 1971), perceptions of police justice (Jacob, 1971), or evaluations of police performance in general (Bordua and Tifft, 1971; Furstenburg and Wellford, 1973; Reisig and Giacomazzi, 1998). Studies that ask for global or general evaluations of the police might understandably bring to mind the “average” or “typical” police officer, whose modal race is white.

Evidence that supports the proposition that global attitudes bring to mind the “average” or “typical” police officer may be found in the research of Frank *et al.* (1996). These researchers examined global attitudes toward the police and conducted their research in a city that has undergone a “black political takeover” in recent years (Frank *et al.*, 1996, p. 322). Interestingly, in this study blacks were actually *more* likely to favorably evaluate the police than were white citizens. The researchers hypothesized that this finding was a consequence of the social context of the city – characterized by a growing black majority and increased minority representation on the police force and in local government (i.e. a popularly elected black mayor). Specifically, Frank *et al.* (1996) suggested that:

... negative attitudes toward authority are part of a larger belief system that includes negative attitudes toward authority exercised by a government composed of individuals who belong to a different racial or ethnic group. In Detroit, the people who perform the police function are not alien to African-Americans; instead they represent an indigenous force (p.332).

This research represents an advance over prior research, in that the study has taken the racial composition of residents and those holding positions of authority (i.e. mayor, police) into account. In addition, this study included incident-specific evaluations of police officers (i.e. specific attitudes) as controls. However, because Frank *et al.* (1996) did not collect information about the individual officers encountered by respondents in their study, this study does not directly test the assumption that lower evaluations of the police by minorities are related to the race of the police officer.

Qualitative accounts also suggest that both the race of the citizen and the race of the officer with whom a citizen has contact is important. For example, Mann (1993) argued that “... there are indications that minority police officers are believed to have developed greater rapport with minority citizens than have white officers” (p. 157). Minority respondents in Bordua and Tifft’s (1971) study echoed a similar sentiment when they stated that they “... felt that if their race were different the officers would have treated them differently” (p. 171). However, qualitative accounts too fall short of providing empirical evidence of the importance of officer race in evaluations of the police. In short, although there is ample research to suggest that police officer race is important in citizen evaluations of the police, no studies have tested this assumption explicitly.

A second void in the literature exists in regard to the study of expectations of police performance. Researchers have suggested that evaluations of the police are determined in part by unfulfilled expectations of the police (Bordua and Tifft, 1971; Carter, 1985). Percy (1980) was the first to examine the impact of expectations on satisfaction with the police. Although Percy (1980) did not focus on minorities *per se*, his research strongly suggested that satisfaction with the police is a function of *both* expectations regarding police behavior and actual services rendered. Percy (1980) studied the disparity

between crime victims' expectations and perceptions of response time. His research illustrated that it was crime victims' expectations relative to perceptions of response time, and not perceptions alone, that determined satisfaction levels.

Carter (1985) did study minorities, and found that crime victims had clear expectations of police performance. These expectations largely revolved around investigative activities (e.g. taking a report, conducting a crime scene investigation). Carter (1985) speculated that expectations of the police differ according to racial group membership; however, since he examined only Hispanics, he was unable to determine whether expectations of police performance differed by race. In short, we still do not know whether minorities expect more or less from the police than whites, nor do we know how these expectations might in turn serve to influence evaluations of the police.

Research objective

The current study hopes to contribute to the existing literature in two ways. First, this study empirically assesses the impact that officer race in conjunction with respondent race has on evaluations of the police. By obtaining evaluations of the police that were the result of a contact with the police due to a victimization, it was possible to ask questions about the police officer who was encountered, particularly the race of that officer. In this regard, the current study examines the following hypothesis:

1. *H1*: Citizens who come into contact with officers of the same race as a result of their victimization will be more satisfied than citizens whose calls are responded to by officers of another race.

Second, this study provides a more comprehensive examination of the effect that expectations regarding police performance have on evaluations of the police. This study establishes the nature of expectations held by crime victims, the manner in which they impact on evaluations of the police, and whether members of different racial groups vary in the expectations they possess regarding police investigative activity. Based on prior research findings (Carter, 1985; Percy, 1980), three specific hypotheses are offered here:

1. *H2*: Expectations as they compare to police behavior, and not expectations alone, will determine satisfaction levels of crime victims.
2. *H3*: Minority crime victims will have fewer expectations regarding police investigative activity than will white crime victims.
3. *H4*: Minorities will be less likely to have the police fulfill their expectations, leading to lower evaluations of the police.

It is important to note that this study examines a wide range of variables in the analyses performed. It is critical that studies that seek to examine the effects of race do not simply examine the effects of single variables without controls, or with a limited range of variables in the analysis (Cao *et al.*, 1996). Race effects may be specified or mediated by a number of variables, and it is important to include these variables in analyses. As such, this study examines a range of variables traditionally examined in crime victim research. These include crime victim demographic variables, a variety of police response

variables (such as police response time, officer demeanor, officer investigative effort) and an important case status variable (whether the victim was recontacted after the initial investigation).

Method

Sample

The data for this study were obtained from telephone surveys and official complainant records from a medium-sized Midwestern police department. Sample data were obtained from the total population of burglary ($n=2,000$) and robbery victims ($n=999$) that were reported to the department between May 15 and August 14 of 1995[1]. The population was disproportionately sampled in order to achieve a sample where burglary and robbery victims were equally represented (Babbie, 1995), as the data were originally collected for the purpose of making comparisons across crime type. As a consequence, the sample utilized in this study is not entirely representative of the population and caution should be exercised when making generalizations to the population.

Systematic sampling procedures were used to create a sample consisting of 200 burglary victims and 216 robbery victims[2]. Of the 416 crime victims that comprised the original sample, 122 respondents were located and agreed to participate in the study. Due to the relatively low response rate (29 per cent), the sample ($n=122$) that was ultimately used in this study was compared to the sample of victims from which it was drawn ($n=416$) (see Appendix, Table AI). A series of one-sample t-tests demonstrated that the sample and the population did not differ significantly in terms of gender ($t = 0.40$; $p = 0.34$), race ($t = 1.2$; $p = 0.12$), age ($t = 1.06$; $p = 0.14$), or type of victimization ($t = 1.0$; $p = 0.16$). While not conclusive evidence, these tests provide some confidence that there was little non-response bias in this study.

Characteristics of respondents

Slightly over half (56 per cent) of the respondents in the current study were male and a slight majority of victims (52 per cent) were of a minority race[3]. The modal age category was between 25 and 40 years of age (42 per cent) and the modal income category was more than \$25,000 a year (45 per cent). Finally, a little more than half of respondents had been the victim of a robbery (57 per cent).

Measures

Values, coding and descriptive statistics for the variables used in this study are provided in the Appendix (Table AII). Each of the measures is described in greater detail below.

Dependent variable: overall satisfaction with the police

The dependent variable in the current study was measured using a four-point ordinal scale. This variable was measured by asking the respondent the following question: "Overall, how satisfied were you with the way the police officer(s) handled the [entire] incident?" Responses were coded "0 = very dissatisfied, 1 = dissatisfied, 2 = satisfied, 3 = very satisfied". Neutral cases ($n = 11$) were dropped from the analyses. In this study, 79 per cent of victims were either satisfied or very satisfied with the police,

consistent with studies that have shown that persons generally hold rather positive views of the police (Dean, 1980; Furstenburg and Wellford, 1973; White and Menke, 1978; Zamble and Annesely, 1987).

Independent measures

Crime victim demographic characteristics. This study included the victim demographic variables of race, gender, age, income, and type of victim. Race was coded as "0 = white, 1 = minority". Gender was coded "0 = male, and 1 = female." Age was coded as "0 = 18-24 years, 1 = 25-40 years, 2 = 41-60 years old, and 3 = 61 years or older". The variable of income was operationalized as "0 = less than \$8,000 a year, 1 = \$8,001-15,000 a year, 2 = \$15,001-25,000 a year, and 3 = over \$25,000 a year". Finally, type of victim was coded "0 = burglary, 1= robbery".

Police officer/victim race. In order to determine the race of the police officer, crime victims were asked during the telephone survey to try to visualize the one officer with whom they had the most contact (if, in fact, more than one officer responded to the scene). Respondents were then asked to identify the race of that officer. Police officer race was coded "0 = white, 1 = minority".

In order to assess whether attitudes toward the police are a function of *both* citizen and police officer race, a race interaction variable was created. This variable was constructed by examining the values of two variables: the race of the crime victim and the race of the police officer who responded to the call. Since there was little theoretical basis for believing that a white victim who encountered a white officer would be more or less satisfied than a minority victim who was serviced by a minority officer, this variable was coded dichotomously. For the race interaction variable, values of "0" indicated that the victim and officer were of different races and values of "1" indicated that the victim and officer were of the same race[4]. Almost half (48 per cent) of the victims in this study were of a different race than the officer who responded to their call.

Police response variables. The variable of response time was operationalized in a manner consistent with previous researchers, as the perception of response time compared to expectations regarding response time (Brandl and Horvath, 1991; Percy, 1980). Response time was coded as "0 = slower than expected, 1 = about the same as expected, and 2 = faster than expected".

"Police Officer Demeanor" was measured using a five-item scale. This scale was created by summing the number of affirmative responses to the following questions: During your initial contact with the police officer, was he/she:

- courteous or respectful;
- understanding;
- concerned; and did he or she
- seem to take you seriously; and
- take the time to listen to you?

Each question was asked independently of the others and respondents were able to reply with answers of yes or no.

“Investigative Effort” (Brandl and Horvath, 1991) was measured using a five-item scale. This scale was created in a manner identical to that of “Police Officer Demeanor,” by summing the number of affirmative responses to the following questions: During your initial contact with the police, did the police officer:

1. (1) take notes;
2. (2) make out a report;
3. (3) attempt to find, locate, or question additional witnesses;
4. (4) search for or collect evidence (e.g. fingerprints); and
5. (5) provide information on available services or offer other advice?

Each question was asked independently of the others, and crime victims could respond to these questions with a response of yes or no.

Case status variable. The measurement of case status variables was restricted to one question that inquired as to whether victims had been recontacted by the police or another criminal justice agency (e.g., District Attorney) regarding the progress of their case. This was a dichotomous variable, coded “0 = no, and 1 = yes”.

Crime victim expectations. In order to measure crime victim expectations regarding police officer investigative effort, respondents were asked the following questions: Before your contact with the police as a result of your burglary/robbery, did you *expect* the police officer to:

- take notes;
- make out a report;
- attempt to find, locate or question additional witnesses;
- search for or collect evidence (e.g. fingerprints); and
- provide information on available services or offer other advice?

These questions were asked before those attempting to measure police officer “Investigative Effort” in an attempt to avoid contamination (Bordua and Tiff, 1971). Affirmative responses were summed in order to create a five-item scale, “Victim Expectations.” In this study, 63 per cent of victims expected the police to perform at least four of the five activities about which were inquired.

To determine whether satisfaction with the police is a consequence of both expectations and police officer behavior, a new set of variables was created. These variables were created by comparing the stated expectations of victims regarding police investigative effort to the activities victims reported the police as having performed. In accordance with Carter’s (1985) belief that lower evaluations of the police are a consequence of unfulfilled expectations, these variables were coded “0 = police met or exceeded victim expectations” and “1 = police failed to meet victim expectations.” These variables were summed to create another five-item scale, “Expectation Fulfillment”. Of the victims in this study, 50 per cent possessed expectations that were met or exceeded for all five police investigative activities about which were inquired. No victims experienced a contact with the police where expectations went unfulfilled by the police for all five activities.

Results

Bivariate analyses were performed to determine the relationship among the independent variables under examination and the dependent variable-satisfaction with the police. A correlation matrix depicting the relationship between these variables is presented in the Appendix (Table AIII). In order to arrive at a more meaningful interpretation of the data, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure was used to determine the difference between mean levels of satisfaction across different values of the independent variables. The results of these analyses are contained in [Table I](#).

The ANOVA revealed significant findings for only one of the crime victim demographic variables examined. Differences in mean satisfaction levels differed according to victim age; $F(3, 110) = 3.562, p < 0.05$. Mean satisfaction scores were highest for the oldest age group tested. The ANOVA procedure failed to demonstrate any relationship between mean satisfaction levels according to different values of the race interaction variable. It did not matter whether victims' calls were responded to by officers of the same race or by officers of another race. Although not a significant finding, it is of interest to note that victims whose calls were responded to by officers of the same race had the highest mean satisfaction scores of the two groups.

The ANOVA for police response time revealed significant differences; $F(2, 110) = 5.74, p < 0.01$. Mean satisfaction levels were greatest for victims who perceived a response time that was faster than expected. The ANOVA performed for "Police Officer Demeanor" revealed significant differences in mean satisfaction levels depending upon how the crime victims perceived they were treated by the police; $F(5, 110) = 11.786 (p < 0.001)$. Mean satisfaction levels were highest for victims who perceived more "positive" police behaviors (i.e. appearing courteous or respectful, concerned, understanding, or taking the time to listen and taking the victim seriously).

The ANOVA conducted for "Investigative Effort" indicated that there were significant differences in mean satisfaction levels according to the perceived level of investigative effort exhibited by the police; $F(5, 110) = 9.368 (p < 0.001)$. Table I portrays a distinct linear relationship between "Investigative Effort" and satisfaction with the police. Crime victims were significantly more likely to be satisfied when the police were perceived as performing a greater number of investigative activities (i.e. taking notes; making out a report; attempting to find, locate, or question additional witnesses; searching for or collecting evidence; and providing information on available services or offering other advice).

The ANOVA analysis revealed significant differences in mean satisfaction levels according to whether the victim was recontacted after the initial investigation; $F(1, 110) = 9.632 (p < 0.01)$. Mean satisfaction levels were higher for victims who were recontacted by the police or another criminal justice agency after the time of the initial police response.

The ANOVA performed for "Victim Expectations" failed to reveal significant differences in mean satisfaction levels among victims who differed in their expectations regarding police investigative effort. The ANOVA for "Expectation Fulfillment," however, did demonstrate statistically significant differences in mean satisfaction levels for victims depending on the extent to which their expectations went unfulfilled; $F(5, 110) = 13.463 (p < 0.001)$. This relationship was distinctly linear in nature; those victims whose expectations were fulfilled (i.e. met or exceeded) reported higher satisfaction levels than victims whose expectations went unfulfilled.

In order to assess the relative influence of the independent variables examined in this study and control for the effects of other variables, an Ordered Probit regression analysis was performed on the data. Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression is based on a linear curve and assumes that dependent variables are measured at the interval-ratio level. While data that does not meet these assumptions are often analyzed using this technique, possible consequences include:

1. (1) heteroscedasticity;
2. (2) residuals that are not distributed normally; and
3. (3) nonsensical probabilities (Long, 1997).

Since the dependent variable in this study was an ordinal level variable, OLS was deemed inappropriate for use in the current analysis. As such, Ordered Probit was the regression model used. Probit coefficients are interpreted on the basis of sign and significance.

[Table II](#) depicts the findings of the Ordered Probit analysis for satisfaction with the police[5]. The “Police Investigative Effort” and “Victim Expectations” scales were not included in the model tested, as they were used to create the “Expectation Fulfillment” scale. Findings revealed two significant predictors of crime victim satisfaction: “Police Officer Demeanor” and “Expectation Fulfillment.” Specifically, the results indicate that the more “positive” behaviors exhibited by the police (e.g. appearing concerned), the more likely it was that crime victims would report being satisfied with the police. Likewise, victims were more likely to be satisfied when they perceived, as a whole, that the police met or exceeded their expectations about investigative activities. As indicated by the size of the coefficient, it appears that after controlling for the effects of all other variables, “Expectation Fulfillment” was the primary determinant of satisfaction with the police for victims in this study.

In order to learn more about the nature of victim expectations, two models using “Victim Expectations”(Model 1) and “Expectation Fulfillment” (Model 2) as the dependent variables were tested. “Victim Expectations” and “Expectation Fulfillment” were regressed against variables that occur temporally prior to a contact with the police – victim demographic characteristics. In addition, assuming that victims might change or alter their expectations based on the race of the police officer, the race interaction variable was included in both models.

Regressing “Victim Expectations” against victim demographic characteristics and the race interaction variable provided a means of determining whether minorities possess greater expectations of the police than their white counterparts. As [Table III](#) shows, victim race was significantly and positively related to victim expectations; in this study, minorities were more likely to have greater expectations of the police. This analysis also pointed to two additional predictors of expectations of the police. Victim age was negatively related to expectations – younger respondents had greater expectations of police behavior. In addition, whether a respondent was the victim of a burglary or robbery influenced expectations. Burglary victims were more likely to possess greater expectations regarding the investigative activities police should perform.

The second model tested (using “Expectation Fulfillment” as the dependent variable) allowed for the examination of whether minorities perceived the police as fulfilling their expectations less often than white crime victims. Results revealed that race was not significantly related to “Expectation Fulfillment” (see [Table III](#)). However, victim age and type of victim were significant determinants of the

extent to which victims perceived that their expectations were fulfilled. Younger respondents and respondents who had been the victims of a burglary were more likely to perceive that the police failed to meet their expectations.

Discussion

Contrary to expectations, this study failed to demonstrate any victim race effects or race interaction effects on evaluations of the police. Consequently, this study failed to find support for the hypothesis that victims serviced by officers of the same race would be more satisfied than victims whose calls were responded to by officers of another race (hypothesis *H1*). There are several possible reasons why this study failed to find such race effects. First, this study was hindered by a small number of respondents ($n=111$). It is possible that the small sample size in this study masked race effects that did, in fact, exist.

A second possibility lies in the type of attitude examined and the population surveyed in this study. In previous studies that have examined crime victim satisfaction with the police (Brandl and Horvath, 1991; Poister and McDavid, 1978; Percy, 1980; Shapland, 1983), only one uncovered racial differences in satisfaction levels (Percy, 1980). It should be noted, however, that this was the only crime victim satisfaction study to date that was conducted in a major metropolitan city. The other crime victim studies (Brandl and Horvath, 1991; Poister and McDavid, 1978; Shapland, 1983) drew their samples from rather homogeneous populations, and thus their lack of findings with regard to race should be considered carefully. The sample used in the current study was drawn from a heterogeneous, ethnically diverse city, and thus does not appear to suffer from problems associated with racial homogeneity.

A third explanation is pointed to by researchers who have found that minority officers and white officers behave similarly (Black, 1980; Fyfe, 1981; Reiss, 1968; Sherman, 1980). Black (1980) examined the arrest patterns of white and African-American officers and found no discernible differences between officers of different races. Fyfe's (1981) study of deadly force situations revealed no significant differences in the use of deadly force by race. Reiss (1968) also failed to uncover any differences between white and African-American officers in their use of excessive force. Sherman (1980) argued that factors other than officer race or gender (e.g. situational) were more influential in determining officer behavior. In sum, "... no evidence suggests that African-American, Hispanic, and white officers behave in significantly different ways" (Walker *et al.*, 1996, p. 109).

A fourth interpretation is that global attitudes toward the police determine specific attitudes, an assertion supported in the research of Brandl *et al.* (1994). These researchers found that global attitudes (i.e. attitudes toward the police in general) have substantial effects on incident-specific assessments of police performance. It may be the case that, as Frank *et al.* (1996) suggested, the social context of the city in which this study was conducted is important. Seven years prior to the time of this study, the police department appointed a minority to the position of the Chief of Police. Other select positions of power (e.g. the County Sheriff) were also filled by minorities at the time, and the city's minority population was growing. It is possible that minorities' favorable assessments of the police in this city (71 per cent were satisfied or very satisfied with police performance) were the result of the city's social context.

The final and most plausible explanation given the data available in this study is that factors other than race were simply more important in determining crime victim evaluations of police performance. After controlling for the effects of all other variables, "Police Officer Demeanor" and "Expectation Fulfillment" were the most influential determinants of crime victim satisfaction with the police. In other words, it made no difference what the race of the victim or the police officer was; it simply mattered how officers treated victims and the extent to which victims perceived the police as fulfilling their expectations.

The current study also set out to examine three hypotheses related to expectations. Hypothesis *H2* predicted that victim expectations relative to police investigative activity would determine satisfaction levels, and not expectations alone. The ANOVA analyses presented in Table I support this hypothesis – mean satisfaction levels vary by "Expectation Fulfillment", but not by "Victim Expectations".

A third hypothesis based on the research of Carter (1985) was offered. This hypothesis predicted that minority crime victims would have fewer expectations regarding police investigative activity than would white crime victims. The results of the Ordered Probit analysis with "Victim Expectations" as the dependent variable (see Table III) did not provide support for this hypothesis. In fact, in this study, minorities were significantly more likely to possess a greater number of expectations regarding police investigative activity than were white respondents. This directly contradicts Carter's (1985) assertion that minorities have low expectations of police performance. All of the minority crime victims in this study expected the police to perform at least two of the investigative activities about which were inquired; nearly 40 per cent expected the police to perform all five activities.

Further, although it was not possible to compare victims and non-victims in this study as Carter (1985) did, descriptive analyses suggested that most victims had high expectations regarding police investigative activity (81 per cent of victims expected the police to perform a majority of the investigative activities about which were inquired). Thus, the findings of this study run contrary to the idea that "... the victimization experience may reduce expectations of police performance" (Carter, 1985, p. 496).

Finally, using "Expectation Fulfillment" as the dependent variable (see Table III) allowed for a test of hypothesis *H4* (i.e. minorities would be more likely to have their expectations go unfulfilled). The Ordered Probit analysis conducted for this model revealed no significant race effects. In other words, victims of different races did not appear to experience differential fulfillment of expectations by the police. This is a surprising finding, given that this research demonstrated that minority victims were more likely to expect more from the police. It would seem to logically follow that this would translate into the greater likelihood that police would fail to meet expectations. Fortunately, this was not the case in this study.

In conclusion, this study has provided the first empirical test of the effects of officer race on specific evaluations of the police. Although this study found no race effects, it is necessary to examine this relationship in greater detail before concluding they are nonexistent. Further research might attempt to study this phenomenon in varied social contexts characterized by different minority populations and representation in positions of authority and power (e.g. Frank *et al.*, 1996). Researchers might also consider examining both global and specific evaluations of the police in order to provide a more critical examination of whether global evaluations of the police made by minorities influence specific attitudes

in the manner outlined by Brandl *et al.* (1994). Both of these designs would require a larger sample size than was available here, which would lend to greater confidence in the results produced.

This study also provided a greater specification of the nature of the relationship between expectations and satisfaction with the police, and the manner in which expectations differ by race. This study indicated that minorities have greater expectations of police performance than do their white counterparts. Although this study contributed to the literature in this respect, more research is needed in order to explore a broader range of expectations (i.e. not just those related to investigative activity). This study showed that some select demographic variables are related to expectations; however, the formation of expectations is certainly a much more complex phenomenon than suggested by the research presented here. Research is still needed regarding the factors that determine expectations of police performance.

Additional research is also needed to understand the finding that minorities have greater expectations of police performance. Based on research delineating the largely negative experiences of minorities with the police (Carter, 1985; Brown, 1977; Browning *et al.*, 1994; Radelet, 1980; Smith *et al.*, 1984; Walker *et al.*, 1996), this finding runs counter to intuition. However, the current analyses were limited in that it was only possible to differentiate between whites and minorities in general. It is both inaccurate and unfair to assume that all minority groups possess the same expectations regarding police performance; thus research that examines several races or ethnic groups is needed. In sum, we need to better understand what different minorities expect from the police, and why they expect it. Finally, a last avenue for exploration suggested by this research lies in attempting to explain the finding that, although minorities expect more from the police, they do not appear to perceive the police as fulfilling those expectations any less than whites.

Notes

1. The author received two printouts from the police department involved in this study. The first was a list of all the burglary victims ($n=2,000$) whose crimes were reported to the department, and the second was a list of all the robbery victims ($n=999$) whose crimes were reported to the department. These lists contained information on the type of offense, type of victim (individual or business), the victim's name, address, and phone number, and select demographic characteristics (race, gender, and age). The lists were not ordered in any way (save for date of offense). While simple random sampling procedures may have been preferable, a systematic sampling technique was considered the most efficient means of deriving a sample.
2. The sampling procedure began by eliminating cases that were not responded to by an in-person police response, cases with critical missing information (e.g. telephone number), cases where the victim was a business, and cases where the victim was less than 18 years of age. For the list of burglary victims, every eighth case was chosen; for robbery victims, every third case was selected. A random start number was selected for both lists. This created an original sample of 416 crime victims (200 burglary victims and 216 robbery victims).
3. Originally, victim race was coded as "0 = white, 1 = African-American, 2 = Hispanic, 3 = other". Of the victims in this study, 8 percent were either Hispanic ($n=3$; 3 per cent) or

classified themselves as falling into the “other” category ($n=6$; 5 per cent). As a result, the latter three categories were collapsed to create a dummy variable (white/minority).

4. Less than 9 per cent of victims ($n=9$) and 7 per cent ($n=7$) of officers in this study were of a race other than white or African-American; for purposes of analysis, victim and officer minorities falling into the “other” category were grouped with African-Americans.
5. Due to a significant number of missing cases for the variables of response time (17.1 per cent) and victim income (8 per cent), these variables were excluded from all Ordered Probit analyses to maintain sample size. Additional models including these variables ($n=80$) were tested, and results demonstrated that these variables were not significant predictors of satisfaction with the police. As such, models excluding response time and income are presented here.

Variable	Overall satisfaction with the police		
	Mean	Std Dev.	F-ratio
<i>Crime victim demographic characteristics</i>			
Victim race			
White	2.23	0.82	3.811
Nonwhite	1.88	1.03	
Victim gender			
Male	2.02	1.03	0.130
Female	2.08	0.84	
Victim age (yrs)			
18-24	1.56	1.00	3.562*
25-40	2.15	0.91	
41-60	2.13	0.94	
61+	2.56	0.53	
Victim income (\$/yr)			
< \$,000	2.33	0.71	1.337
8,001-15,000	1.77	0.92	
15,001-\$25,000	1.81	0.98	
< 25,000	2.14	0.99	
Type of victim			
Burglary	2.17	0.88	1.398
Robbery	1.95	0.99	
<i>Police officer/victim race</i>			
Race interaction			
Victim and officer of different races	1.90	1.0	2.196
Victim and officer the same race	2.17	0.89	
<i>Police response variables</i>			
Response time			
Faster than expected	2.42	0.78	5.74**
About the same as expected	2.05	0.89	
Slower than expected	1.56	1.05	
Police officer demeanor			
0.5 Behaviors	0.00	0.00	11.786***
1.5 Behaviors	1.00	1.00	
2.5 Behaviors	1.50	0.58	
3.5 Behaviors	1.00	1.00	
4.5 Behaviors	1.93	0.70	
5.5 Behaviors	2.33	0.78	
Investigative effort			
0.5 Activities	–	–	9.368***
1.5 Activities	0.88	0.83	
2.5 Activities	1.50	1.05	
3.5 Activities	2.06	0.81	
4.5 Activities	2.23	0.86	
5.5 Activities	2.71	0.46	
<i>Case status variable</i>			
Victim recontacted by police			
No	1.85	0.97	9.632**
Yes	2.41	0.79	

(continued)

Table Ia. One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) results: relationship between independent variables and satisfaction with the police

Variable	Overall satisfaction with the police		
	Mean	Std Dev.	F-ratio
<i>Crime victim expectations</i>			
Victim expectations			
0/5 Activities expected	3.00	0.00	0.922
1/5 Activities expected	2.25	0.50	
2/5 Activities expected	2.19	0.75	
3/5 Activities expected	2.20	0.77	
4/5 Activities expected	2.08	1.02	
5/5 Activities expected	1.78	1.06	
Expectation fulfillment			
0/5 Expectations unfulfilled	2.47	0.63	13.463***
1/5 Expectations unfulfilled	2.00	0.93	
2/5 Expectations unfulfilled	1.53	0.99	
3/5 Expectations unfulfilled	1.14	0.90	
4/5 Expectations unfulfilled	0.40	0.55	
5/5 Expectations unfulfilled	-	-	

Notes: * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

Table Ib. One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) results: relationship between independent variables and satisfaction with the police

Variable	Model ($p < 0.001$) Ordered probit coefficient
Constant (α)	0.55
Race	-0.10
Gender	0.21
Age	0.06
Type of victim	0.32
Race interaction	0.89
Police officer demeanor	0.40**
Expectation fulfillment	-0.53**
Victim recontacted	0.48
Log-likelihood (L)	-99.19

Notes: * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

Table II. Ordered probit coefficients by satisfaction with the police

Variable	Model 1 Victim expectations ($p < 0.001$)	Model 2 Expectation fulfillment ($p < 0.01$)
Constant (α)	2.89	0.83
Race	0.84**	0.38
Gender	-0.24	-0.13
Age	-0.27*	-0.41**
Type of victim	-0.56*	-0.56*
Race interaction	0.32	-0.27
Log-likelihood (L)	-152.93	-132.94

Notes: * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

Table III. Ordered probit coefficients by victim expectations and expectation fulfillment

Variable	Percent of sample (<i>n</i> = 122)	Percent of population (<i>n</i> = 416)
Type of victim		
0 – Robbery	57	52
1 – Burglary	43	49
Gender		
0 – Male	56	58
1 – Female	44	42
Race		
0 – White	48	41
1 – Nonwhite	53	59
Age (yrs)		
0 – 18-24	23	18
1 – 25-40	42	46
2 – 41-60	27	24
3 – 61+	8	12

Table AI. Comparison of sample and population by demographic characteristics

Variable	Value	<i>n</i>	%
<i>Crime victim demographic characteristics</i>			
Race	0 – White	53	48
	1 – Minority	58	52
Gender	0 – Male	62	56
	1 – Female	49	44
Age (yrs)	0 – 18-24	25	23
	1 – 25-40	47	42
	2 – 41-60	30	27
	3 – 61+	9	8
Income (\$/yr)	0 – Less than 8,000	9	8
	1 – 8,000-15,000	22	20
	2 – 15,001-25,000	16	14
	3 – More than \$25,000	50	45
	̄ – Missing data	14	13
Type of victim	0 – Burglary	48	43
	1 – Robbery	63	57
<i>Police officer/victim race</i>			
Police officer race	0 – White	79	71
	1 – Minority	32	29
Race interaction variable	0 – Victim and officer of different races	52	47
	2 – Victim and officer of same race	59	53
<i>Police response variables</i>			
	0 – Faster than expected	24	22
	1 – About the same as expected	41	37
	2 – Slower than expected	27	24
	̄ – Missing data	19	17
Police officer demeanor	0 – No behaviors exhibited	4	4%
	1 – 1/5 behaviors exhibited	5	5
	2 – 2/5 behaviors exhibited	4	4
	3 – 3/5 behaviors exhibited	5	5
	4 – 4/5 behaviors exhibited	15	14
	5 – All behaviors exhibited	78	70
Police investigative effort	0 – No activities performed	0	0%
	1 – 1/5 activities performed	8	7
	2 – 2/5 activities performed	22	20
	3 – 3/5 activities performed	34	31
	4 – 4/5 activities performed	26	23
	5 – All activities performed	21	19
<i>Case status variable</i>			
Victim recontacted after initial investigation	0 – No	72	65
	1 – Yes	39	35

*(continued)***Table AII.** Independent and dependent variables: values, coding, and descriptive statistics

Variable	Value	<i>n</i>	%
<i>Crime victim expectations</i>			
Victim expectations	0 – No activities expected	1	< 1
	1 – 1/5 activities expected	4	4
	2 – 2/5 activities expected	16	14
	3 – 3/5 activities expected	20	18
	4 – 4/5 activities expected	38	34
	5 – All activities expected	32	29
Expectation fulfillment	0 – 0/5 expectations unfulfilled	55	50
	1 – 1/5 expectations unfulfilled	29	26
	2 – 2/5 expectations unfulfilled	15	14
	3 – 3/5 expectations unfulfilled	7	6
	4 – 4/5 expectations unfulfilled	5	5
	5 – all expectations unfulfilled	–	–
<i>Dependent variable</i>			
Overall satisfaction with the police	0 – Very dissatisfied	12	11
	1 – Dissatisfied	11	10
	2 – Satisfied	48	43
	3 – Very satisfied	40	36

Note: Due to rounding, not all percentages may add to 100

Table AIII. Correlation matrix: bivariate relationships between independent variables and overall satisfaction with the police

References

- Babbie, E. (1995), *The Practice of Social Research*, 7th ed., Wadsworth, New York, NY.
- Bayley, D.H. and Mendelsohn, H. (1969), *Minorities and the Police: Confrontation in America*, Free Press, New York, NY.
- Black, D. (1980), *The Manners and Customers of the Police*, Academic Press, New York, NY.
- Bordua, D.J. and Tifft, L.L. (1971), "Citizen interviews, organizational feedback, and police-community relations decisions", *Law and Society Review*, Vol. 6, pp. 155-82.
- Brandl, S.G. and Horvath, F. (1991), "Crime-victim evaluation of police investigative performance", *Journal of Criminal Justice*, Vol. 19, pp. 293-305.
- Brandl, S.G., Frank, J., Worden, R.E. and Bynum, T.S. (1994), "Global and specific attitudes toward the police: disentangling the relationship", *Justice Quarterly*, Vol. 11 No. 1, pp. 119-34.
- Brown, L.P. (1977), "Bridges over troubled waters: a perspective on policing in the black community", in Woodson, R.J. (Ed.), *Black Perspectives on Crime and the Criminal Justice System*, G.K. Hall, Boston, MA.

- Browning, S.L., Cullen, F.T., Cao, L., Kopache, R. and Stevenson, T.J. (1994), "*Race and getting hassled by the police: a research note*", *Police Studies*, Vol. 17 No. 1, pp. 1-11.
- Cao, L., Frank, J. and Cullen, F.T. (1996), "*Race, community context and confidence in the police*", *American Journal of Police*, Vol. 15 No. 1, pp. 3-22.
- Carter, D. L. (1985), "*Hispanic perception of police performance: an empirical assessment*", *Journal of Criminal Justice*, Vol. 12, pp. 487-500.
- Chandek, M.S. and Porter, C.O.L.H. (in press), "*The efficacy of expectancy disconfirmation in explaining crime victim satisfaction with the police*", *Police Quarterly*.
- Correia, M.E., Reisig, M.D. and Lovrich, N.P. (1996), "*Public perceptions of state police: an analysis of individual-level and contextual variables*", *Journal of Criminal Justice*, Vol. 24 No. 1, pp. 17-28.
- Dean, D. (1980), "*Citizen ratings of the police: the difference police contact makes*", *Law and Policy Quarterly*, Vol. 2, pp. 445-71.
- Frank, J., Brandl, S.G., Cullen, F.T. and Stichman, A. (1996), "*Reassessing the impact of race on citizens' attitudes toward the police: a research note*", *Justice Quarterly*, Vol. 13 No. 2, pp. 321-34.
- Furstenburg, F.F. and Wellford, C.F. (1973), "*Calling the police: the evaluation of police service*", *Law & Society Review*, Vol. 8, pp. 393-406.
- Fyfe, J.J. (1981). "*Who shoots? A look at officer race and police shooting*", *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, Vol. 9 No. 4, pp. 367-82.
- Hahn, H. (1971), "*Ghetto assessments of police protection and authority*", *Law & Society Review*, Vol. 6, pp. 183-93.
- Jacob, H. (1971), "*Black and white perceptions of justice in the city*", *Law & Society Review*, Vol. 6, pp. 69-89.
- Joyner, I. (1977), "*People and police*", in Bryce, H.J. (Ed.), *Black Crime: A Police View*, Joint Center for Political Studies, Washington, DC.
- Long, J.S. (1997), *Regression Models for Categorical and Limited Dependent Variables*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Mann, C.R. (1993), *Unequal Justice: A Question of Color*, University Press, Indianapolis, IN.
- Murty, K.S., Roebuck, J.B. and Smith, J.D. (1990), "*The image of the police in black Atlanta communities*", *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, Vol. 17, pp. 250-7.
- Peek, C.W., Alston, J.P. and Lowe, G.D. (1978), "*Comparative evaluation of the local police*", *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Vol. 42, pp. 370-9.

- Percy, S.L. (1980), "Response time and citizen evaluation of the police", *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, Vol. 8, pp. 75-86.
- Poister, T.H. and McDavid, J.C. (1978), "Victim's evaluations of police performance", *Journal of Criminal Justice*, Vol. 6, pp. 133-49.
- Radelet, L.A. (1980), *The Police and the Community*, 3rd ed., Glencoe, Encino, CA.
- Reisig, M.D. and Giacomazzi, A.L. (1998), "Citizen perceptions of community policing: are attitudes toward police important?", *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*, Vol. 21 No. 3, pp. 547-61.
- Reiss, A.J. (1968), "Police brutality – answers to key questions", *Transaction*, Vol. 5, pp. 10-9.
- Scaglione, R. and Condon, R.G. (1980), "Determinants of attitudes toward city police", *Criminology*, Vol. 17 No. 4, pp. 485-95.
- Shapland, J. (1983), "Victim-witness services and the needs of the victim", *Victimology*, Vol. 8 Nos 1-2, pp. 233-7.
- Sherman, L.W. (1980), "Causes of police behavior: the current state of quantitative research", *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, Vol. 17, pp. 69-100.
- Smith, D.A., Visher, C. and Davidson, L.A. (1984), "Equity and discretionary justice: the influence of race on police arrest decisions", *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, Vol. 75, pp. 234-49.
- Smith, P.E. and Hawkins, R.O. (1973), "Victimization, types of citizen-police contacts, and attitudes toward the police", *Law & Society Review*, Vol. 8, pp. 135-52.
- Thomas, C.W. and Hyman, J.M. (1977), "Perceptions of crime, fear of victimization, and public perceptions of police performance", *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, Vol. 5 No. 3, pp. 305-17.
- Webb, V.J. and Marshall, C.E. (1995), "The relative importance of race and ethnicity on citizen attitudes toward the police", *American Journal of Police*, Vol. 19 No. 2, pp. 45-66.
- Walker, S., Spohn, C. and DeLone, M. (1996), *The Color of Justice: Race, Ethnicity, and Crime in America*, Wadsworth, New York, NY.
- White, M.F. and Menke, B.A. (1978), "A critical analysis of surveys on public opinions toward police agencies", *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, Vol. 6, pp. 204-18.
- Zamble, E. and Annesely, P. (1987), "Some determinants of public attitudes toward the police", *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, Vol. 15 No. 4, pp. 285-9.

Further reading

Decker, S.H. (1981), "*Citizen attitudes toward the police: a review of past findings and suggestions for future policy*", *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, Vol. 9, pp. 80-6.

Kelling, G.L. (1978), "*Police field services and crime: the presumed effects of a capacity*", *Crime and Delinquency*, Vol. 24, pp. 173-84.

Koenig, D. J. (1980), "*The effects of criminal victimization and judicial or police contacts on public attitudes toward local police*", *Journal of Criminal Justice*, Vol. 8, pp. 243-9.

Radelet, L.A. (1986), *The Police and the Community*, 4th ed., Macmillan, New York, NY.

US Commission on Civil Rights (1981), *Who Is Guarding the Guardians?*, US Government Printing Office, Washington, DC.