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Abstract

Police officers play a very important role in their communities, considering they need to interact with the public in order to carry out their duties. For that reason, the relationship between the public and police officers has been the focus of many studies. The current study analyzed data from the 2011 Police-Public Contact Survey ($n= 49,246$). The study was conducted in three separate parts - the relationship between individual demographic characteristics and type of contact with the police, individual demographic characteristics and perceptions of police, and type of contact with the police and perceptions of the police. The results from this study were consistent with previous findings from studies that used smaller populations, as it was found that women were more likely to have voluntary contact with police than men, non-Hispanics had more voluntary contact with police than those of Hispanic Origin, women reported more positive perceptions of police, there was a positive relationship between age and perception of the police, and those who had voluntary contact had a more positive perception of police officers than those who had involuntary contact.
The Relationship Between Demographic Characteristics, Types of Contact with Police, and Perceptions of Police

The police play a vital role in communities, as officers regularly interact with the public through community patrols, responding to emergency calls, issuing tickets, making arrests, and investigating criminal activity. Their primary role is to serve and protect the community, which they accomplish by helping community members during times of crisis or making arrests to discourage dangerous behavior (Kokemuller, 2017). When they engage with the community, the police officers need to consider their relationship with the public in order to remain “effective, efficient, economically viable and accessible” to consumers (i.e. the public) (Gravelle & Rogers, 2012, p. 12). Essentially, the relationship between the public and the police can influence how well police officers are be able to fulfill their duties (Brandl & Horvath, 1991).

Since the relationship between the public and the police has the potential to impact the officers’ ability to perform their jobs, this relationship has been a focus of numerous studies. Previous research has found that some degree of positive interaction is necessary for law enforcement to complete their duties both effectively and efficiently (Brandl & Horvath, 1991). This is because positive interactions can lead to higher levels of trust and confidence in the police, which are linked to more cooperation with the police and compliance with the law (Bradford, 2011). Individuals with positive experiences are also more deferential in their interactions with police officers (Bradford, 2011).

In a meta-analysis, Brown and Benedict (2002) found that the results from studies regarding the public’s perceptions of the police were concentrated within three areas. Based off of those three areas of concentration, Dai and Jiang (2016) created three general models for examining the public’s satisfaction with the police in the United States. The first model focuses
on the relationship between individual demographic characteristics and the public’s satisfaction with police. The second model examines the role that contact with the police plays in the public’s satisfaction with police officers. The third model is the neighborhood conditions model, in which the public holds the police accountable for the quality of life issues in the neighborhood they serve (Dai & Jiang, 2016).

In addition to these models, it is also necessary to examine the individual demographic characteristics of community members that influence the type of contact an individual may have with the police, as research has found that there may be a relationship between demographic characteristics and type of contact (Blumstein, 1986; Avakame, Fyfe, & Mccoy, 1999; Durose & Langton, 2013).

The data used in the current study allowed for the analyses of the relationship between individual demographic characteristics and type of contact with police, individual demographic characteristics and perceptions of police, and type of contact with police and perceptions of police. Therefore, the remainder of the literature review is focused on these relationships/areas of concentration.

**The Influence of Individual Demographic Characteristics on Type of Contact with Police**

Previous research has examined the relationship between the demographic characteristics and type of contact with police, such as criminal offending, victims of a crime, and contacting the police for assistance. In a study that focused on the demographic characteristics of criminal offenders, Blumstein (1986) found that criminal offenders are more likely to be young and male. There is also literature regarding the relationship between race and criminal offending, but the topic is debated, as there is a disproportionate representation of minorities in the criminal
population, which could reflect higher rates of offending or bias within the criminal justice system itself (Moynihan 1965; Berger & Simon 1974; Sampson & Lauritsen, 1997). In the United States, there has been a history of racism and discrimination, both at the individual and structural levels, which could impact how minorities encounter police. For example, the war on drugs, a more recent movement, seems to uphold discriminatory and possibly racist motives, as there is a disproportionate percentage of minorities in the criminal justice system because of drug charges. This is supported by the information presented by the Drug Alliance Policy (2016), which reported that even though Black people only make up 13 percent of the general United States population and use drugs at similar rates as other races, they make up 31 percent of those arrested for drug law violation and almost 40 percent of those incarcerated (state or federal) for violations of drug laws. Similarly, the Drug Alliance Policy (2016) reported that Latinos make up 17 percent of the general United States population, but that 20 percent of the people in state prisons for drug offenses and 37 percent of people in federal prisons for drug offenses were Latino. In total, almost 80 percent of people in federal prisons in the United States are Black or Latino, even though they only make up about 30 percent of the general population. It is clear that, even with the changes in law and society, there are still differences in how people of different races are treated by those who enforce the law.

In a study that examined the individual characteristics of crime victims, it was noted that even though crimes rates in the United States have been declining since the 1990s, certain groups of people are still more likely to be the victims of crime (Kearney, Harris, Jacome, & Parker, 2014). The National Sheriffs’ Association (1985) reported that victims of crime are more likely to be men, young, and Black. This finding was supported by more recent research conducted by the National Institute of Justice (2017), where it was found that adolescents, men, and Black
people are more likely to be victims of a crime. Kearney et al. (2014) added to this research by reporting that low-income individuals are more likely to be victims of crime.

Finally, research has also examined the demographics of those who contact the police for other reasons, such as for assistance. Durose and Langton (2013) found that a similar percentage of males and females contacted the police to request assistance to report a crime/neighborhood disturbance. More non-Hispanic White people contacted the police for assistance as compared to Hispanic people, and more White people requested assistance than Black people. Durose and Langton (2013) found that minorities and people of two or more races had the highest rates of reporting crime/neighborhood disturbances to the police, and there was not a statistically significant difference between the reporting rates of White and Black people. In addition, people who were age 25 to 44 reported contacting the police more than younger people (age 16 to 24) or older people (age 65 or older).

The Influence of Individual Demographic Characteristics on Perceptions of Police

Previous research has examined the relationship between the demographic characteristics of individuals and perceptions of the police. The demographic characteristics examined by past research include race, ethnicity, gender, and age (Bradford, Jackson & Stanko, 2009; Dai & Johnson, 2009; Dai & Jiang, 2016). It was found that these characteristics are particularly important to study because they have a strong correlation with the likelihood of contact (Bradford, 2011; Dai & Jiang, 2016).

It has been noted that race is a critical demographic characteristic for determining public perceptions of the police (Schafer, Huebner, & Bynum, 2003; Bradford, Jackson & Stanko, 2009; Dai & Jiang, 2016). Early research found that a majority of the public had positive
perceptions of the police, but that Black people had significantly less positive perceptions, as compared to White people (Hahn, 1971; Smith & Hawkins, 1973; Schuck, Rosenbaum, & Hawkins, 2008). Skogan and Frydl (2004), found that the disproportionate contact minority citizens tend to have with the police made them feel targeted and caused them to question the legitimacy of law officials and the law. This also reduced the positive interactions minorities had with police officers. This can be partly attributed to the enforcement of laws in the United States, particularly the drugs laws. As mentioned before, almost 80 percent of people in federal prisons in the United States are Black or Latino, even though they only make up about 30 percent of the general population (Drug Alliance Policy, 2016). Since minorities are more likely to have police-initiated and negative contact, it may impact their perceptions of police in a negative way.

These findings are consistent with some prior research (Reisig & Parks, 2000), but other research has found that race may be confounded by social class and neighborhood characteristics (Dai & Johnson, 2009). From the results, it can be suggested that race interacts with the social context of the individual, which can produce a variety of opinions of the police (Dai & Jiang, 2016).

In addition to race, more recent studies have started to examine ethnic groups in their research (Dai & Jiang, 2016). These studies have found that Hispanic Americans’ perceptions of police officers varies (Brown & Benedict, 2002). According to Dai and Jiang (2016), Hispanic Americans are less likely to perceive bias from police officers than Black Americans, but both Hispanic Americans and Black Americans are more likely to believe that “racially biased policing exists, that the police provide worse service to black and Hispanic neighborhoods, and that police prejudice is a serious problem” (p. 33). This statement is consistent with Gabbidon and Higgon’s (2009) finding that Hispanic Americans and Black Americans believe the police
treat White Americans more fairly. Again, we see that the type of contact Hispanic American and Black Americans have with the police may impact their perceptions of police.

Another demographic characteristic that can influence perception of the police is sex. Overall, research has found that females tend to have more positive perceptions of the police than males, and that these differences could be due to the different ways males and females are treated by society, family, and the police (Dai & Jiang, 2016). However, Dai & Jiang (2016) noted that this difference between sexes has not always been consistent, as previous studies have found no effects (Reisig & Parks, 2000), some effects (Hurst & Frank, 2000), or strong effects (Skogan, 2005). Even though there is some debate as to how effective sex is as a predictor of individuals’ perception of the police, previous research indicates that males are more likely to perceive the police to be unfair (Pollock & Menard, 2015). Some of this can be attributed to the fact that males are more likely to be criminal offenders and victims of crime, so they are more likely to be in contact with the police.

In the studies that have examined age and perception of police, a positive relationship was found, because those who are younger tend to have less positive perceptions of the police (Reisig & Parks, 2000; Dai & Jiang, 2016). This can possibly be attributed to the amount of contact each age group has with police officers (Dai & Jiang, 2016), as it has been found that individuals aged 25 to 44 contact the police at higher rates when compared to those aged 16 to 24 and those aged 65 and older (Durose & Langton, 2013). The type of contact may also impact the relationship because it is more common for younger age groups to have negative contact with police (i.e. be arrested) (Murphy, 2009).
The Influence of Contact with Police on Perceptions of Police

The relationship between contact with police and perceptions of the police has been an important topic of criminal justice research (Brown & Benedict, 2002), considering contact between the public and the police has been found to predict perceptions of police officers (Cheurprakobkit, 2000). For many studies, the public’s contact with the police was divided into two broad categories of contact: voluntary contact (individual reached out to the police) and involuntary contact (the police reached out to the individual).

Individuals who voluntarily contact the police tend to have more positive interactions with the police and higher levels of satisfaction of the police, while individuals who have involuntary contact with the police tend to have more negative interactions with the police and lower levels of satisfaction of the police (Reisig & Stroshine, 2001; Skogan, 2005). This could be due, in part, to the fact that voluntary contact reinforces the support the police offer the public, while involuntary contact creates suspicion of the police, making the difference between the categories of contact more pronounced (Skogan, 2005).

Other studies have examined crime victims’ perceptions of police officers. In a study conducted by Murphy and Barkworth (2014), it was found that procedural justice was more important to victims than a favorable legal outcome, meaning that the way the police officer(s) handled their case was more important to the victims than a conviction in court. A similar study by Laxminarayn and Bosmans (2013) found that the level of satisfaction with each aspect of the procedure varies among victims, so each case needs to be treated on an individual basis. From these findings, it is clear that the way in which police officers handle a call or a case greatly influences a crime victim’s perception of the police.
The contact criminal offenders have with police officers can influence their perceptions of police officers. Myrstol and Hawk-Tourtelot (2011) found that the way the officers treated the offenders (arrestees) influenced their perceptions of police officers. They also found that police benevolence and police effectiveness were both important factors in influencing criminal offenders’ perceptions of the police. A very important discovery from this line of research is that, when people felt that law officials (i.e., police officers) treated them fairly, they were more likely to accept the authority of those law officials (Tyler, 2006).

In order to understand individuals’ perception of police officers Reisig and Stroshine (2001), proposed the use of the expectancy disconfirmation theory. This theory predicts that consumer satisfaction (i.e., those interacting with the police) is a response to the relationship between the consumer’s expectation and the actual performance/quality of the service (Reisig & Stroshine, 2001). Robinson and Stroshine (2005) found that this theory can be used for different types of crime and within different criminal justice systems, making it very valuable. This theory has been used to understand how satisfied the public is in regard to the quality of service expected and received from the police. For example, Robinson and Stroshine (2005) found that when victims’ expectations matched the outcome, they were significantly more likely to be satisfied than when police did not meet their expectations (Skogan, 2005).

The Current Study

The data collected through the Police-Public Contact Survey in 2011 was used in the current study, and allowed for the examination of the relationship between demographic characteristics and type of contact with police, demographic characteristics and perceptions of police, and type of contact with police and perceptions of police, as previously mentioned.
In their research, Pollock and Menard (2015) realized there is a gap in the research when it comes to using a national sample (especially in the United States) to study the relationship between demographic characteristics, types of contact with police, and perceptions of police. This is of particular importance because not all findings in the literature have been consistent, especially between recent studies that have used samples from national populations and older studies that have used samples from smaller populations. To understand if the findings from earlier studies are similar to what we would see in a national population, studies need to focus on national samples and compare them to the findings of studies that used smaller populations and studies that used national populations. The data from the Police-Public Contact Survey consists of a sample from the United States, which allowed for those comparisons.

This study consisted of three main parts. The first part examined demographic characteristics (independent variable) and contact with police (dependent variable), the second part examined demographic characteristics (independent variable) and perceptions of police officers (dependent variable), and the third part examined contact with police (independent variable) and perceptions of police officers (dependent variable). Due to the nature of the variables, crosstabulations were used to examine the relationships, and the chi-square test was used to determine significance of the relationship. Bivariate correlations were also run to test the significance of the relationships. It was hypothesized that:

1. There would be a significant relationship between all demographic characteristics and types of contact.
   a. Females would have higher reported rates of voluntary contact than males.
   b. Black Americans would have higher rates of being arrested than White Americans.
c. Those in younger age groups would have higher reported rates of being arrested.

d. Non-Hispanics would have more voluntary contact with police than those of Hispanic Origin.

e. Those who have a lower income would have higher reported rates of being arrested.

2. There would be a significant relationship between all demographic characteristics and perceptions of the police.

   a. Females would have higher reported positive perceptions of police than males.

   b. Black Americans would have lower positive perceptions of police than White Americans.

   c. There would be a positive relationship between age and perception of the police.

   d. Those who identified as non-Hispanic would have more positive perceptions of the police than those of Hispanic Origin.

   e. Those who have a higher income would have more positive perceptions of the police.

3. There would be a significant relationship between all types of contact and perceptions of the police.

   a. Those who had public-initiated contact would have a more positive perception of the police than those who had police-initiated contact.
Methods

Participants and Study Design

This study used secondary data from the 2011 Police-Public Contact Survey, which asked participants about their contact with police officers, individual demographic characteristics, outcomes of contact, and perceptions of police officers based on that contact. This data was collected as part of the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), which used computer-assisted telephone interviews (CATI), face-to-face interviews, and telephone interviews. Participants in the Police-Public Contact Survey were respondents to the National Crime Victimization Survey that were 16 years of age and older, and were surveyed during the last six months of 2011. The data collected is cross-sectional and was collected using a stratified, multistage cluster sampling design. For the Police-Public Contact Survey, 49,246 out of the 62,280 individuals eligible in the National Crime Victimization Survey were interviewed. A total of 13,034 non-respondents were excluded from the 2011 Police-Public Contact Survey as non-interviews (not available for the interview, refused to participate, and non-English speaking respondents) or as proxy interviews (representing household members who were unable to participate for physical, mental, or other reasons).

This sample is 47.6% male and 52.4% female; 41.5% make less than $20,00 (or the information was not available), 22.8% make $20,000 - $49,000, and 35.7% make $50,000 or more; 82.6% are White only, 10.6% are Black only, 0.5% are American Indian or Alaskan Native only, 4.8% are Asian only, 0.3% are Hawaiian/Pacific Islander Only, and 1.2% identify as mixed race; 14.1% identify as Hispanic; and 4.9% are age 16-18, 9.0% are age 19-24, 17.5% are age 25-35, 18.9% are age 36-46, 25.7% are age 47-60, 17.0% are age 61-75, and 6.9% are age 76-90.
Measurement

**Demographic Characteristics.** The demographic characteristics used in this study were age, sex, ethnicity, income and race. From the original age variable, which spanned from 16 to 90 years old, I created a new variable with the categories: 16-18 years old (those in the category are assigned a 1), 19-24 years old (those in the category are assigned a 2), 25-35 years old (those in the category are assigned a 3), 36-46 years old (those in the category are assigned a 4), 47-60 years old (those in the category are assigned a 5), 61-75 years old (those in the category are assigned a 6), and 76-90 years old (those in the category are assigned a 7). For each of these age categories, a dummy variable was also created so that a 0 indicates they are not in that category and a 1 indicates they are in that category.

From the original race variable, which included 20 categories of race, I created a new variable with the categories: White only (those in the category are assigned a 1), Black only (those in the category are assigned a 2), American Indian/Alaskan Native only (those in the category are assigned a 3), Asian only (those in the category are assigned a 4), Hawaiian/Pacific Islander only (those in the category are assigned a 5), and all others (those in the category are assigned a 0). The categories included were only those that contained one race because people who are of mixed race may resemble one race more than the other, introducing a confound when considering that races may be treated differently by police. The mixed-race categories were also not included because of the low response rate. For each of these race categories, a dummy variable was also created so that 0 indicates they are not in that category and a 1 indicates they are in that category.

For ethnicity, I used the variable Hispanic Origin, which originally had three categories – respondent is Hispanic (assigned a 1), respondent is not Hispanic (assigned a 2), and residue
(assigned a 3). From this, I created a dummy variable, so that those who did not identify as Hispanic were assigned a 0 and those who did identify as Hispanic were assigned a 1.

The original sex variable had two categories – male and female. In the original study, males were assigned a 1 and females were assigned a 2. For this study, a dummy variable was created, so that males were assigned a 0 and females were assigned a 1.

The original income variable had three categories - less than $20,000 or N/A (assigned a 1), $20,000 - $49,999 (assigned a 2), and $50,000 and above (assigned a 3). For this study, a dummy variable was created so that those in the category less than $20,000 or N/A were assigned a 0, those in the category $20,000 - $49,999 were assigned a 1, and those in the category $50,000 and above were assigned a 2.

**Contact with Police.** Contact with the police was measured using several of the screener questions in the original survey (all participants had the option to answer these questions). The first set of questions involved the contact that the public initiated with the police (voluntary contact) and included the variables: sought help from police in the last 12 months, reported non-emergency crime to the police, and participated in anti-crime programs with police.

The second set of questions involved contact the police initiated with the public (involuntary contact) and included the variables: stopped by the police in a public place (not vehicle), been stopped by the police while driving a motor vehicle, been the passenger in a motor vehicle that was stopped by the police, been involved in a traffic accident that was reported to the police, been arrested, and have been stopped or approached by the police in a way that was not mentioned.
For all nine types of contact, the original response options included: yes (assigned a 1), no (assigned a 2), refused (assigned an 8), don’t know (assigned a 9), and missing (assigned a -9). Dummy variables were created for these types of contact by recoding the categories so that a 0 indicated no and a 1 indicated yes. All other answers (don’t know, refused, missing) were coded as missing.

**Perceptions of Police.** For perceptions of police, the two variables used were: police behaved properly and treated respectfully by police. The original questions included the following response options: yes (assigned a 1), no (assigned a 2), don’t know (assigned a 3), refused to answer (assigned an 8), and missing (assigned a -9). Both variables were recoded so that a 0 indicated no and a 1 indicated yes. All other responses (don’t know, refused, missing) were coded as missing.
Results

The frequencies for types of contact with police and perceptions of police were run to gain a better understanding of the overall rates of contact and perception.

Table 1 displays the frequencies for all nine types of contact. The most frequent types of contact reported were: had been stopped by the police while driving a motor vehicle (10.3%), sought help from police in the last 12 months (8.2%), and reported non-crime emergency to police (5.3%). The least common type of contact was the category of been arrested (0.6%). Out of the public-initiated contacts, the most common contact was the category of sought help from police in the last 12 months (8.2%) and the least common contact was the category of participated in anti-crime program with police (1.5%). Out of the police-initiated contacts, the most common contact was the category of been stopped by the police while driving a motor vehicle (10.3%) and the least common contact was the category of been arrested (0.6%).

Table 2 displays the frequencies for the two variables for perceptions of police. For both police behaved properly and treated respectfully by police, a majority of participants reported that the officers did behave properly (91.6%) and they were treated respectfully (93.2%).

Demographic Characteristics and Contact with Police

Rates of Contact by Sex (Table 3). The relationship between sex and type of contact was significant for the contacts: sought help from police in the last 12 months, \(X^2 (1, N = 41505) = 8.640, p = .003\), stopped by the police in a public place – not vehicle, \(X^2 (1, N = 41469) = 51.660, p < .001\), been stopped by the police while driving a motor vehicle, \(X^2 (1, N = 41457) = 173.544, p < .001\), been a passenger in a motor vehicle that was stopped by the police \(X^2 (1, N = \ldots\)
41457) = 14.679, \( p < .001 \), been arrested \( \chi^2 (1, N = 41450) = 39.844, p < .001 \), and stopped or approached by the police in the last 12 months – other, \( \chi^2 (1, N = 41447) = 9.720, p = .002 \).

A higher percentage of females reported having all three types of public-initiated contact (for sought help from police in the last 12 months, 7.8% male and 8.6% female; for reported non-crime emergency to police, 5.1% male and 5.3% female; for participated in anti-crime programs with police, 1.5% male and 2.6% female). Within the six types of contact initiated by the police officers, a higher percentage of males reported having been stopped by the police in a public place - not vehicle (1.5% male and 0.7% female), been stopped by the police while driving a motor vehicle (12.4% male and 8.5% female) been arrested (0.8% male and 0.4% female), and been stopped or approached by the police in the last 12 months - other (1.8% male and 1.4% female).

The bivariate correlations were consistent with the significance shown in the chi-square tests (Table 8). There was a positive correlation between sex and all three of the public-initiated contact variables (for sought help from the police in the past 12 months, \( r(41505) = .014, p = .003 \); for reported non-crime emergency to police, \( r(41496) = .005, p = .340 \); for participated in anti-crime programs with police, \( r(41484) = .003, p = .546 \).

**Rates of Contact by Race (Table 4).** For participated in anti-crime programs with police, 2 cells were below the minimum expected count of 1.79; for stopped by police in a public place – not vehicle, 2 cells were below the expected count of 5, and 1 cell was below the expected count of 1.26; for been involved in a traffic accident that was reported to the police, 1 cell was below the minimum expected count of 3.46; and for been arrested, 2 cells were below the expected count of 5, but above the minimum expected count of 0.69.
The relationship between race and type of contact was found to be significant for the contacts: sought help from police in the last 12 months, $X^2 (5, N = 41505) = 74.005, p < .001$, reported non-crime emergency to the police, $X^2 (5, N = 41496) = 32.696, p < .001$, participated in anti-crime programs with police, $X^2 (5, N = 41484) = 17.430, p = .004$, stopped by police in a public place – not vehicle, $X^2 (5, N = 41469) = 15.328, p = .009$, been stopped by the police while driving a motor vehicle, $X^2 (5, N = 41457) = 24.282, p < .001$, been the passenger in a motor vehicle that was stopped by the police, $X^2 (5, N = 41457) = 20.641, p = .001$, been arrested, $X^2 (5, N = 41450) = 73.649, p < .001$, and been stopped or approached by the police in the last 12 months – others, $X^2 (5, N = 41447) = 17.167, p = .004$.

The types of contact that had high reported rates across all races were: sought help from police in the last 12 months (8.4% White only, 7.6% Black only, 15.1% American Indian/Alaskan Native only, 4.6% Asian only, 11.2% Hawaiian/Pacific Islander only, 14.4% all others), reported non-crime emergency to police (5.4% White only, 4.5% Black only, 5.0% American Indian/Alaskan Native only, 3.1% Asian only, 5.2% Hawaiian/Pacific Islander only, 8.3% all others), and been stopped by the police while driving a motor vehicle (10.3% White only, 11.0% Black only, 14.2% American Indian/Alaskan Native only, 8.3% Asian only, 12.9% Hawaiian/Pacific Islander only, 14.6% all others). For White only, the most common type of contact was the category of been stopped by the police while driving a motor vehicle (10.3%) and the least common type was the category of been arrested (0.5%); for Black only, the most common type of contact was the category of been stopped by the police while driving a motor vehicle (11.0%) and the least common type was the category of been arrested (1.2%); for American Indian/Alaskan Native only, the most common type of contact was the category of sought help from police in the last 12 months (15.1%) and the least common type was the
category of participated in anti-crime programs with police (0.5%); for Asian only, the most common type of contact was the category of been stopped by the police while driving a motor vehicle (8.3%) and the least common type was the category of been arrested (0.2%); for Hawaiian/Pacific Islander only, the most common type of contact was the category of been stopped by the police while driving a motor vehicle (12.9%) and the least common type was the category of been stopped by police in a public place – not vehicle (0.0%).

There were a few differences between the significance found in the bivariate correlations and the chi-square test of significance for the crosstabulations (Table 8). The bivariate correlations showed no significant relationship between race and stopped by police in a public place – not vehicle, \( r(41469) = -.008, p = .109 \), been stopped by the police while driving a motor vehicle, \( r(41457) = -.008, p = .108 \), and been the passenger in a motor vehicle that was stopped by the police \( r(41457) = -.005, p = .295 \). These differences may be because the nominal variables were treated as interval variables through the use of the dummy variables.

**Rates of Contact by Age (Table 5).** The relationship between age and type of contact was found to be significant for all nine types of contact (for sought help from police in the last 12 months, \( X^2 (6, N = 41505) = 222.867, p < .001 \); for reported non-crime emergency to the police, \( X^2 (6, N= 41496) = 85.307, p < .001 \); for participated in anti-crime programs with police, \( X^2 (6, N= 41484) = 64.255, p < .001 \); for stopped by police in a public place – not vehicle, \( X^2 (6, N = 41469) = 265.953, p < .001 \); for been stopped by the police while driving a motor vehicle, \( X^2 (6, N = 41457) = 771.952, p < .001 \); for been the passenger in a motor vehicle that was stopped by the police, \( X^2 (6, N = 41457) = 639.020, p < .001 \); for been involved in a traffic accident that was reported to the police, \( X^2 (6, N = 41450) = 113.891, p < .001 \); for been arrested, \( X^2 (6, N = 41450) = 186.635, p < .001 \); and been stopped or approached by the police in the last 12 months
– other, $X^2 (6, N = 41447) = 30.748, p < .001$). Within the public-initiated contact, those aged 16-18 and 76-90 tended to have lower contact rates. For the contact categories of had been stopped by the police while driving a motor vehicle, been the passenger in a motor vehicle that was stopped by the police, been involved in a traffic accident that was reported to the police, and been arrested, there is a bell-shaped curve in the reported contact rates – the younger groups and older groups had lower rates of contact, and the middle age groups had higher rates of contact.

The bivariate correlations were consistent with the significance shown in the chi-square test of significance for the crosstabulations (Table 8).

**Rates of Contact by Hispanic Origin (Table 6).** The relationship between ethnicity (Hispanic Origin) and type of contact was found to be significant for the contacts: sought help from police in the last 12 months, $X^2 (1, N = 41505) = 5.983, p = .014$, reported non-crime emergency to the police, $X^2 (1, N = 41496) = 25.846, p < .001$, participated in anti-crime programs with police, $X^2 (1, N = 41484) = 7.445, p = .006$, stopped by police in a public place – not vehicle, $X^2 (1, N = 41469) = 11.013, p = .001$, been involved in a traffic accident that was reported to the police, $X^2 (1, N = 41450) = 14.583, p < .001$, and been arrested, $X^2 (1, N = 41450) = 7.888, p = .005$.

For all the public-initiated contacts, people of Hispanic Origin had lower rates of contact with police (for sought help from police in the last 12 months, 8.4% non-Hispanic and 7.3% Hispanic Origin; for reported non-crime emergency to the police, 5.5% non-Hispanic and 3.7% Hispanic Origin; and participated in anti-crime programs with police, 1.6% non-Hispanic and 1.1% Hispanic Origin). For the police-initiated contacts, those of Hispanic Origin had higher rates of contact for the contact categories of had been stopped by the public in a public place – not vehicle (1.0% non-Hispanic and 1.5% Hispanic Origin), been the passenger in a motor
vehicle that was stopped by police (2.7% non-Hispanic and 2.9% Hispanic Origin), been arrested (0.6% non-Hispanic and 0.9% Hispanic Origin), and been stopped or approached by the police in the last 12 months – other (1.6% non-Hispanic and 1.8% Hispanic Origin).

The bivariate correlations were consistent with the significance shown in the chi-square tests (Table 8). There was a negative relationship between Hispanic Origin and all three public-initiated contact variables (for sought help from the police in the last 12 months, $r(41505) = -0.012, p = .014$; for reported non-crime emergency to police, $r(41496) = -0.025, p < .001$; and for participated in anti-crime programs with police, $r(41484) = -0.013, p = .006$).

**Rates of Contact by Income (Table 7).** The relationship between income and type of contact was found to be significant for all nine types of contact (for sought help from police in the last 12 months, $X^2 (2, N = 41505) = 34.593, p < .001$; for reported non-crime emergency to the police, $X^2 (2, N = 41496) = 164.235, p < .001$; for participated in anti-crime programs with police, $X^2 (2, N = 41484) = 43.345, p < .001$; for stopped by police in a public place – not vehicle, $X^2 (2, N = 41469) = 9.461, p = .009$; for been stopped by the police while driving a motor vehicle, $X^2 (2, N = 41457) = 179.595, p < .001$; for been the passenger in a motor vehicle that was stopped by the police, $X^2 (2, N = 41457) = 31.301, p < .001$; for been involved in a traffic accident that was reported to the police, $X^2 (2, N = 41450) = 30.634, p < .001$; for been arrested, $X^2 (2, N = 41450) = 30.689, p < .001$; and been stopped or approached by the police in the last 12 months – other, $X^2 (2, N = 41447) = 16.077, p < .001$). For the contact categories of reported non-crime emergency to police, participated in an anti-crime program with police, been stopped by the police while driving a motor vehicle, and been involved in a traffic accident that was reported to the police, there appears to be a positive relationship between the variables (as income increases, the rate of contact increases).
For the contact category of been arrested, there appears to be a negative relationship (as income increases, rate of contact decreases). For the contact categories of sought help from police in the last 12 months, stopped by the police in a public place – not vehicle, been the passenger in a motor vehicle that was stopped by the police, and been stopped or approached by the police in the last 12 months – other, there appears to be a bell-shape curve in the reported rates, as the income categories less than $20,000 or N/A and $50,000 and above reported higher rates of contact than the income category $20,000 - $49,999.

There was one difference between the bivariate correlations and the chi-square test – the bivariate correlations did not indicate a significant relationship between income and stopped by police in a public place – not vehicle, \( r(41469) = -.009, p = .066 \) (Table 8). There was a positive relationship between income and all types of public-initiated contact (for sought help from the police in the last 12 months, \( r(41505) = .024, p < .001 \); for reported non-crime emergency to police, \( r(41496) = .062, p < .001 \); and for participated in anti-crime program with police, \( r(41484) = .030, p < .001 \).

Demographic Characteristics and Perceptions of Police

Perception of Police by Sex (Table 9). Females reported slightly higher rates for the police behaving properly (91.2% males and 92.1% females) and being treated respectfully by police (92.6% males and 93.7% females). For police behaved properly and sex the chi-square test did not show significance, \( X^2 (1, N = 9991) = 2.929, p = .087 \), but the relationship between treated respectfully by police and sex was found to be significant, \( X^2 (1, N = 10041) = 5.160, p = .023 \).
The bivariate correlations were consistent with the results found with the chi-square test of significance (Table 14). The results also showed a positive correlation between sex and both perception variables (for police behave properly, \( r(9991) = .017, p = .087 \); and for treated respectfully by police, \( r(10041) = .023, p = .023 \)).

**Perception of Police by Race** (Table 10). The relationship between police behaved properly and race was found to be significant, \( X^2 (5, N = 9991) = 22.055, p = .001 \). In the crosstabulation for police behaved properly and race, there was 1 cell less than 5, but more than the minimum expected count of 2.76. Those that identified as Black only (87.8%) reported the lowest rate for the police behaving properly during their contact, while Asian only (92.6%) and White only (92.1%) reported the highest rates.

The relationship between treated respectfully by police and race was also found to be significant, \( X^2 (5, N = 10041) = 14.140, p = .015 \). In the crosstabulation for treated respectfully by police and race, there were 2 cells less than 5, and 1 of those cells had less than the minimum expected count of 2.25. For this variable, people who identified as Black only (90.4%) reported the lowest rate for being treated respectfully by the police, while Asian Only (93.9%), Hawaiian/Pacific Islander Only (93.9%), and White only (93.5%) reported the highest rates.

The bivariate correlations did not indicate a significant relationship between police behaved properly and race, \( r(9991) = -.017, p = .094 \), or between treated respectfully by police and race, \( r(10041) = -.012, p = .220 \), which was not consistent with the results found in the crosstabulations (Table 14). These differences may be because the variables were treated as interval instead of nominal.
Perception of Police by Age (Table 11). The relationship between police behaved properly and age, $X^2 (6, N = 9991) = 37.973, p < .001$, and the relationship between treated respectfully by police and age, $X^2 (6, N = 10041) = 54.461, p < .001$, were both found to be significant. For police behaved properly, there appeared to be a positive relationship with age, which drops off after ages 61-75. There also appeared to be a positive relationship between treated respectfully by police and age (though the rate for ages 16-18 is slightly higher than the rate for ages 19-24), which drops off after ages 61-75.

The bivariate correlations revealed a positive and significant relationship between police behaved properly and age, $r(9991) = .050, p < .001$, and treated respectfully by police and age, $r(10041) = .070, p < .001$ (Table 14).

Perception of Police by Hispanic Origin (Table 12). The relationship between police behaved properly and Hispanic Origin, $X^2 (1, N = 9991) = 8.922, p = .003$, and the relationship between treated respectfully by police and Hispanic Origin, $X^2 (1, N = 10041) = 13.022, p < .001$, were both found to be significant. Those who identified as being Hispanic reported lower rates for police behaving properly during contact (89.2% Hispanic and 91.9% non-Hispanic) and for being treated respectfully by police (90.6% Hispanic and 93.5% non-Hispanic), when compared to those who did not identify as Hispanic.

The bivariate correlations revealed a negative and significant relationship between police behaved properly and Hispanic Origin $r(9991) = -.030, p = .003$, and treated respectfully by police and Hispanic Origin, $r(10041) = -.036, p < .001$ (Table 14).

Perception of Police by Income (Table 13). The relationship between police behaved properly and income, $X^2 (2, N = 9991) = 28.187, p < .001$, and the relationship between treated
respectfully by police and income, \( X^2 (2, N = 10041) = 40.086, p < .001 \), were both found to be significant. There appeared to be a positive relationship for both police behaved properly and income, and treated respectfully by police and income.

The bivariate correlations revealed a positive and significant relationship between police behaved properly and income, \( r(9991) = .050, p < .001 \), and treated respectfully by police and income, \( r(10041) = .060, p < .001 \) (Table 14).

**Contact with Police and Perceptions of Police (Table 15)**

There was a significant relationship between reported non-crime emergency to the police, \( X^2 (1, N = 9990) = 20.690, p < .001 \), stopped by police in a public place – not vehicle, \( X^2 (1, N = 9991) = 90.790, p < .001 \), been stopped by the police while driving a motor vehicle, \( X^2 (1, N = 9990) = 20.903, p < .001 \), been involved in a traffic accident that was reported to the police, \( X^2 (1, N = 9990) = 11.243, p = .001 \), been arrested, \( X^2 (1, N = 9990) = 91.899, p < .001 \), and been stopped or approached by the police in the last 12 months – other, \( X^2 (1, N = 9990) = 13.291, p < .001 \), and the perception variable police behaved properly. Those who had been arrested (74.6%) reported the lowest rates for the police behaving properly during their contact, while those who reported a non-crime emergency to police (94.1%) and had been involved in a traffic accident that was reported to the police (94.2%) reported the highest rates.

There was a significant relationship between sought help from police in the last 12 months, \( X^2 (1, N = 10040) = 4.873, p = .027 \), reported non-crime emergency to the police, \( X^2 (1, N = 10040) = 41.831, p < .001 \), stopped by police in a public place – not vehicle, \( X^2 (1, N = 10041) = 109.879, p < .001 \), been stopped by the police while driving a motor vehicle, \( X^2 (1, N = 10040) = 50.894, p < .001 \), been the passenger in a motor vehicle that was stopped by the police,
$X^2 (1, N = 10041) = 6.983, p = .008$, been involved in a traffic accident that was reported the police, $X^2 (1, N = 10040) = 16.103, p < .001$, been arrested, $X^2 (1, N = 10040) = 192.720, p < .001$, and been stopped or approached by the police in the last 12 months – other, $X^2 (1, N = 10040) = 13.875, p < .001$, and the perception variable treated respectfully by police. Those who had been arrested (70.6%) reported the lowest rates for the police treating them respectfully during their contact, and those who reported non-crime emergency to police (96.3%) and had been involved in a traffic accident that was reported to the police (95.9%) reported the highest rates.

All the relationships that were found to be significant in the crosstabulations were also found to be significant in the bivariate correlations (Table 16). The correlations revealed that people who had public-initiated contact were more likely to report that police behaved properly and that they were treated respectfully by police.
Discussion

The purpose of this study was to expand on the literature that examined the relationship between demographic characteristics, contact with police, and perceptions of the police. Most of the previous literature focused on smaller populations (often just a specific community or city), and the small amount of literature that did use national populations tended to use populations outside of the United States. Overall, the findings of this study supported the results from in the previous studies, which indicates that the patterns previously found in smaller samples could also be found in a national sample.

From the analysis of the relationship between demographic characteristics and perceptions of police, the findings suggest a difference in how certain groups of people are likely to come into contact with the police. It was found that women were more likely to have public-initiated contact. Women may be more likely to initiate contact with police because they are not as likely to have negative perceptions of police, which has been linked to involuntary contact with the police. So, they are less likely to have involuntary contact with the police and more likely to have positive perceptions of the police, which leads them to be more willing to voluntarily engage with the police. The results indicated that Black Americans had higher rates of being arrested than White Americans. When considering the history of the racism and discrimination in the United States, it makes sense that different races vary in how they encounter the police. As mentioned earlier, Black Americans make up a disproportionate percentage of those who had been arrested for drug offenses (Drug Alliance Policy, 2016). From this finding, we see that Black Americans are being arrested at higher rates than White Americans, indicating a possible bias in the system. Younger age groups reported higher rates of arrest than older age groups. From this finding, it appears that those in younger age groups may
have more negative contact with the police (Murphy, 2009), which may influence their
derception of the police and willingness to contact them in the future. This study also revealed a
negative correlation between the three types of public-initiated contact and Hispanic Origin. This
indicates that Non-Hispanics are more likely to have public-initiated contact than those of
Hispanic Origin. This is consistent with the research conducted by Durose and Langton (2013),
who reported that more non-Hispanic White people contacted the police for assistance as
compared to Hispanic people. This can be attributed to the fact that Hispanic Americans believe
that the police treated White Americans more fairly (Gabbidon and Higgon, 2009), which can
lead to Hispanic Americans being less likely to initiate police contact. Finally, those with lower
incomes reported higher rates of being arrested than those with higher incomes. From this, it
seems that those who have lower incomes may have more negative contact with the police,
which may influence their perceptions of the police and future contact with police.

From the analysis of the relationship between demographic characteristics and
perceptions of the police, the findings indicate that individuals with certain characteristics may
be more likely to have positive perceptions of the police than others. The analyses revealed that
females had higher reported positive perceptions of the police, supporting previous research,
which found that women tend to have more positive perceptions of the police than men (Dai &
Jiang, 2016). Black Americans had lower positive perceptions of police than White Americans,
which could be due, partly, to the fact that Black Americans had higher reported rates of being
arrested, a form of police-initiated contact that has been linked to less positive perceptions of the
police. There was also a positive relationship between age and the perception of the police,
indicating that those in the older age categories had more positive perceptions of the police. In
previous studies that have examined age and perception of police, an overall positive relationship
was found between age and perception of police, as those who are younger tend to have less positive perceptions of police officers (Reisig & Parks, 2000; Dai & Jiang, 2016). Those who identified as non-Hispanic had more positive perceptions of the police than those who identified as Hispanic. This finding could be the result of the fact the Hispanic Americans believe that police treat White Americans more fairly (Gabbidon and Higgons, 2009), influencing how they may interact and perceive the police. Those who had a higher income reported having more positive perceptions of the police than those with lower incomes. This could be because those with lower incomes were more likely to have been arrested, creating a less positive perception of the police.

In the analysis of the relationship between contact with police and perceptions of the police, it was found that certain types of contact were correlated with more positive perceptions of the police. In this study, those who had public-initiated contact reported more positive perceptions of police than those who had police-initiated contact. This is consistent with previous studies, which found that individuals who voluntarily contact the police have more positive interactions with the police and higher levels of satisfaction, while individuals who have involuntary contact with the police have more negative interactions with police and lower levels of satisfaction (Reisig & Stroshine, 2001; Skogan, 2005).

In looking at the previous literature and results from this study, there seems to be an interaction between demographic characteristics, types of contact, and perceptions of the police. This interaction may occur because certain groups of people are more likely to be in contact with the police in different ways, which can influence their perception of the police. The perception of police may also influence how people come into contact with the police (i.e. a more positive perception of police may make an individual more likely to call the police). From this research, it
seems that we are able to determine the presence of a relationship, but it may be hard to
determine cause and effect because the three variables of interest influence each other in
different ways.

Limitations

The current study was not able to use all the types of contact or perceptions variables
collected in the original data because only a small number of people responded to most of those
questions, which did not allow for a reliable test of significance (started out with 49,246
participants, but that number decreased after the screener questions). Even though the
relationships between the variables were still able to be tested for significance, a considerable
number of participants were lost, which could impact the results of the study.

The original study used a stratified, multistage cluster sampling design, and implemented
weights so that the sample would be representative of the United States population. The current
study was unable to correct for the complex sampling design, so the sample used may not have
been representative of the United States population. For that reason, the results may not be
generalizable to the entire population.

The data collected focused on the most recent contact participants had with the police,
but participants may have previously had multiple incidents of the same type of contact and/or
different types of contact that could have influenced their perception of police. In addition, the
individual demographic characteristics and type of contact with police both seem to influence
perceptions of police, but the current study was not able to determine the true direction of the
relationship (if there is one) or which was the better predictor of perceptions of the police.
Finally, previous research indicates that the demographic characteristics may confound each other (i.e. race and income), so it is difficult to determine the contribution of each variable to the relationship between demographic characteristics and types of contact with police or the relationship between demographic characteristics and perceptions of police. The current study examined the overall patterns, but did not untangle the effects of individual variables from each other.

**Conclusion**

The nature of the job requires police officers to regularly be in contact with the public. In order for the police to do their jobs effectively and efficiently, is it necessary for them to have some degree of positive interactions with the public (Brandl & Horvath, 1991). These positive interactions have been associated to higher levels of confidence and trust in the police, which are related to the increase in public cooperation with the police and compliance with the law (Bradford, 2011).

In addition to the public cooperating with the police and compliance with the law, previous research has also found that public satisfaction with police is important for the police to consider because it can impact officer safety (Myrstol & Hawk-Tourtelot, 2011). Positive interactions increase the likelihood that people will be willing to accept police decisions and comply with the officer’s directions/orders. The increased levels of compliance may increase officer and public safety, as officers would not need to resort to coercive control tactics, which puts the officer(s) and the public at risk for injury (Myrstol & Hawk-Tourtelot, 2011). Public satisfaction with the police can make policing easier and safer, for both the police and the public.

If the police officers are more aware of who they are likely to have contact with, what type of contact they are likely to have, and a general idea of how people perceive them, they can
work to enhance those interactions and perceptions. Programs should be designed by police departments that aim to foster positive interactions between police officers and the public, such as community events or meetings. In order to make positive changes in the relationship between the public and the police, these programs would need to include people from all groups, not just the ones that are likely to have most positive or voluntary contact to begin with. In creating setting that allows for positive interactions, the public’s satisfaction with police officers should increase, making the police officers’ job easier and safer.

As previously mentioned, there is a gap in the research when it comes to using a sample from a national population to study the relationship between demographic characteristics, contact with the police, and perceptions of the police (Pollock & Menard, 2015). Pollock and Menard (2015) also noted that there may be a difference between the findings of studies using smaller populations and the studies using national populations. This study did not find differences but future researchers should continue to analyze national data, so that it can be determined if there are differences and what those differences look like.

Prior research found that some of the demographic characteristics may confound each other in the analyses, and it is important to understand how much of each variable accounts for what we see in the dependent variables (contact and perception). Future research should also strive to use multivariate analysis, which would allow them to separate out the effects of each variable and make more definitive conclusions about the relationships.

Finally, future research should examine any community programs that police departments may design to encourage positive interactions. It would be important to know if these programs help to create a more positive perception of police. They should also examine whether or not the
positive interactions at these programs are enough to offset possible negative interactions in the past.

Overall, the findings of this study add to our current understanding of perceptions of police officers, as the results were consistent with previous literature, demonstrating that studies that used samples from smaller populations are similar to a study that used a sample from a national population. These results also show that there appears to be a complicated relationship between demographic characteristics, types of contact with police and perceptions. Much more research is still needed in order to fully understand the relationship between the police and the public, but examining national data has put us another step closer to doing so.
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Table 1

Rates of Contact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Contact</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sought help from police in the last 12 months</td>
<td>3415 (8.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported non-crime emergency to police</td>
<td>2179 (5.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in anti-crime programs with police</td>
<td>640 (1.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stopped by police in a public place – not vehicle</td>
<td>449 (1.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been stopped by the police while driving a motor vehicle</td>
<td>4281 (10.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been the passenger in a motor vehicle that was stopped by the police</td>
<td>1126 (2.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been involved in a traffic accident that was reported to the police</td>
<td>1235 (3.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been arrested</td>
<td>246 (0.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you been stopped or approached by the police in the last 12 months - other</td>
<td>663 (1.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

*Rates of Perception of Police Officers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of Police</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police behaved properly</td>
<td>9156 (91.6%)</td>
<td>835 (8.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated respectfully by police</td>
<td>9357 (93.2%)</td>
<td>684 (6.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

*Crosstabulation of Sex and Contact*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Contact</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sought help from police in the last 12 months</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>8.640**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported non-crime emergency to police</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in anti-crime programs with police</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stopped by police in a public place – not vehicle</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>51.660***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been stopped by the police while driving a motor vehicle</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>173.544***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been the passenger in a motor vehicle that was stopped by the police</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>14.679***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been involved in a traffic accident that was reported to the police</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been arrested</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>39.844***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you been stopped or approached by the police in the last 12 months - other</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>9.720**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001*
### Table 4

**Crosstabulation of Race and Contact**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Contact</th>
<th>White Only</th>
<th>Black Only</th>
<th>American Indian, Alaskan Native Only</th>
<th>Asian Only</th>
<th>Hawaiian/Pacific Islander Only</th>
<th>All others</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sought help from police in the last 12 months</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>74.005***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported non-crime emergency to police</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>32.696***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in anti-crime programs with police</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>17.430**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stopped by police in a public place – not vehicle</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>15.328**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been stopped by the police while driving a motor vehicle</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>24.282***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been the passenger in a motor vehicle that was stopped by the police</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>20.641***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been involved in a traffic accident that was reported to the police</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>6.639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been arrested</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>73.649***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you been stopped or approached by the police in the last 12 months - other</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>17.167**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001
Table 5

*Crosstabulation of Age and Contact*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Contact</th>
<th>16-18</th>
<th>19-24</th>
<th>25-35</th>
<th>36-46</th>
<th>47-60</th>
<th>61-75</th>
<th>76-90</th>
<th>χ²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sought help from police in the last 12 months</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>222.867***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported non-crime emergency to police</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>85.307***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in anti-crime programs with police</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>64.255***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stopped by police in a public place – not vehicle</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>265.953***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been stopped by the police while driving a motor vehicle</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>771.952***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been the passenger in a motor vehicle that was stopped by the police</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>639.020***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been involved in a traffic accident that was reported to the police</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>113.891***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been arrested</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>186.635***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you been stopped or approached by the police in the last 12 months - other</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>30.748***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001
Table 6

*Crosstabulation of Hispanic Origin and Contact*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Contact</th>
<th>Hispanic Origin</th>
<th>Not Hispanic</th>
<th>(\chi^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sought help from police in the last 12 months</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>5.983*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported non-crime emergency to police</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>25.846***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in anti-crime programs with police</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>7.445***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stopped by police in a public place – not vehicle</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>11.013***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been stopped by the police while driving a motor vehicle</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been the passenger in a motor vehicle that was stopped by the police</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been involved in a traffic accident that was reported to the police</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>14.583***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been arrested</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>7.888**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you been stopped or approached by the police in the last 12 months - other</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>.921</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001\)
Table 7

*Crosstabulation of Income and Contact*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Contact</th>
<th>Less than $20,000 or N/A</th>
<th>$20,000 - $49,999</th>
<th>$50,000 and above</th>
<th>$^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sought help from police in the last 12 months</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>34.593***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported non-crime emergency to police</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>164.235***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in anti-crime programs with police</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>43.345***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stopped by police in a public place – not vehicle</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>9.461**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been stopped by the police while driving a motor vehicle</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>179.595***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been the passenger in a motor vehicle that was stopped by the police</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>31.301***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been involved in a traffic accident that was reported to the police</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>30.634***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been arrested</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>30.689***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you been stopped or approached by the police in the last 12 months - other</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>16.077***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001*
### Table 8

*Correlations Between Demographic Characteristics and Contact*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Contact</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Hispanic Origin</th>
<th>Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sought help from police in the last 12 months</td>
<td>.014**</td>
<td>- .026**</td>
<td>-.028**</td>
<td>-.012*</td>
<td>.024**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported non-crime emergency to police</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.025**</td>
<td>-.022**</td>
<td>-.025**</td>
<td>.062**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in anti-crime programs with police</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.015**</td>
<td>.031**</td>
<td>-.013**</td>
<td>.030**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stopped by police in a public place – not vehicle</td>
<td>-.035**</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>-.074**</td>
<td>.016**</td>
<td>-.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been stopped by the police while driving a motor vehicle</td>
<td>-.065**</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>-.111**</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.066**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been the passenger in a motor vehicle that was stopped by the police</td>
<td>.019**</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>-.112*</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.020**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been involved in a traffic accident that was reported to the police</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>-.049**</td>
<td>-.019**</td>
<td>.025**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been arrested</td>
<td>-.031**</td>
<td>.010*</td>
<td>-.057**</td>
<td>.014**</td>
<td>-.026**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you been stopped or approached by the police in the last 12 months - other</td>
<td>-.015**</td>
<td>-.011*</td>
<td>-.025**</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.015**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** correlation significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed), * correlation significant at 0.05 level (2 tailed)
Table 9

*Crosstabulation of Sex and Perception of Police*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of Police</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police behaved properly (yes)</td>
<td>91.2%</td>
<td>92.1%</td>
<td>2.929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated respectfully by police (yes)</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
<td>93.7%</td>
<td>5.160*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001*
Table 10

*Crosstabulation of Race and Perception of Police*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of Police</th>
<th>White Only</th>
<th>Black Only</th>
<th>American Indian, Alaskan Native Only</th>
<th>Asian Only</th>
<th>Hawaiian/Pacific Islander Only</th>
<th>All others</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police behaved properly (yes)</td>
<td>92.1%</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
<td>90.8%</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>22.055***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated respectfully by police (yes)</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
<td>90.4%</td>
<td>92.4%</td>
<td>93.9%</td>
<td>93.9%</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
<td>14.140*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001
Table 11

*Crosstabulation of Age and Perception of Police*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of Police</th>
<th>16-18</th>
<th>19-24</th>
<th>25-35</th>
<th>36-46</th>
<th>47-60</th>
<th>61-75</th>
<th>76-90</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police behaved properly (yes)</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
<td>90.1%</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>91.1%</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
<td>94.5%</td>
<td>37.973***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated respectfully by police (yes)</td>
<td>91.3%</td>
<td>90.1%</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
<td>92.8%</td>
<td>93.9%</td>
<td>96.5%</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td>54.461***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001
Table 12
*Crosstabulation of Hispanic Origin and Perception of Police*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of Police</th>
<th>Yes (Hispanic)</th>
<th>No (Either not Hispanic or N/A)</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police behaved properly (yes)</td>
<td>89.2%</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
<td>8.922**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated respectfully by police (yes)</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
<td>13.022***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001*
Table 13

*Crosstabulation of Income and Perception of Police*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of Police</th>
<th>Less than $20,000 or N/A</th>
<th>$20,000 - $49,999</th>
<th>$50,000 and above</th>
<th>$^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police behaved properly (yes)</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
<td>92.2%</td>
<td>92.8%</td>
<td>28.187***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated respectfully by police (yes)</td>
<td>90.8%</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td>94.5%</td>
<td>40.086***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001*
Table 14

*Correlations Between Demographic Characteristics and Perception of Police*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptions of Police</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Hispanic Origin</th>
<th>Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police behaved properly</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>.050**</td>
<td>-.030**</td>
<td>.050**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated respectfully by police</td>
<td>.023*</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.070**</td>
<td>-.036**</td>
<td>.060**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** correlation significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed), * correlation significant at 0.05 level (2 tailed)
Table 15

Crosstabulation of Contact and Perception of Police (All contacts combined)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of police</th>
<th>Sought help from police in the last 12 months</th>
<th>Reported non-crime emergency to police</th>
<th>Participated in anti-crime programs with police</th>
<th>Stopped by police in a public place – not vehicle</th>
<th>Been stopped by the police while driving a motor vehicle</th>
<th>Been the passenger in a motor vehicle that was stopped by the police</th>
<th>Been involved in a traffic accident that was reported to the police</th>
<th>Been arrested</th>
<th>Have you been stopped or approached by the police in the last 12 months - other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police behaved properly (yes)</td>
<td>91.5%</td>
<td>94.1***</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
<td>79.2***</td>
<td>90.2***</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>94.2***</td>
<td>74.6***</td>
<td>87.8***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated respectfully by police (yes)</td>
<td>94.0*</td>
<td>96.3***</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
<td>80.7***</td>
<td>91.1***</td>
<td>91.3*</td>
<td>95.9***</td>
<td>70.6***</td>
<td>89.6***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001
Table 16
Correlations Between Contact and Perception of Police

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of police</th>
<th>Sought help from police in the last 12 months</th>
<th>Reported non-crime emergency to police</th>
<th>Participated in anti-crime programs with police</th>
<th>Stopped by police in a public place – not vehicle</th>
<th>Been stopped by the police while driving a motor vehicle</th>
<th>Been the passenger in a motor vehicle that was stopped by the police</th>
<th>Been involved in a traffic accident that was reported to the police</th>
<th>Been arrested</th>
<th>Have you been stopped or approached by the police in the last 12 months - other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police behaved properly (yes)</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.046**</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.095**</td>
<td>-.046**</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.034**</td>
<td>-.096**</td>
<td>-.036**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated respectfully by police (yes)</td>
<td>.022**</td>
<td>.065**</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>-.105**</td>
<td>-.071**</td>
<td>-.026**</td>
<td>.040**</td>
<td>-.139**</td>
<td>-.037**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** correlation significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed), * correlation significant at 0.05 level (2 tailed)