1-1-2011

Racial Profiling Policy and its Relation to Pro-Active Policing

Bradley R. Anders
Walden University

Walden University

College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Bradley Anders

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee
Dr. Barbara Benoliel, Committee Chairperson, Human Services Faculty
Dr. Gregory Hickman, Committee Member, Human Services Faculty
Dr. Donna Sheperis, University Reviewer, Human Services Faculty

Chief Academic Officer
Eric Riedel, Ph.D.

Walden University
2013

Abstract

Racial Profiling Policy and its Relation to Proactive Policing

by

Bradley R. Anders

MCJ, Boston University, 2007

BS, Central Missouri State University, 2002

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Criminal Justice

Walden University

December 2013

Abstract

To address the primary problem of racial profiling by police, many states have passed legislation that require police departments to collect demographic data on those with whom the officer comes into contact; these data are later evaluated by supervisors. The problem lies in the possibility for police officers to disengage, or *depolice*, when faced with data collection policies that may be viewed as lessening the officer's discretion. It was this potential to depolice as related to policy interpretation that formed the conceptual framework for this study. As a result, implementation of racial profiling policies may negatively impact the very minorities they are designed to protect. The purpose of this exploratory study was to identify and analyze the possible correlationship between statutory racial data tracking, the frequency of racial profiling discussion, the officer's time in policing, and history of disciplinary procedures for violating profiling policy in the decision to either stop or not stop a motorist when the race of that motorist is observed to be that of a racial and ethnic minority. A forward stepwise logistic regression was utilized to analyze data collected from a sample of 176 police officers in the Midwest recruited through police organizational contacts. The results showed the only significant predictor in a police officer's decision to stop or not stop a minority motorist was the presence of a state statute requiring the collection of racial profiling data. This information can be useful to administrators and policy makers in addressing allegations of racial profiling. Understanding the influence of mandated racial profiling data collection policies on police officer behavior offers potential explanation when analyzing individual officer minority contact ratios, and may prompt policy revision to effect equal treatment of all citizens regardless of race or ethnicity.

Racial Profiling Policy and its Relation to Pro-Active Policing

by

Bradley R. Anders

MCJ, Boston University, 2007

BS, Central Missouri State University, 2002

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Criminal Justice

Walden University

December 2013

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to my family. First and foremost to my wife Kelli who took on every other domestic responsibility, including raising our children, while I chased this dream, and to my wonderful children: Nick, Brooklyn, and Ethan. Thank you for your understanding and willingness to share me not only with my academic cohorts but with those in my law enforcement family. I love you all more than I can ever express. To my parents, Don and Shirley: I told you I would be fine. Last, but not least, my sister Lori...thanks for everything. Secondly, I dedicate this dissertation to everyone who currently, or who has in the past, served their communities in a law enforcement capacity. Your dedication to this difficult profession truly inspires me.

Acknowledgements

I would like to give special thanks to Dr. Barbara Benoliel, my committee chair and mentor, for everything you have done. There are not enough words to express my gratitude. I would also like to give special thanks to Dr. Gregory Hickman, my methodologist. Thank you for being a breath of fresh air in a foreign environment. In addition, I wish to thank some of the more influential faculty members from Walden University: Committee member Dr. Donna Sheperis, Dr. Richard Balkin, Dr. Tina Jaeckle, Dr. Stacee Reicherzer, and Dr. Paul Katsampes. Also, thank you to Dr. Greg Etter from the University of Central Missouri and Dr. Scott Phillips from Buffalo State. To Sarah Dibben, thank you for inadvertently drawing my attention to this topic; you don't know it, but your rants are what inspired me to look into this phenomenon. Thank you to all of you in my command staff who provided input on this study and took time to share your most valuable of work experiences: Chief Joe Piccinini, Capt. Mark Liebig, Capt. Jim Green, Capt. Kevin Reaves, and Major Scott Lyons. Thank you to Teresa Treece for the introductions. Thank you Phil Stewart and Tim Resch for listening to me and providing me direction while this study was in its infancy, and to Mike for being so encouraging. Thank you to my partner/supervisor Josh Patterson for your support and input in the latter stages and for helping me maintain what sanity I have left. Thank you to the Westphal family for just being there. I would also like to thank each respective chief and police officer who participated in this study. I wish I could tell the world about your willingness to help a brother and give credit where credit is due. This venture has only strengthened my dedication to each and every man and woman who has devoted their lives to serving the public, and I am proud to be a part of it.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1: Introduction

The Study

In the mid-1980s, the United States Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) engaged in a narcotics trafficking venture entitled "Operation Pipeline" with the goal of identifying drug couriers engaged in narcotics trafficking along major highways within U.S. borders (Ramirez, Hoopes, & Quinlan, 2003). The problem, according to Ramirez et al. (2003), was the identification of such couriers involved the use of race and ethnicity. The training program implemented during Operation Pipeline specifically outlined certain indicators, such as race and gender, to identify would-be drug traffickers (Ramirez et al., 2003). What followed were the filings of civil suits in which police were accused of using race in an inappropriate manner when deciding to conduct investigatory stops (Ramirez et al., 2003). Consequently, racial profiling, defined roughly as targeting minorities for disparate investigatory practices based on the belief that their race or ethnicity suggests a greater potential for criminality, was brought to the forefront of American legal proceedings (Gabbidon, Marzette, & Peterson, 2007).

Barnum and Perfetti (2010) observed that the foundation of the racial profiling legal battle can be identified in two notable court cases: The *State of New Jersey vs. Soto* (1996) and *Wilkins vs. Maryland State Police* (1993). In each of these cases, the plaintiffs, minority citizens, alleged that police officers used their race as a primary motivating factor in the decision to conduct a traffic stop as opposed to any observed violation, traffic or criminal (Barnum & Perfetti, 2010). What followed, as noted by Gabbidion et al. (2007), was a barrage of federal court cases addressing the practice of racial profiling. Between the years of 1991 and 2006, approximately 135 cases were

heard on the federal level that directly addressed the issue of racial profiling. Furthermore, in regard to the *Wilkins* (1993) decision, the State of Maryland was required to start a data collection campaign to track demographic information of every traffic stop conducted in the state; this represented the beginning of data tracking campaigns across the country (Gabbidon, et al., 2007).

In a report to Congress, Laney (2004) noted numerous bills introduced at the federal level that addressed the practice of racial profiling. However, the United States has yet to pass a comprehensive racial profiling law that explicitly bans the use of race as the primary factor in a police officer's decision to conduct an investigatory, or otherwise, lawful stop (Laney, 2004). The reasons for the repeated failure of passing a law to address racial profiling may lie in the ambiguous definition of the practice itself (Laney, 2004) or even the more recent social push to use the tactic in the name of national security to assist in identifying terrorists after the September 11, 2001 attacks on Washington D.C. and New York (Reddick, 2004; Spencer, 2006). In fact, Laney noted that when polled, the majority of Americans were in favor of racial profiling when used to identify and capture terrorists.

Whatever the case for legislative failure on the federal level may be, the academic world provided empirical and philosophical debate on the topic, presenting arguments for both its tactical use (Risse & Zeckhauser, 2004) and complete abolition (Lever, 2005). In addition, numerous states were successful in passing legislation that addressed law enforcement's use of race as an indicator of criminal activity, calling for the mandatory collection of demographic data that characterized each police/citizen contact. Laney (2004) noted that data collection efforts may be useful in identifying whether or not

police officers are actually engaging in the practice of racial profiling. However, Laney added that with such an ambiguous definition of racial profiling, and a notable lack of disagreement on what constitutes the act, the possibility of measuring the concept could be quite difficult.

Regardless of the disagreement in definition, Schafer, Carter, Katz-Bannister, and Wells (2006) noted that discretionary decisions made by police were, in fact, significantly influenced by the department's culture as opposed to the officer's individual ideologies. This influence may produce a potential problem if the department is concerned with addressing allegations of racial profiling via data collection policies as the data alone may not be indicative of the countless other reasons for stopping a person other than his or her race. Schafer et al. noted the importance of data collection in this manner and stated that data collection may actually show a problem when one does not really exist. But what Schafer et al. further observed was that the police themselves are now stereotyped as racial profilers; "The profiler has become the profiled" (p.204).

Study Rationale

In this study, I addressed the issue of data collection as used in the analysis of whether or not racial profiling occurred in a given jurisdiction by individual officers. Miller (2007) noted that data collection policies may be completely symbolic in nature and have the potential to have a negative effect on police behavior, resulting in the decision to disengage, or *depolice*, in an effort to manipulate their numbers. Cooper (2003) also noted the *depolicing* effect and stated that in response to public criticisms or accusations of disparate treatment involving minorities, police officers may choose to pay less attention to neighborhoods populated by minorities to show solidarity in discretion.

In other words, the act of depolicing can help an officer avoid any accusations of racial profiling while sending a message to those who may accuse police of such tactics that those accusations will not go unanswered, resulting in decreased patrol in neighborhoods that may have significantly higher crime rates (Cooper, 2003).

Race may be one of many factors influencing a police officer's decision to stop, or not stop, a motorist observed committing a traffic violation. The importance of this study is that I addressed some of those variables and their potential correlation with data collection policies as they may influence an officer's decision to conduct a traffic stop. Specifically, I addressed the issue of deciding not to stop a motorist when the race of that motorist is observed to be that of a racial or ethnic minority. As Miller (2007) noted, officers may engage in various forms of data manipulation in an attempt to make their numbers representative of departmentally defined objectives. This data manipulation can include, but may not be limited to, a reduction in officer presence or enforcement efforts in neighborhoods populated predominantly by minorities. Kennedy (1997) noted that one of the most notable historical injustices, and one of the "most destructive forms of oppression" (p.29) in the United States is characterized by unequal protection against criminality. The potential for this to continue in law enforcement today should be enough to justify the importance of this study.

Included in this chapter is an introduction of the study, first covering the background (including an explanation of the gap in the literature and a brief summary), and then the problem statement. The purpose of this quantitative study is addressed and the research questions are presented, along with the alternative and null hypotheses. Next, the theoretical framework is provided for the study, briefly describing the concepts that

ground the study as well as state the connections between the key elements. The nature of the study is explained to include a description and definition of the variables involved and the methodology employed. Also included in this chapter are the assumptions, scope and delimitations, and limitations involved in the study. Lastly, I discuss the significance of the study and potential contributions to positive social change.

Background

The role race plays in the various dimensions of a police officer's decision making process has been the focus of numerous research projects geared toward analyzing equality in policing (e.g. Capers, 2009; Higgins, Vito, & Grossi, 2012). Higgins et al. (2012) addressed focal concerns relating to race and the decision to search a motorist while Capers (2009) and Ingram (2007) evaluated the impact of neighborhood characteristics on policing styles and the number of citations issued for traffic violations, respectively; Novak and Chamlin (2012) also contributed to the body of knowledge by analyzing the impact of race and place in a police officer's decision making process. Holmes, Smith, Freng, and Munoz (2008) discussed how minority threat can influence police allocation of manpower to address crime. Furthermore, Davenport, Soule, and Armstrong (2011) focused on resource allocation as it pertained to differential policing of Black protesters in the United States. The common theme amongst the research of Higgins et al. (2012), Capers, (2009), and the others noted is the impact race has on police discretion.

Several researchers, such as Ioimo, Tears, Meadows, Becton, and Charles (2007) and Cochran and Warren (2012), took their studies further and directly addressed police officer behavior from the point of view of the police officer (e.g. Cochran & Warren,

2012; Worden, McLean, & Hart, 2012). Worden et al. (2012) conducted a study in which traffic stop data was analyzed as it related to stops conducted after dark, searching for evidence of racial neutrality in officer discretion, while Cochran and Warren (2012) addressed the impact of the officer's race itself as it relates to public perception. Ioimo et al. also addressed racial profiling from the perspective of the police officers themselves. Again, the studies of Worden et al., Cochran and Warren, and Ioimo et al. each address race as the primary variable.

Despite the countless pieces of empirical research on the numerous variables that play a part in an officer's decision to stop a motorist, the term *racial profiling* is still a topic that stirs controversy amongst the American populace and negatively impacts public perceptions of the police (Miller, 2007). According to Gabbidon, Marzette, and Peterson (2007), no less than 254 cases were filed in the federal court system that employed the term "racial profiling" as of the time of their publication. The topic of racial profiling itself yielded a deep divide amongst supporters of officers using race as an investigative tool and supporters of abolishing the tactic altogether. Gabbidon, Higgins, and Wilder-Bonner (2012) identified a group termed "Black Supporters" who are Black and, as the title may suggest, support racial profiling. In addition, Risse and Zeckhauser (2004) presented a compelling argument in favor of racial profiling, citing a notable correlation between committing certain crimes and race, yet cautioned against using race as the sole indicator. On the contrary, Lever (2005, 2007) countered Risse and Zeckhauser's argument and stated that the use of race as an indicator of criminality is not only wrong but it is extremely harmful to minorities and fosters distrust and resentment for police.

As the term racial profiling first appeared in American media and court system, the tactic has evolved from addressing street crime to addressing national threats (Johnson, Brazier, Forrest, Ketelhut, Mason & Mitchell et al., 2011). While the DEA utilized the tactic to identify drug couriers in the 1980s (Ramirez et al., 2003), Johnson et al. (2011) noted that the tactic changed to address terrorism in the United States. According to Johnson et al., public support for racial profiling to combat terrorism is greater, and possibly more socially acceptable, than racial profiling to combat crime. However, Novak (2004) noted that many people believed the police employed racial profiling in their normal duties and, therefore, the problem was widespread. There is no indication that this sentiment has subsided. As a consequence, Laney (2004) observed that many state legislatures adopted laws that addressed the use of race by police and demanded data be collected to ensure officers were not disproportionately stopping minority motorists. However, as Mastrofski (2004) noted, the measurement that needs to be conducted is that of police discretion. In other words, as noted by Mastrofski, the factors that may play into an officer's decision-making process can be of great importance when analyzing a topic such as racial profiling.

In response to the passage of racial profiling legislation calling for disciplinary procedure brought against officers found to be in violation and the blanket measurement of police/minority contacts without attention to the other factors that influence an officer's decision, Cooper (2003) and Miller (2007) noted the potential for depolicing. As Shane (2012) noted, "The intent conveyed by the organization when its disciplinary practices are perceived as unfair is that the employees are expendable and not valued" (p.66). As Cooper observed, the potential for a police officer to react to a policy, such as

an ambiguous racial profiling policy aimed at reducing officer discretion, is great and the officer may in turn choose to disengage.

The research of Ingram (2007) and Novak and Chamlin (2012), amongst others, addressed the numerous variables that play into a police officer's decision to stop a motorist. What is missing from the existing literature is an analysis of how racial profiling policies impact proactive policing. In other words, there is a lack of research addressing how a police officer makes the decision to not stop a motorist as that decision relates to policy. As Kennedy (1997) noted, under-enforcement is a discriminatory practice as well, and if the policies implemented by both state statute and department policy affect proactive policing negatively then that information should be known as it may adversely impact those they are designed to protect. This study identified the variables that play into an officer's decision to not stop a motorist. Included in those variables were the state statute and department policy banning racial profiling or bias based policing.

Problem Statement

Implementation of a policy that negatively impacts an entire class of people can be detrimental to not only the members of that class but to those whom the policy is intended to protect. Racial profiling legislation and policy may negatively impact the very racial and ethnic minorities it is designed to protect by fostering a depolicing response by police officers assigned to patrol minority populated neighborhoods. To date, there is a lack of research that addresses the impact of racial profiling or bias based policing policy, either at the state or department level, on a police officer's decision to stop a motorist.

Race relations in the United States, historically, were a topic addressed by many lawmakers (Kennedy, 1997). From the racial tensions felt by American citizens during the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s (Kennedy, 1997) to the election of a Black President in 2008 (Ostertag & Armaline, 2008), race has been at the forefront. However, law enforcement officials have historically been at odds with minority populations here in the United States (Kennedy, 1997), and the impact of this adversarial relationship is notable. According to Johnson et al. (2011), racial profiling is a hot topic because of police behavior and actions in various public policies such as the War on Drugs and the War on Crime. Johnson et al. further suggested that some of the most widely known and influential Supreme Court cases such as *Terry v. Ohio* (1968) and *Whren v. The United States* (1996) fostered an environment in which police were allowed to use race as an indicator of criminal activity. Consequently, disparity in minority contacts is an issue that needs to be addressed (Novak, 2004), and the roots behind this disparity might be found in a police officer's decision making process. In today's society, the fact that perceptions of bias-based policing are detrimental to departmental goals and have a profoundly negative impact on police/citizen relationships (Ioimo et al., 2007) justifies analysis of the many factors that predicate a police officer's decision to contact a minority motorist. In addition, the control mechanisms employed by police administrators can have significant impact on a department's ability to direct employees toward attaining department goals set forth in their respective mission statements (Mastrofski, 2004).

My analysis of the current literature identified numerous pieces of research addressing the factors that play a part in an officer's decision to stop a motorist (e.g. Novak & Chamlin, 2012; Phillips, 2009). It might be assumed that the policies

implemented to eradicate the use of race as the solitary factor in a police officer's decision to stop a motorist are effective, but as Miller (2007) noted, the policies may be merely symbolic. Discretion can be a powerful tool in policing, but discretion involves more than just decisions to take action, it involves decision for inaction as well, and the latter is a notable gap in extant research, addressed only in part by Phillips (2009).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this exploratory, quantitative, cross-sectional study was to identify and analyze the possible relationship between racial profiling policy, state statutes, and a police officer's decision to stop or not stop a motorist when that motorist is observed to be a racial or ethnic minority. As this study was geared to identify significant relationships with a dichotomous dependent variable, and predict that outcome, binary logistic regression was employed. In addition, I utilized vignettes to address police officer behavior in hypothetical situations as found in current literature (Phillips, 2009). Jenkins, Bloor, Fischer, Berney, and Neale, (2010) stated that vignettes can be used to identify behavioral patterns not identified through other data collection methods.

Variables

This study, as noted above, was a quantitative analysis utilizing binary logistic regression. Field (2009) noted that the presence of a dichotomous dependent variable with either categorical or continuous predictors fits with a binary logistic regression model. In this case, the dichotomous variable was a police officer's decision to stop or not stop a motorist when their race is observed to be that of a visible minority. In addition, as noted by existing research, there are many variables that influence an officer's decision to stop a motorist and the decision affecting a stop's outcome or

disposition. However, for this study, I identified predictor variables by analyzing the current literature and utilizing anecdotal information from my own experience as a police officer assigned to patrol. The four predictor variables I identified for this study include:

- The frequency of racial profiling data discussion,
- The presence of a statutory data collection policy to identify racial profiling,
- An officer receiving any prior discipline for violating department policy on racial profiling or bias-based policing, and
- The time an officer has spent in policing.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The following are the Research Questions initially created and their related hypotheses:

RQ1: What is the correlation between the presence of a State Statute Requiring Data Collection of Citizen Contacts and an officer's decision to stop or not stop a visible, racial or ethnic minority for any observed law violation?

$H_0$1: ßκ=0 In the population, the odds of the independent variable the presence of a state statute requiring data collection of citizen contacts as measured by a specific state statute increasing the likelihood of the dependent variable decision to stop or not stop as measured by an officers' self-report equals zero.

$H_1$1: ßκ≠0 In the population, the odds of the independent variable the presence of a state statute requiring data collection of citizen contacts as measured by a specific state statute increasing the likelihood of the dependent variable decision to stop or not stop as measured by an officers' self-report does not equal zero.

RQ2: What is the correlation between an officer's years as a sworn police officer and an officer's decision to stop a visible, racial or ethnic minority motorist for any observed law violation?

$H_0$2: ßκ=0 In the population, the odds of the independent variable officer's years as a sworn police officer as measured by an officers' self-report increasing the likelihood of the dependent variable decision to stop or not stop as measured by an officers' self-report equals zero.

$H_1$2: ßκ≠0 In the population, the odds of the independent variable officer's years as a sworn police officer measured by officers' self-report increasing the likelihood of the dependent variable decision to stop or not stop as measured by an officers' self-report does not equal zero.

RQ3: What is the correlation between the officer receiving any prior discipline or consultation for violating the department's racial profiling or bias-based policing policy and an officer's decision to stop a visible, racial or ethnic minority for any observed law violation?

$H_0$3: ßκ=0 In the population, the odds of the independent variable officer receiving any prior discipline or consultation for violating the department's racial profiling or bias-based policing policy as measured by an officers' self-report increasing the likelihood of the dependent variable decision to stop or not stop as measured by an officers' self-report equals zero.

$H_1$3: ßκ≠0 In the population, the odds of the independent variable officer receiving any prior discipline or consultation for violating the department's racial profiling or bias-based policing policy as measured by an officers' self-report increasing

the likelihood of the dependent variable decision to stop or not stop as measured by an officers' self-report does not equal zero.

RQ4: What is the correlation between the frequency of discussion of racial profiling or bias-based policing statistics and that officer's decision to stop or not stop a visible racial or ethnic minority for any law violation?

$H_0$4: ßκ=0 In the population, the odds of the independent variable frequency of discussion of racial profiling or bias-based policing statistics as measured by an officers' self-report increasing the likelihood of the dependent variable decision to stop or not stop as measured by an officers' self-report equals zero.

$H_1$4: ßκ≠0 In the population, the odds of the independent variable frequency of discussion of racial profiling or bias-based policing statistics as measured by an officers' self-report increasing the likelihood of the dependent variable decision to stop or not stop as measured by an officers' self-report does not equal zero.

Other variables, such as the race of the officer, were initially included in this study. However, after the pilot study, this variable was removed and replaced with the frequency of racial profiling data discussion. Anecdotally, the frequency at which I am reminded of my contact data has influenced my personal discretionary decision making.

Theoretical Framework

There are numerous identifiable theories that address the phenomenon of racial profiling and the factors influencing a police officer's decision making process. Novak and Chamlin (2012) noted the influence of racial threat hypothesis in traffic enforcement as it relates to officer suspicion, Higgins, Vito, and Grossi (2012) addressed focal concerns theory as it may apply to the decision to search motorists on traffic stops, and

Petrocelli, Piquero, and Smith (2003) utilized conflict theory to analyze the differences in traffic stop characteristics between different neighborhoods. However, I was unable to identify one theory, or a combination thereof, that can characterize a police officer's decision to stop or not stop a motorist; most current analyses reflect the officer's decision to stop. Consequently, this research was grounded in concepts previously identified in extant research, and those concepts were rooted in officer behavior, racial profiling, and policy.

Allport (1958) presented the idea of different groups inherently at odds with one another, groups termed "in-groups" and "out-groups." Throughout the history of American policing, an "us vs. them" mentality can be identified as it relates to police vs. the citizenry, specifically minorities. Kennedy (1997) explained the numerous instances in which this mentality manifested in police/minority encounters, often resulting in violence, civil unrest, and death. What Kennedy observed was that the practice of ignoring one's individuality and acting on conscious stereotypes was a detrimental act that fostered distrust of law enforcement; Lever (2005) echoed this sentiment. As a result of this distrust and identifiable disparate treatment of minorities by law enforcement, policies were implemented to control officer behavior in hopes of reducing instances of racial profiling (Laney, 2004).

Implementing policy to control behavior is not an absolute answer to any perceived problem. As a matter of fact, depending on the methods of control employed, employees may react negatively to the policy (Rowe, O'Brien, Rouse, & Nixon, 2012). The policy I addressed for this study was that of racial profiling policy, both at the state and departmental level. As Laney (2004) and Miller (2007) noted, many police agencies

implemented policies that ban the use of race in discretionary decision making processes when race is the guiding factor. Failure to adhere to this policy can result in disciplinary action taken against the officer found to be in violation, as noted in both Missouri law and Kansas law. What Cooper (2003) suggested, reiterated by Miller, was police officers may engage in depolicing in an attempt to comply with such a policy out of malicious compliance or in retaliation for the removal of discretion. It is this decision to disengage from a police officer's sworn duties that lies at the heart of this study. However, as noted previously, there is an abundance of research that addresses the numerous variables that influence a police officer's decision making process, many much stronger predictors than race. Phillips (2009), is the only researcher I identified to address variables that affect an officer's decision to stop or not stop a motorist, and he noted the lack of significance race had on the decision to stop a motorist. The specifics of these concepts and the existing body of research supporting them can be found in Chapter 2.

This conceptual framework best fits with a quantitative analysis, specifically binary logistic regression. As Miller (2007) noted, the decisions made by a police officer when conducting traffic stops are under such scrutiny that they may engage in depolicing (the decision to stop or not to stop), or they may manipulate their traffic stop data in an effort to present a more socially acceptable minority contact ratio. As both the former and latter issues may be of a sensitive nature, this study utilized an anonymous questionnaire as the data collection instrument and included questions to address the primary research question of whether or not there is a correlation between the perceived race of a motorist and an individual officer's decision, as it relates to mandated policy, to stop that motorist for any observed violation. In addition, I addressed the other concepts involved in this

study (years of service, prior discipline, and frequency of discussion) with specific questions on the questionnaire

The data I collected was anonymous via a questionnaire administered to officers from three police departments in the Midwestern United States. The sample population consisted of sworn police officers assigned to patrol which were given the questionnaire electronically. Once the questionnaires were completed, I collected them and entered them into the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) where they were analyzed using binary logistic regression.

Definitions and Operationalizing Variables

According to Creswell (2009), precision in term definitions are essential to any research study. If a term is used in the study that may be ambiguous or have multiple meanings to those unfamiliar with the basic knowledge surrounding the study, that term should be defined at the beginning so the reader understands the intent (Creswell, 2009). This study had some terms that needed to be defined to clarify their meaning, and this section will address those terms.

Most of the variables involved in this study were self-explanatory. For example, the outcome variable was defined as a police officer's discretionary decision to stop, or not to stop, a motorist for any observed violation. The predictors included variables such as race, listed as race of the driver, and years employed as a sworn police officer. However, there were a few predictors that needed defining.

The presence of legislated data collection statutes was a predictor that needed to be defined. This study addressed three different states in which the statutory data collection requirements were different. Either there was a law requiring departments

to collect racial profiling data or there was not a law. In addition to data collection to evaluate the occurrence of racial profiling, many police departments were also required through these statutes to implement policies banning the use of race as the primary deciding factor in discretionary decision making. For example, Missouri statute 590.650 mandates that all police departments in the State of Missouri adopt policies that ban the practice of using race as a pretext for other investigative stops even if a violation is observed by the officer.

Also a requirement of data tracking legislation, officers who are found to be in violation of department policy banning the use of race in decision making are subject to disciplinary action to include counseling and training. This variable was characterized as any officer who has received any counseling, training, or otherwise any disciplinary proceedings for violating this policy.

Lastly, the variable addressing the frequency of discussion is defined as the occurrence of racial profiling ratio discussions that occur between an officer and his or her supervisor. This variable is an anecdotal variable suggested by an expert panel employed to analyze content validity (a further description of this panel can be found in Chapter 3). Colebatch (2006) noted that policies are intended to guide employee behavior, and by reminding that employee of their current adherence, or lack thereof, to said policy may be influential in their decision making.

Depolicing: As defined by Cooper (2003), depolicing is the conscious decision made by a police officer to disengage in enforcement efforts in response to criticisms of their investigative tactics.

Racial Profiling: I utilized Risse and Zeckhauser's (2004) definition of racial profiling as "any police-initiated actions that relies on the race, ethnicity, or national origin and not merely on the behavior of an individual" (p.136).

Visible Minority: By visible I mean the observed race. I followed the FBI's interpretation of a minority as presented in the Uniform Crime Report as any of the following races or combination thereof: Black, Hispanic, American Indian, or Asian/Pacific Islander.

Assumptions and Delimitations

The utilization of logistic regression, much like other statistical analyses, involves several assumptions (Field, 2009). Field (2009) noted that assumptions are necessary to address because failing to do so may lead to incorrect conclusions from data analysis. According to Field, logistic regression has three assumptions: (a) Linearity, (b) Independence of errors, and (c) Multicollinearity. The variables involved in this study satisfied these three assumptions.

I used a non-probability, purposive sample for data collection; I administered a survey to sworn police officers to collect demographic information and information relating to variables affecting police discretion. As Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias (2008) noted, response bias in a survey can be an issue when addressing sensitive subjects, and considering the historically strained relationship between police and minorities, the concept of racial profiling can be considered sensitive. However, I did not ask officers to discuss their behavior as it pertains to bias-based policing in the vein that prompted policy implementation to ban it, but instead I asked officers to identify their propensity to ignore violations when the race of the driver is observed to be that of a minority. It is assumed that the officers, given the somewhat benign nature of ignoring

violations, were honest in their responses. In addition, as noted by Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias (2008), anonymity is an excellent way to protect participants when dealing with sensitive topics, and each participant was advised of the anonymous nature of the study. There was no way to track individual responses by administrators or myself.

Another assumption I identified in this study involved the knowledge of department policy. Ouchi (1977) noted that the presence of formal policies that outline expected behavior predicated a reduction in controlling employee output. It is understood that the mere presence of a policy does not necessarily mean that the employee is aware of it and will abide by it, thereby meeting the goals set forth by the organization. The officers involved in this survey were asked specifically to note whether or not they had training in the specific policy in question, and their answers were intended to satisfy this assumption.

The issue of racial profiling is one that has historically fueled negative relations and distrust between police and the minority community (Kennedy, 1997). In this study, I addressed the statutorily mandated policy implemented to curb the phenomenon of racial profiling and how it might affect an individual police officer's discretionary decision-making process. Consequently, only officers who are assigned to patrol or who routinely conduct traffic stops as part of their daily duties were surveyed. Specifically, I addressed sworn officers from one department in Kansas, one in Missouri, and one in Iowa, representing different levels of statutory data tracking requirements pertaining to racial profiling or bias-based policing. As such, the results of this study should be generalizable only to those departments from which the data was collected.

Limitations

As with most studies, this one was not without its limitations. Of significant importance, as noted in the assumptions section, there is no proof that those who were surveyed were 100% forthcoming with their experiences on such a sensitive topic. While anonymity can provide a blanket of security for participants, full disclosure may not have been achieved due to nature of the study. The officers knew that I am a police officer as well but this fact may not have been enough to warrant full disclosure of discretionary decision making processes and the variables that impact them. Again, anonymity was ensured to address this limitation.

Generalizability is a notable limitation. Realistically, this study can be generalized only to the departments from which data was extracted. There are over 18,000 police departments in the United States, according to the Bureau of Justice Statistics (2013). This study addresses only three of those 18,000, which in comparison is quite small in terms of generalizability for the entire police population.

Another limitation must be addressed in this study, and that limitation deals with the use of stepwise regression analysis. Thompson (1995) noted the downfalls in using stepwise binary logistic regression in research. According to Thompson, the chances of making a Type I error are significantly increased with stepwise regression, and the data obtained from such an analysis are often over-inflated. This limitation is addressed at greater length in Chapter 5 of this study.

Significance of the Study

As Kennedy (1997) noted, prohibiting an officer from using race in his or her decision making process is not the ultimate answer to the problem of racial profiling.

Furthermore, it cannot be determined if an individual officer made the decision to contact a minority based on personal bias or on legitimate means as some officers may choose to keep such variables to themselves (Kennedy, 1997). However, as noted by Justice Jackson in *Korematsu v. United States* (1944), guilt is not something that someone is born with, as inherent as the color of skin, guilt is something that is characterized by an individual person. In response to past practices involving police officers using race as an indicator of criminality, ignoring the individuality of those involved, racial profiling policy was implemented to address community concerns (Miller, 2007). The problem is, as Miller (2007) noted, implementation of such a policy may have the opposite effect on police discretion. In other words, police officers may depolice in response to a policy that they feel takes away their discretion (Cooper, 2003; Miller, 2007). If this is the case, as identified by this study, then the implementation of racial profiling policy may actually be counter-productive to the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution. Recognition of this effect can reduce under-enforcement and put police officers back into minority-populated neighborhoods where crime tends to be higher than other neighborhoods (Capers, 2009).

Summary

Racial profiling has been an issue for several decades, as noted by Barnum and Perfetti (2010), and the numerous cases heard by the Supreme Court are indicative of its importance (Gabbidon et al., 2007). Since hearing these cases, the federal government has yet to pass a comprehensive piece of legislation that addresses the use of race by police officers and the subsequent association with criminality (Laney, 2004). As Kennedy (1997) noted, this practice of associating race with criminality is extremely

damaging to not only the targeted race itself but the relationship between police and members of that race. However, after the September 11th attacks, the general public seems to be more acceptable of the use of race in identifying those who may be a threat to our national security; the use for criminal interdiction is still overwhelmingly socially unacceptable (Reddick, 2004; Spencer, 2006).

Despite the failure of the federal government to pass such legislation that bans the use of race as a criminal indicator, several states were successful in passing statutory bans on the practice of racial profiling, and included with many of those statutory bans are data collection requirements in which police departments are required to track demographic and stop disposition information on each individual contact with citizens made by police on either traffic stops, voluntary contacts, or both (Laney, 2004). Included in many of these statutes and policies are the threatened use of discipline for violating the policy. The problem, however, lies in the fact that discretionary decision making is impacted by more than policy implementation; other variables such as police subcultures may impact officer behavior (Schafer et al., 2006). In addition, scholars have yet to agree on what even constitutes racial profiling (Laney, 2004), yet policy makers are ready to punish those found to be in violation of an extremely ambiguous concept.

This study was a quantitative analysis utilizing logistic regression to measure any correlation between the decision to stop, or not to stop, a motorist for any observed traffic violation when that motorist is observed to be a visible, racial or ethnic minority. While organizational control mechanisms are put in place to push employees toward attainment of departmental goals (Ouchi, 1977), the improper use of control mechanisms may negatively influence performance (Rowe et al., 2012). Consequently, when it comes to

police officer behavior as it pertains to discretionary decision making, improper application of control mechanisms may result in a phenomenon called depolicing (Cooper, 2003; Miller, 2007). At minimum, officers may feel as if their discretion is taken away and may under-report or completely report falsely to avoid exacerbating an already perceived social problem within the minority community (Miller, 2007). Even more important, officers may refuse to patrol or enforce laws in neighborhoods primarily populated by minorities to avoid over-representative contacts with minorities. A review of the existing research revealed a gap that fails to address the potential influence of state law and policy on an officer's decision to stop or not stop a motorist.

Although there is not one single identifiable theory that addresses a police officer's decision to not stop a motorist, the conceptual framework is quite extensive. Police officer behavior, organizational compliance and control, and racial profiling policy each provide an abundance of information of which form the foundation of this study. This information and research are addressed at length in Chapter 2, which constitutes a review of the current literature and theoretical framework.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Introduction

The purpose of this dissertation was to analyze the relationship between racial profiling policy, at both the statutory and departmental level, and a police officer's decision to stop a motorist whom he or she has observed to be a member of a racial minority. The factors that influence a police officer's decision to stop a motorist ranging from the environment in which the stop occurs (Warren & Farrell, 2009) to the time of day and visibility of the officer (Worden et al., 2012). However, as noted by Laney (2004), policy banning the use of race in an officer's decision to stop was widely implemented across the United States as a means to control officer behavior.

In an effort to abolish racial profiling, many lawmakers passed legislation that required police officers to individually track their contacts with the citizenry via either traffic stops, voluntary contacts, or sometimes both (Higgins & Vito, 2012; Iomo et al., 2007; Schafer et al., 2006). Legislation in some states required the collection of certain demographic data, race being one of the primary components (Laney, 2004). In addition, participating states required law enforcement agencies to establish racial profiling policies that addressed and prohibited the use of race in discretionary decision-making processes, such as the decision to make a traffic stop, and also provided for discipline or extra training for those officers identified as having too many contacts with racial or ethnic minorities (RSMO 590.650). Cooper (2003) noted that these policies potentially resulted in withdrawal of crime prevention effort by police officers, a practice known as depolicing. This withdrawal may harm the very population these policies are designed to protect and could potentially remove police from minority populated neighborhoods.

In this chapter, I review the research associated with racial profiling policy, officer behavior, policy implementation, and depolicing. I focus on the many factors that influence police discretionary decisions, such as the decision to make a traffic stop, to identify variables other than race that may justify a police officer's decision to stop a motorist. Miller (2007) noted that there may be a tendency for an officer to withdraw from proactive policing where people of ethnic or racial minorities are concerned in an effort to curb any administrative identification with bias-based policing. In other words, an officer may either refuse to stop a Black or Hispanic person to reduce any statistical chance of being identified as one who engages in racial profiling, or worse, refuse to patrol neighborhoods populated by racial or ethnic minorities, which, according to Tomaskovic-Devey and Warren (2009), often have higher rates of crime. As there is not a standard definition for racial profiling, existing policies may have a detrimental effect on those neighborhoods that need police the most.

In an attempt to build a theoretical foundation, I researched numerous theories including critical race theory (Delgado & Stefancic, 2007), social identity theory (Coover 2001; Goar, 2007), and conflict theory (Marx, 1983; Gumplowicz, 1899). However, I was unable to identify a single theoretical influence that addressed the variables present in this study. Delgado and Stefancic (2007) and Bell (1995) addressed how the law was constructed to oppress Blacks, while Marx (1983) espoused inter-group conflict via class. Coover (2001) and Goar (2007) addressed fulfillment of expected social roles between races. However, what is common to each of these theories is intergroup conflict on both a legal and social level, and it is a conflict centered on race. These theories of racial conflict at the legal level provided the basis of the conceptual framework for the current

study, but what has been missing from extant research is a theoretical analysis of how policies implemented to combat racial conflict impact law enforcement efforts. In constructing this theoretical framework, I analyzed racial profiling policies and their implementation, which involved both a review of organizational practices and the concept of racial profiling itself. I discussed the ambiguous definition of racial profiling as well as presented an analysis of which groups it affects, arguments for its acceptance, arguments for its abolishment, and the legal precedents surrounding the topic. In the next section I address changes in the scholarly opinions of racial profiling, focusing on the War on Drugs and the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. The perceptions held by citizens in regard to police and their involvement in racial profiling are also addressed. In addition, policy implementation, data tracking, and control mechanisms are discussed. Finally, I have addressed officer behavior as a result of policy implementation, whether it is compliance or depolicing.

Literature Search Strategy

The literature review for this dissertation consisted of books, journal articles, magazine articles, published dissertations, and case law. I located these sources on the Internet and through hard copies. I used Internet sources such as Questia, Google Scholar, and various databases such as Sage Publications and Academic Search Premier located in the Walden University library. I performed both a general search and a search limited to articles published within the past 5 years and used search words such as *racial profiling, racial profiling policy, organizational management, depolicing, police officer behavior, organizational compliance, Driving While Black, decision to stop,* and *police organizational management.* My analysis of these articles revealed numerous other

primary sources of racial profiling data, police officer behavior, and organizational management. In addition, previous unpublished essays I wrote were searched for related sources.

The amount of research on racial profiling I located was abundant. In addition, articles addressing organizational management were plentiful. However, I dramatically reduced the latter by focusing solely on management in high-stress environments and the application of organizational controls. I identified several seminal works addressing race and the law, racial profiling, group dynamics, interpersonal communication, and foundational stereotyping and included them as well. However, there was a notable lack of research addressing the concept of depolicing. I addressed this limitation by focusing on policy implementation, organizational control tactics, and police behavior as a function of organizational goals. In this study, I used approximately 72 sources, including contemporary seminal works, to include in this literature review. I read each source thoroughly and categorized them into one of five categories: (a) What is racial profiling? (b) The changes researchers have noted in the existing racial profiling literature, (c) How do the public and police respond to racial profiling? (d) How do organizations promote desired behavior to meet public and organizational expectations? and (e) How does racial profiling policy in general affect police behavior and decision making?

Conceptual Framework

Researchers of racial profiling have addressed multiple variables that play a part in an officer's decision to stop a motorist. In addition, officer behavior was not an understudied topic by any means. On the other hand, there had been less research on policy influence as it relates to both officer decisions and racial profiling. However, I

identified several leading pieces of research that informed the current study and provided the theoretical foundation and conceptual framework. While some of these are seminal works, others are recent, informative works that are essential to understanding the relationship between police officer behavior and racial profiling policy.

Racial Profiling and Stereotype Formation

While Kennedy (1997) conducted his research close to 15 years ago, his ideas are still valid today. Risse and Zeckhauser (2004), Lever (2005), and Lippert-Rasmussen (2006) debated the social impact of Kennedy's assertions. Racial profiling, according to Kennedy, involves the conscious interpretation of race as an indicator of criminal activity, and this interpretation can be made by a police officer on patrol or a pedestrian walking down the street at night. Kennedy noted that these interpretations, as far as the police are concerned, are a tactic employed on a daily basis. To understand how these perceptions and stereotypes are formed, Allport (1958) discussed the formation of in-groups and out-groups. An in-group consists of those who use the collective "we with the same essential significance" (Allport, 1958, p.31). As members of the same occupational status, defined by Allport as characteristic of an in-group, police officers may use the collective term "we." Conversely, as members of the same race, also characteristic of an in-group, racial minorities may also use the collective term "we" to define themselves.

In the case of out-groups, Allport (1958) noted several steps that typically lead up to physical violence between groups, an event common between police and racial minorities throughout history (Hickman & Piquero, 2009; Kennedy, 1997). These steps included: (a) an extended time in which prejudgment occurred and members of the in-group cannot identify individuality within members of the out-group, (b) discrimination

as a continual problem that increases in intensity, and (c) complaints about the opposing group also increasing in intensity. Allport stated that the formation of prejudice begins with the assimilation of like behaviors into clusters of categories that ignore individuality.

It is this refusal to note individuality that should not be characteristic of the criminal justice system. As Kennedy (1997) asserted, "guilt is personable and not inherited" (p.139). However, past issues and civil unrest between police and racial minorities reveal how police officers routinely ignored the individuality of members of racial minorities or members of the out-group (Kennedy, 1997). In addition, such incidents involved the three steps noted by Allport (1958). For example, the Rodney King incident involved prejudgment, increased discrimination claims in the City of Los Angeles, and complaints that were lodged against the LAPD for racial discrimination (Kennedy, 1997). The differential treatment noted in the Rodney King incident, which resulted in the initial acquittal of the officers involved, proved extremely damaging to relations between police and the Black population of Los Angeles. Kennedy noted, "The acquittals sparked several days of furious rioting during which 52 people were killed, 2,382 injured, 500 fires set, a billion dollars in property destroyed, and 16,291 arrests made" (p. 118). Risse and Zeckhauser (2004) noted that when racial profiling is scrutinized, what matters the most is that a person's individuality is completely ignored.

Policy Creation

Echoing Kennedy's (1997) assertion, Miller (2007) noted the threat to institutional legitimacy associated with perceptions of bias-based policing. Miller stated that the threat would be not only to police authority but to the community as well. In response threats to institutional legitimacy and public perceptions, police departments

implemented policies that called for an end to racial profiling and, for some, the collection of data that revealed whether or not police were engaging in racial profiling (Laney, 2004; Miller, 2007). In a report for Congress, Laney (2004) noted that there were two sides to the data collection process: those who support the collection of data hold that it reveals whether or not racial profiling is happening and those who oppose data collection maintain that the data can be skewed and cause undue unrest within the populace (Laney, 2004). Despite the bifurcation in ideology, Laney presented data collection as the preferred method to identify bias-based policing.

The origins of data collection policies may be traced back to disparate stop rates in the state of Maryland in the early 1990s (Novak, 2004). In this instance, a Black attorney claimed that he was stopped by police solely because of his race. As a result of the claim, research was conducted that looked into the minority contact rate of those stopped on Maryland highways; the result of this indicated that although Blacks represented 17.5% of traffic violators, about 35% of motorists stopped for any reason were Black (Novak, 2004). While other instances occurred in which racial disparity was either alleged or substantiated, many states responded with legislation that forbade racially biased policing (Novak, 2004), and according to Laney (2004), some supporters of the policy wanted officers who were found to be in violation to be subject to civil litigation. However, as Laney noted, there is no agreement on what racial profiling actually is or how it can be measured. Consequently, in regard to policy creation, Miller (2007) asserted that ambiguity can foster an administrative response that is designed to address and bolster public image instead of actually addressing the problem.

Organizational Compliance

According to Ouchi and Johnson (1978), control mechanisms are an important facet of both organizational management and employee emotional wellbeing. Employees are expected to follow policies and further organizational goals, and in order to accomplish that, supervisors may implement mechanisms of control. Ouchi (1977) identified control as watching behavior, comparing that behavior to a pre-designated standard, and either rewarding that behavior or punishing it. Rowe et al. (2012) defined control as employee behavior modification or influence at the hands of a supervisor. The two primary control mechanisms identified by Ouchi and Maguire (1975) and Ouchi were behavior control and output control. The application of behavior controls, as noted by Ouchi, required an agreement and understanding between employees and management about the means-end relationship. In other words, there must be some similarity in understanding how employee behavior transforms into a desired product. Output controls, conversely, do not require the understanding of the means-end relationship (Ouchi, 1977). With the identification of behavior and output controls came another form of organizational control identified as professional control (Rowe et al., 2012). Rowe et al. (2012) made the assertion that the inappropriate application of behavior controls would result in negative employee behavior, especially when professional controls were expected.

Police Behavior

Mendias and Kehoe (2006) observed that discretion employed by police officers must reflect the ideology, current social structure, and current paradigm espoused by the department with which they are employed. This suggests that police officers have not

only drawn on departmental policy to guide their behavior but the police culture may have had an influence as well. Mastrofski (2004) further noted the impact of police culture on individual officer discretion and stated that it is an organizational variable that should be taken into account when attempting to understand police officer behavior. However, police behavior and decision-making processes may not be an easily understood phenomenon. Phillips (2009) noted the different variables that impact an officer's decision to stop or not stop a motorist. Phillips further identified issues such as vehicle characteristics as significant in influencing the decision to stop as opposed to driver characteristics, which were found to be not significant in the decision-making process. Conversely, Higgins et al. (2011) asserted that in making their decisions, police officers managed the information presented to them by using similar clues ascribed to similar people, stereotypes of sort. To better understand these actions, and to conceptualize police behavior, I referred to both Heider's (1958) views of interpersonal communication and Goffman's (1959) assertions of the self in society.

Heider (1958) stated that behavior is the result of either personality characteristics or outside influences stemming from the environment. The concept of attribution as it applies to individual perception defines potential for self-efficacy and how people evaluate their surroundings (Heider, 1958). The latter variable is what was important for this research and evaluation of relationships between law enforcement and the citizens they serve. Heider stated that once a person observes and learns something concerning about another person, the observer may react in a negative way. In addition, when the other person is aware they are being observed, they may become self-conscious and respond in kind (Heider, 1958). According to Goffman (1959), the role performed by the

observed is representative of that role in general in the eyes of the observer. Consequently, race is one of those variables that can be used to define a role and an individual in general (Goffman, 1959). Higgins et al. (2011) echoed this assertion when they stated police use clues to manage information that guide their decision making processes. When those clues include race, then past experiences, training, or even culture may guide an officer's behavior and influence group solidarity.

Allport (1958) noted the importance of in-group and out-group conflict. Goffman (1959) also addressed the concept of in-groups and out-groups. Colleagues, according to Goffman, tend to act in a similar manner whether they are around each other or not. Therefore, the roles performed by members of an in-group are similar when performed in front of the same audience, the out-group (Goffman, 1959). In other words, anecdotally, police officers may tend to act a certain way around the public and do so whether they are around other police officers or not; this may be a cultural role defined by policing in general. In turn, members of the public, including minorities who may feel scrutinized to begin with, may act accordingly; this can be identified as an *us vs. them* mentality reinforced by in-group/out-group sentiment.

With the thoughts and assertions of both Goffman (1959) and Heider (1958) in mind, the actions and behaviors associated with police officers may be better understood as not only facets of their own individual beliefs, but as facets of their institutional and organizational goals. According to Goffman there are expectations from both sides, in this case police and the citizens they serve, reference actions and beliefs.

Synthesis of Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework for this study addressed the concept of racial profiling, the policies implemented as a response to the practice of racial profiling, and the police behavior associated both individually and organizationally. Kennedy (1997) identified racial profiling as the conscious identification of race as an indication of potential criminality. As such, Kennedy delineated two primary groups, police and members of racial minorities, as key players in the practice of racial profiling. The issue arises as to whether or not racial profiling is an acceptable tactic used by police officers. Risse and Zeckhauser (2004) noted that while racial profiling can have its uses from a utilitarian perspective, ignoring one's individuality is a damaging practice. The damage, according to Kennedy, is monumental and has historically resulted in violent outbursts from racial minorities. Allport (1958) noted that such actions taken by members of a group can reinforce group solidarity, thereby solidifying the establishment of in-groups and out-groups.

However, identifying the damaging effects of using race as an indicator of criminality as Kennedy (1997) noted, many police departments responded by creating policies that ban the use of race as a proxy for criminality (Miller, 2007). These policies, as noted by Laney (2004), often include the practice of tracking data to identify whether or not an officer is, in fact, engaging in the practice of racial profiling. Some police departments chose to implement racial profiling policies on their own while others were mandated by statutes adopted through legislation in their respective states (Laney, 2004). Upon implementing such policies, however, police departments needed to ensure compliance, and as Ouchi (1977) noted, control over an employee comes via watching

the employee and either rewarding desirable or punishing undesirable behavior. It is at this point that the decisions made by an employee are directly affected, according to Rowe et al. (2012), by the control mechanisms chosen by an employee's supervisor. Improper application of organizational control mechanisms result in negative behavior from the employee (Rowe et al., 2012) In the case of police officer behavior, this negative behavior may manifest itself in the form of depolicing (Cooper, 2003).

Kennedy (1997) identified two primary groups involved in racial profiling: The police and racial minorities. Allport (1958) and Goffman (1959) both identified the formation of in-groups and out-groups. In addition, the propensity for stereotypes to form and apply to out-groups is real and may strengthen group solidarity (Allport, 1958). When these stereotypes are a part of a police officer's milieu, whether from individual perspective or cultural influence, his or her actions may be predictable before he or she ever makes the decision to stop a motorist. Higgins et al. (2011) noted police officers' tendency to manage the information they use in their discretionary decisions from a group perspective. Mastrofski (2004) identified the influence of the police culture in individual officer discretion, whereas Mendias and Kehoe (2006) noted the influence of organizational policy on discretion; both culture and policy were found to directly influence a police officer's decision-making process. In the case of racial profiling, the identification of race as an indicator of criminality can directly impact relationships between police and racial minorities from an in-group/out-group perspective (Miller, 2007), and ultimately result in violence or, at minimum, a decreased sense of trust between the two groups (Bah, 2006). Policies created to stop the practice of racial

profiling are then implemented as a response, but implementation can result in negative behaviors from police (Miller, 2007).

Key Statements and Definitions

Policy creation, according to Colebatch (2006), is an "exercise in informed problem-solving" (p.309). Policies are implemented after a problem has been identified, researched, and culminated in advice given to a policy maker (Colebatch, 2006). Upon implementation, however, policies are intended to guide behavior and influence individual choice (Colebatch, 2006). For this study, influence on the individual came in the form of control mechanisms, which according to Rowe et al. (2012) are designed to ensure employees work towards organizational goals outlined in policy.

Ouchi and Johnson (1978) noted that control mechanisms can directly influence an employee's emotions, fostering a desirable or undesirable environment. Two forms of organizational control were identified by Ouchi and Maguire (1975) that are independent mechanisms that are irreplaceable. Ouchi and Maguire identified these control mechanisms as behavior controls and output controls, the former involving direct supervision that includes observation and the latter involving analysis of production. Building on Ouchi and Maguire's control mechanisms, Rowe et al. (2012) noted a third form or organizational control: professional controls. Professional controls are implemented when outcome analysis may be ambiguous (Rowe et al., 2012). Professional control involves individually enforced control in a variety of situations, not excluding group monitoring and group application of social sanctions and reward (Rowe et al., 2012). For the purposes of this study, behavior controls were characterized as the disciplinary procedures inherent in racial profiling policy, output controls were

characterized by data tracking mechanisms implemented to identify disparate minority contact, and professional controls were characterized by the cultural influence within a police department.

In a congressional research report, Laney (2004) noted that there are numerous definitions of racial profiling. Citing Dale's (2004) definition, Laney described racial profiling as "the practice of targeting individuals for police or security interdiction, detention or other disparate treatment based primarily on their race or ethnicity in the belief that certain minority groups are more likely to engage in unlawful behavior" (p.1). Glover (2007) noted that racial profiling involves the mere belief that racial minorities (those who are not White) are disproportionately involved in crime. Kennedy (1997) noted that racial profiling involved the application of criminal traits to racial minorities, specifically Blacks. In addition, Risse and Zeckhauser (2004) defined racial profiling as police action that is prompted by race as opposed to individual behavior. The commonalities with the previous definitions include police action associated with the perceived, or belief in, criminality associated with race or ethnicity, typically Black or Hispanic.

Racial profiling policy, as noted by Cooper (2003), may result in a police officer's decision to under police neighborhoods populated predominately by minorities. According to Cooper, this practice of depolicing serves two purposes: (a) By under policing minority populated neighborhoods police avoid antagonizing any racial tensions, and (b) Depolicing challenges police critics. In addition, Cooper noted that by engaging in depolicing, police officers get the chance to exert their autonomy and discretion in such a way that policy makers would have trouble controlling the action. The author

further noted that the message conveyed with depolicing was, “Criticize our policing and you will get no policing” (Cooper, 2003, p.8).

Conceptual Framework and Its Influence on Existing Research

Extant racial profiling literature has tended to focus on the social harms associated with using race as a proxy for criminal behavior. According to Tomaskovic-Devey and Warren (2009), the Drug Enforcement Administration’s (DEA) Operation Pipeline prompted modern interest in racial profiling. The DEA trained officers to profile drug couriers, and this profile included race; specifically young males with dark skin (Tomaskovic-Devey & Warren, 2009). From this point forward, police officers were believed to use the drug courier profile, which included race, as an indicator of criminal activity in the War on Drugs (Gabbidon et al., 2007). Research focused on the drug courier profile and its impact on the minority community while civil rights organizations condemned its use (Tomaskovic-Devey & Warren, 2009). Meanwhile, law enforcement agencies continued to engage in the tactic with full support from the United States Department of Justice (Tomaskovic-Devey & Warren, 2009).

Research in racial profiling changed significantly after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. According to Ramirez, Hoopes, and Quinlan (2003), instead of concerns revolving around Black and Hispanic drug courier profiles, “new questions and concerns have been raised about racial profiling of Arab and Muslim Americans” (p.1197). Consequently, the topic of racial profiling jumped to the forefront of American homeland security as claims of racial profiling skyrocketed in both airport security checks and traffic stops (Ramirez et al., 2003). Research into public approval of racial profiling as a police tactic also emerged, with results indicating a public propensity to

approve of the tactic to prevent terrorism, but low approval ratings for crime prevention (Johnson et al., 2011). In addition, data tracking policies were beginning to emerge, at least on the federal level, since President Clinton signed an executive order that banned racial profiling and called for data collection of individuals held by federal agencies (Warren & Farrell, 2009).

On the state level, according to Barnum and Perfetti (2010), data collection policies began to emerge in the 1990s after two Supreme Court cases were heard in which racial profiling was claimed: *Wilkins vs. Maryland State Police* (1993) and *State of New Jersey vs. Soto* (1996). However, Barnum and Perfetii, as well as Higgins, Gabbidon, and Jordan (2008), noted a recurring problem with racial profiling research founded in racial profiling data collection, the lack of a clear baseline for minority drivers in a given jurisdiction. The conundrum, according to Ioimo et al. (2007), is that "the current literature suggests that police contact should be proportionate to population demographics and ignores all other intervening variables" (p.274). In addition, just because disproportionate stop ratios may be identified, that does not necessarily indicate disparate treatment at the hands of police (Barnum & Perfetti, 2010); there is just the assumption that the minority distribution identified in stops should be representative of the community (Reitzel & Piquero, 2006).

Laney (2004) noted the issue of accountability in racial profiling claims. Laney stated that some people feel that an officer found to be in violation of racial profiling policy should be subject to additional training, intense monitoring, or even removal from his or her position as an officer; others wanted the individual police officers subjected to civil litigation. Horowitz and Levin (2001), in referring to public reaction to racially

charged police-involved shootings in Cincinnati, called the reaction "a war against the defenders of law in Cincinnati, and in particular, against the defenders of law in the impoverished Cincinnati neighborhoods" (p.224). However, as a response to the public reaction, police administrators implemented control mechanisms in the form of policy to address the issue of racial profiling.

Existing research in mechanisms of control includes the findings of Ouchi (1977), Ouchi and Johnson (1978), and Ouchi and Maguire (1975). Understanding how professional (ritual), output, and behavioral control mechanisms affect employees can be important in understanding employee behavior and psychological wellbeing (Ouchi & Maguire, 1975). The application of the appropriate form of control mechanisms also influences organizational effectiveness (Rowe et al., 2012). To better understand police behavior as a result of policy implementation and organizational control, extant research focused on change in both organizational goals and police officer behavior (Mendias & Kehoe, 2006; Schultz & Withrow, 2004). In addition, discipline as it relates to policy implementation was the focus of Shane's (2012) research, stating that "the intent conveyed by the organization when its disciplinary practices are perceived as unfair is that the employees are expendable and are not valued" (p.66). However, as Mendias and Kehoe (2006) noted, officer discretion must be employed in such a way that it agrees and meets organizational standards set forth in policy.

Officer discretion is at the heart of the concept of depolicing (Cooper, 2003). Research in the area of depolicing is quite lacking, but Miller (2007) noted depolicing's relation to policy implementation, stating that data collection policies may backfire, resulting in a police officer engaging in the practice of depolicing or the intentional

misrepresentation of actual minority contacts. Furthermore, Cooper (2003) suggested police officers may ultimately disengage significantly from patrolling minority populated neighborhoods. This practice, as noted by Cooper, serves to both address critics of racial profiling practices and to send the message that police will "allow crime to go unchecked" (p.8).

As a behavior exhibited by police officers, depolicing might be viewed as an individual officer's attempt to establish solidarity or exhibit his or her authority to employ discretion when he or she sees fit, as was the case when Cooper (2003) referenced the practice. However, an analysis of police behavior revealed a multi-faceted approach to the decision-making process. Citing Wilson, Liederbach and Travis III (2008) noted the differential policing styles of service, watchdog, and legalistic orientation, but suggested that officers differ in the way they approach problems and those behaviors cannot be attributed solely to the municipality's political culture. Stroshine, Alpert, and Dunham (2008) noted how individual interpretations of people and places have a direct influence on officer behavior and decision making processes. Notably, much of the existing literature has focused on a police officer's decision-making process during a traffic stop.

Higgins et al. (2012) addressed an officer's decision to search during a traffic stop encounter, noting the lack of research clearly addressing police decision-making during a traffic stop. In regard to racial profiling, Higgins et al. further asserted that the research in existence has generally relied on tests with no theoretical foundation. Nonetheless, officer behavior in traffic stop encounters is a heavily researched area; what appears to be

lacking is research in factors influencing an officer's decision not to conduct a traffic stop.

Table 1

Elements Identified in Existing Research

Racial Profiling	Policy Implementation	Organizational Control	Depolicing
Group Harm	Data Collection	Professional Control	Individual Response
Usefulness	Baseline Problems	Behavior Control	Disengagement
Traffic Stops	Competing Definitions	Output Control	Impact

The current research surrounding racial profiling, as identified in Table 1, has focused on three primary issues: (a) The harm associated with identifying a certain group of individuals with inherent criminality, (b) the usefulness of race as an indicator of criminality, and (c) the police use of racial profiling in traffic stops. While there are other issues relative to the topic of racial profiling, these three elements appear to fuel the majority of research on the topic.

The current research surrounding policy implementation in racial profiling, as identified in Table 1, has focused on three primary issues: (a) the implementation of data collection policies, (b) a problem identifying an acceptable baseline of minority contacts, and (c) consensus on how racial profiling is defined. While there are other issues relative to the topic of policy implementation and police discretion, these three elements have been the most popular in the extant related research.

The current research surrounding organizational control, as identified in Table 1, has involved the identification and discussion of three primary control mechanisms: (a)

professional control mechanisms, (b) behavior control mechanisms, and (c) output control mechanisms. Lastly, extant research surrounding police behavior (specifically depolicing), while very minute, can be identified as involving the following three elements: (a) a police officer's individual response to a policy, (b) disengagement from enforcement, and (c) the impact of depolicing in a given community.

Literature Review and Key Concepts

Researchers have typically characterized racial profiling as adhering to a positivistic paradigm. When addressing racial profiling data ontologically, the hard data reveals the existence of a notable disparity in traffic stop data (Higgins et al., 2012). However, current researchers identified other variables relating to a police officer's decision making process and not all identify such a disparity; some of these variables include environment (Warren & Farrell, 2009; Ingram, 2007), race of the officer (Gilliard-Matthews, Kowalski, & Lundman, 2008; Cochran & Warren, 2012), organizational determinants (Chappell, MacDonald, & Manz, 2006), vehicle characteristics (Phillips, 2009), and time of stop (Worden et al., 2012).

Warren and Farrell (2009) addressed racial profiling as it related to political environment. Utilizing a quantitative time-series analysis and multivariate analysis they sought to analyze racial disparity in searches initiated during traffic stops dependent upon several variables such as media attention to racial profiling, the passage of data collection policies, and change in organizational leadership (Warren & Farrell, 2009). The results indicated that external environment did have an influence on individual officer behavior (Warren & Farrell, 2009). In addition, officer behavior was significantly influenced by

police leadership (Warren & Farrell, 2009). This research indicated that the police chief could influence individual officer behavior (Warren & Farrell, 2009).

In analyzing the geographical correlation to racial profiling, Roh and Robinson (2009) kept with the quantitative trend by employing regression analysis. Roh and Robinson were interested in analyzing the effects of neighborhood characteristics on patrol practices. Specifically, the authors noted the disproportionate stop rate of minorities in predominantly minority populated areas and cited how a more aggressive policing style may be implemented in such areas. The results of this research indicated that in some places, police officers were more likely to make traffic stops in areas predominantly populated by racial minorities; searches and arrests were also more likely to occur in these neighborhoods (Roh & Robinson, 2009). In a similar finding to Warren and Farrell's assertions, Roh and Robinson (2009) stated that the police agency itself supported differentiated policing strategies and that support can be reflected in that agency's increased allocation of police resources in areas populated by racial minorities. This suggests that police behavior may be influenced by policy and professional environment. Ingram (2007) echoed the spatial correlation with the issuance of citations in minority populated areas. However, when Ingram controlled for surrounding environment and aspects of the encounter, only Hispanic populations and low economic status were significantly correlated with the issuance of citations. Ingram, much like Warren and Farrell (2009) and Roh and Robinson, utilized bivariate and multivariate quantitative analysis. Ingram did note that it is not merely race that influences police behavior as it relates to traffic stops.

Novak and Chamlin (2012) noted the importance of race in a police officer's decision to stop a motorist. Applying a conflict theory perspective, Novak and Chamlin sought to explore the relationship between race and structural characteristics have with the enforcement of traffic laws and suspicion generated by officer perception. Furthermore, the authors focused on traffic stops, searches, and arrest or citation rates as they relate to pre-designated patrol districts characterized by minority population (Novak & Chamlin, 2012). The results of this quantitative research indicated that racial composition of the police district did not have a relationship with traffic stop rates (Novak & Chamlin, 2012). However, it was noted that when an officer observed a driver belonging to a racial minority in an area not populated by racial minorities, suspicion increased; the same was noted for Whites observed in a predominantly minority populated neighborhood (Novak & Chamlin, 2012). Vito and Walsh (2008) also noted that police officers were more likely to be suspicious of Blacks even without any behavioral cues present. Novak and Chamlin followed up the latter assertion by stating one of the limitations of their study was it did not address micro-level variables such as behavioral cues that may have played into this suspicion.

Stepping away from the racial profiling analysis, but still analyzing police officer behavior as it relates to race and ethnicity, Fallik and Novak (2012) employed the typical quantitative research strategy, regression to be specific, to look at automobile searches conducted as a result of a traffic stop. It was learned that neither race nor ethnicity was significantly related to discretionary searches, non-discretionary searches, or searches relating to several predictor variables such as age, race, time of stop, or specified traffic violation to name a few (Fallik & Novak, 2012). Fallik and Novak noted that the results

"indicate a further diminishing influence of race and ethnicity for discretionary decisions" (p. 159).

Vito and Walsh (2008) stated that the decision to make a traffic stop involved a conscious decision- making process on the officer's part and understanding the thoughts and motives behind those decisions are of the utmost importance. In analyzing multiple variables associated with such a decision, Pollock, Oliver, and Menard (2012) utilized multilevel Bernoulli models, similar to logistic regression, to analyze the relationship of numerous variables such as sex, age, race, age, and so on, on an officer's decision to arrest or stop and question a person. Pollock et al. discovered that race did not have a significant relationship to an officers' decision to stop and question or arrest a person. It was noted that their findings are consistent with the current body of knowledge addressing the insignificance of race and police contacts (Pollock et al., 2012).

Utilizing logistic regression, Gilliard-Matthews et al. (2008) addressed the relationship between an officer's race and ticketing practices between the years of 1999 and 2002. Since the dependent variable, ticket or no ticket is a dichotomous variable, Gilliard-Matthews et al. utilized logistic regression to find that Black officers did not ticket Black motorists in 2002 as the same rate they did in 1999; the rate was lower. However, Gilliard-Matthews et al. noted that White police officers ticketed minorities at a higher rate than Whites in general. Interestingly, it was noted that White police officers' experiences differ from those of Black police officers in that they were buffered by the traditional police subculture (Gilliard-Matthews et al., 2008). In addition, it was stated that White police officers had never been on the receiving end of a race-based stop (Gilliard-Matthews et al., 2008). This assertion reflects Theobald and Haider-Markel's

(2009) quantitative survey that revealed that when met with Black police officers, Black citizens were significantly more likely to believe the contact was justified as opposed to during contact with White officers.

Also using logistic regression, Cochran and Warren (2012) addressed how an officer's race impacts public perception in the context of racial profiling. Cochran and Warren (2012) noted that there has been a notable lack of research analyzing the employment of more minorities in police agencies to improve relationships with the public and combat racial profiling claims. Again, logistic regression was employed by Cochran and Warren due to the dichotomous dependent variable. The findings indicated that Black citizens were prone to view their contact as negative when a traffic stop was initiated by a White police officer (Cochran & Warren, 2012). Conversely, when Black citizens were stopped by Black officers, the only significant predictor of perceived illegitimacy was the reason for stop as opposed to the officer's race (Cochran & Warren, 2012). According to that research, the race of the officer does impact the perceptions of minority motorists who are stopped by police, which adds support to Theobald and Haider-Markel's (2009) research into symbolic representation.

When analyzing racial profiling, from an anecdotal perspective, it might be important to note an officer's ability to even identify the race of a motorist. Worden et al. (2012) sought to evaluate the effect of the officer's inability to see the driver due to the time of day and natural lighting. In keeping with the quantitative theme in racial profiling research, Worden et al. employed logistic regression to control for variables such as time and place to identify the effect the time of day has on an officer's propensity to stop a minority. From the results of the logistic regression analysis, an odds ratio was computed

to compare the likelihood that an African American would be stopped during the daylight rather than at night under the "veil of darkness" (Worden et al., 2012). The findings indicated that African Americans were no more likely to be stopped during daylight hours than they were at night, revealing yet another example of a notable lack of racial bias in police behavior (Worden et al., 2012).

Warren and Farrell (2009) noted the political influence in a police officer's decision. Chappell et al. (2006) also sought to analyze police officer behavior in looking at the arrest rates as influenced by the organization. Chappell et al. revisited J.Q. Wilson's theory on organizational determinants, calling on the legalistic, watchman, and service oriented policing styles to explain how they may influence a police officer's decision making process. Utilizing regression analysis, Chappell et al. revealed that the typologies noted by Wilson are not necessarily individually indicative of one characterizing method of policing over another as "police agencies do not fall squarely within only one of Wilson's typologies" (p.303). Findings indicated that there was a relationship between unit specialization and violent arrests; officer membership in a union was significantly related to the number of violent arrests per officer (Chappell et al., 2006). In general, arrest rates were not found to be significantly related to organizational make-up, but the study addressed arrest rates only (Chappell et al., 2006). More recently, Warren and Farrell (2009) identified the relationship between an organization's political environment and an officer's propensity to subject minorities to increased investigative attention. Schafer et al. (2006) also noted the influence of police culture in individual officer discretion as a notable variable in addition to their use of generalized classifications of citizens to "simplify their working environment" (p.188).

As politics may play a part in an officer's decision making process (Warren & Farrell, 2009), or the organizational leadership may influence police action (Chappell et al., 2006), officers conduct themselves according to their descriptive perspectives of organizational justice (Wolfe & Piquero, 2011). According to Wolfe and Piquero (2011), officers who view their departments as just in enforcing departmental guidelines are less likely to engage in undesirable behavior otherwise known as police misconduct. Shane (2012) echoed this assertion in noting the trend of increased desirable performance by employees when they felt connected or embraced by the organization. Conversely, Wolfe and Piquero cited research indicating that those who view their departments as treating their employees unjustly are more likely to engage in deviant behavior. Wolfe and Piquero utilized regression analysis in seeking their understanding perceptions of organizational justice as it effects officer attitude and beliefs in noble-cause or code-of-silence attitudes. What was learned was as officers felt their organizations were just, their rate of citizen complaints decreased. Wolfe and Piquero noted the importance of policy development that appears fair and just while explaining the importance and allowing for the officer to voice concerns about the policy.

Most notable in this study is the research conducted by Phillips (2009). Phillips utilized ordinal regression to address an ordinal scaled dependent variable of the likelihood of stopping a vehicle based on several variables. To address the dependent variable of stop or not stop, Phillips utilized vignettes to identify those independent variables that might have a moderating or mediating effect on a police officer's decision-making process. Phillips noted that the use of vignettes is useful in measuring decision-

making as other methods, such as qualitative observations, may not measure variables that are not readily visible to the researcher.

Strengths and Weaknesses in Quantitative Research

In researching the current body of knowledge addressing racial profiling, police behavior, and policy implementation, I noted a clear quantitative trend (e.g. Phillips, 2009; Wolfe & Piquero, 2011). However, this overwhelming trend of statistical data collection to represent the chosen variables has both its strengths and weaknesses (Batton & Kadleck, 2004). For example, while regression analysis, specifically logistic regression, is useful in predicting categorical outcomes (Field, 2009), representing a notable strength in using quantitative research in the area of racial profiling , there is confusion in the scholarly world about what even constitutes racial profiling. It can be difficult to measure a variable when there is confusion on what constitutes that variable. As noted by Batton and Kadleck (2004), racial profiling is an "elusive concept" that is lacking in defining characteristics (p.36). Furthermore, analysis of racial profiling generally asserts the presumption of a universally accepted definition of the phenomenon when in fact, the cited definitions are somewhat ambiguous (Batton & Kadleck, 2004).

Ramirez et al. (2003) provided an operational definition of racial profiling, stating that it constitutes an officers use of race, ethnicity, or national origin inappropriately when making a decision to investigate a person for a suspected criminal offense. Ramirez et al. noted that when making this decision, these descriptive variables are interpreted as a greater indication of criminality than the person's individual behavior. Withrow (2007) defined racial profiling as a decision made by a police officer to stop a motorist based only on his or her race or ethnicity, thereby emphasizing the relationship with traffic

stops. Novak and Chamlin (2012) also noted how police officers may target minorities for traffic stops in addition to increased rates of searches and higher sanctioning dispositions. What is common in each definition is the pejorative nature of racial profiling. Risse (2007) noted three issues at hand that contributed to the ambiguous, or potentially unclear, definition of what constitutes racial profiling: the use of race as an "information-carrier" (p.4), police misconduct, and the notably high incidents of police officers using race to identify potential offenders. But, as noted by Barnum and Perfetti (2010), the suggested disproportions in minority contacts have been a shortcoming in racial profiling research as there is no identifiable baseline that defines what is or what is not disproportionate. In addition, just because disproportions have been found to exist in regard to police/minority contact does not necessarily indicate malfeasance on part of the officer (Barnum & Perfetti, 2010).

Another weakness in the existing body of research pertains to the use of official police records as the primary source of data collected in regard to racial profiling (Phillips, 2009). According to Phillips (2009) there are many data collection procedures that fail to identify the legal factors that play into an officer's decision to stop a motorist. In addition, Withrow (as cited in Phillips, 2009) suggested that data collection efforts fail to address those instances where officers choose to not stop a motorist, making comparisons between who was stopped and not stopped less valid.

Lastly, as noted by Phillips (2009), one of the problems associated with racial profiling data collection is the mere nature of self-reported data on a controversial topic. Lundman (2012) found that police officers have several reasons to inaccurately report data pertaining to racial profiling: (a) some agencies may prove to be indifferent to the

reporting of racial profiling statistics, whereas some agencies may be concerned about it, (b) there may be an unwillingness to report racial profiling data as it tends to automatically assume officer misconduct associated with bias-based policing, (c) there are justifications for using race as an indicator of criminal activity and even case law that supports pre-textual stops, and (d) interpretation of disproportionality in regard to over-representative minority contacts are quite often misinterpreted.

As a notable strength, the current body of knowledge in the realm of racial profiling points to multiple variables that might explain an assumed disproportionality, and many researchers sought expose these other variables that might explain police behavior (e.g. Cochran & Warren, 2012; Ingram, 2007; Liederbach & Travis, 2008) Since many minority citizens have a tendency to view police actions as illegitimate to begin with (Cochran & Warren, 2012), any identifiable variable that might explain the disproportional rate of contact might be beneficial in understanding the existing research. Cochran and Warren (2012) noted that officer race and gender have significant effect on how a citizen views police behavior. By utilizing quantitative analysis, Cochran and Warren were able to control variables such as the reason for stop and still identify the tendency for Black citizens (males and females) to have a negative perception of police activity when the contact was initiated by a White officer. This information might be valuable when creating policy to combat racial profiling in response to public pressure.

Another identified variable noted by quantitative research in racial profiling addressed how neighborhood characteristics influenced police behavior (Ingram, 2007). As noted by Ingram (2007), race was not the only factor that significantly predicted a

certain outcome of a traffic stop. Ingram identified the significance of socioeconomic status in relation to an officer's decision to cite a motorist as opposed to just race.

In addition, racial profiling research has changed from the War on Drugs to the War on Terror (Johnson et al., 2011). When evaluating a sensitive topic such as racial profiling it might be important to take into account the current political climate (Liederbach & Travis, 2008). Horowitz and Levin (2001) commented on how police were often victims associated with the fallout of racial profiling issues prior to the terror attacks on September 11, 2001. Race-fueled riots in Cincinnati as a result of an officer-involved shooting of a Black man brought the police and every White citizen into harm's way based solely on the color of their skin or the fact that they wore a badge. In this instance, race was a factor in the outcome, but that outcome was characterized by emotion. However, the focus and political climate changed after September 11, 2001 (Johnson et al., 2011).

The identification of a change in public perception of racial profiling as an acceptable tool in law enforcement is of note. Johnson et al. (2011) noted no significant difference in perceptions of racial profiling used as a tool for crime prevention vs. terrorism prevention. However, Johnson et al. noted that the approval rating of racial profiling as a preventative measure for both crime and terrorism nearly doubled after the terror attacks of September 11, 2001.

Utilizing qualitative procedures, such as interviews, in researching sensitive topics may prove to be problematic (Creswell, 2009).The validity of qualitative analysis may be challenged in that the sample population may be predisposed to answering

questions about such a sensitive topic in a socially acceptable way (Creswell, 2009). For this reason, I chose to employ a quantitative study.

For this study, I chose to build upon the assertion that there are multiple variables that play into an officer's decision to stop a motorist. Most importantly, establishment of a statutorily mandated policy that calls for data collection relating to the race of motorists stopped by a particular officer may influence that officer's decision to stop those who violate the law for fear of discipline through improper application of behavioral controls. By identifying the multiple variables that influence police behavior, policies may be written to address racial profiling in such a way that explain over-representative minority contacts through addressing individual, or even environmental, factors. The consequences for failing to address these variables may result in depolicing or as Horowitz and Levin (2001) noted, potential victimization of police officers fueled by perceived racist stereotypes.

Review and Synthesis of Related Variables

The impact of racial profiling can be felt by many. As noted by Kennedy (1997), the practice ignores individuality and lumps people into categories associated with increased criminality. Just the mere thought of police conducting themselves in such a manner can be just as influential as the misconduct itself (Weitzer, Tuch, & Skogan, 2008). In fact, Weitzer et al. (2008) noted that public perceptions affect many facets of police/community relations to include cooperation and trust; Rocque (2011) echoed this assertion stating the differential treatment of minorities within the criminal justice system negatively impacts perceptions of legitimacy. Zhao and Hassell (2005) stated, "Professionalism and impartiality are viewed as the most essential elements of

organizational operation" (p.414). However, Piquero (2008) pointed to a trend in which minorities are disproportionately represented at every stage of the criminal justice system, and this trend is growing at a faster rate than the representation of Whites. The result of this over-representation reveals distrust and feelings of illegitimacy held by citizens of the community (Higgins et al., 2008; Reitzel & Piquero, 2006; Theobald & Haider-Markel, 2009). There are even some African American citizens who take great strides to separate themselves from what might be considered "bad Negroes" (Gabbidon et al., 2012, p. 4). Bobo and Thompson (2006) argued that the practices that affect minorities in a negative and disproportionate way were the result of policy enactment that reinvented the racial strife present in the Civil Rights era.

On the other hand, Mastrofski (2004) noted the concern that police administrators historically had regarding how to successfully eliminate any racial bias that may be present within their police departments. Hickman and Piquero (2009) also noted the historical push to increase equal enforcement of the law and minority representation within police departments. On the other hand, Miller (2007) observed that the implementation of policy, specifically those that address data collection for minority contact, serve only to show responsiveness to community perceptions. The data itself does not provide a basis for identifying any racial disparities in traffic stop information (Miller, 2007). However, failure to adhere to written policy may result in certain disciplinary actions or corrective measures. Missouri's racial profiling statute 590.650 advises departmental policy shall provide for certain steps to be taken when an officer is identified to have engaged in racial profiling, steps that include counseling and training (Missouri General Assembly, 2012). What is lacking in the statute is language addressing

the many variables that may influence an officer's decision making process as it relates to stopping motorists; the identification of variables other than race, as noted by Phillips (2009), prior to the stop. Nonetheless, policies have been implemented, and as Laney (2004) noted, some wanted police officers to be open for civil litigation if found to be engaging in bias based policing. But it is not just the threat of civil litigation noted by Laney that may influence an officer's behavior; the application of certain control mechanisms as described by Rowe et al. (2012) may be just as influential.

As Rowe et al. (2012) noted, an organization will experience negative repercussion when and if improper control mechanisms are utilized by superiors. Application of improper control mechanisms may alienate an employee, resulting in a decreased level of performance (Rowe et al., 2012). Shane (2012) noted that feelings of not belonging to the organization may increase feelings of alienation and reduce desired performance levels in an employee. However, the reality of patrolling neighborhoods in the United States is characterized by deep racial segregation in many communities (Capers, 2009). So the question remains, how does department policy influence police officer decision-making?

As Lever (2007) stated, the use of racial profiling has the potential to reduce victimization of those involved in Black-on-Black crime, but in reality it is intended to foster feelings of safety within the White community. But as Withrow (2007) noted, the use of race must not be ignored in some situations; most notably when described as part of a physical description of a criminal suspect. For the criminal interdiction aspect of racial profiling, this concept may be useful in reactive patrol efforts, but utilizing it for crime prevention in general has not garnered much public support (Johnson et al., 2011).

Since the September 11, 2001 terror attacks, citizens of the United States have sought to evaluate the usefulness of bias based policing in an effort to prevent both crime and terrorism (Johnson et al., 2011). According to Johnson et al. (2011), prior to September 11th, the issue of racial profiling revolved around the use of drug courier profiles espoused by the DEA's Operation Pipeline. However, since the terror attacks, the issue of racial profiling has switched gears from a crime prevention mechanism to one of national security as those of Middle Eastern descent, Arabs, and Muslims were targeted in the newly waged War on Terror (Johnson et al., 2011). Soon after the attacks, the general public engaged in unprecedented approval of using race as an indicator of criminal activity in the name of homeland security (Johnson et al., 2011). Spencer (2006), noted that those responsible for the September 11th attacks, and other notable incidents, were Muslims, so ignoring that would be "suicidal" (p.12). Citing public approval ratings, Reddick (2004) noted that prior to September 11th, "80% of Americans opposed racial profiling. Today, 60% of Americans believe in the necessity of some form of profiling to ensure public safety and national security" (p.154). However, public sentiment surrounding race relations may have changed with the election of President Barack Obama.

According to Ostertag and Armaline (2011), two-thirds of the respondents in a 2008 Gallup poll believed that the election of President Obama was the single most important event in the advancement of Blacks that occurred in the past 100 years. Ostertag and Armaline (2011) further asserted that the election signified the end of racism in America for many respondents, but some conservatives noted concern for what was deemed "reverse racism," in which Whites would suffer from policy implementation

in the name of equality. Possibly stemming from this concern, the Southern Poverty Law Center noted a rise in White-supremacist groups after the election (Ostertag & Armaline, 2011).

What has happened in the United States is the implementation of a color-blind ideology, which from a critical race perspective, is characterized by three characteristics: (a) racism is no longer an issue in the United States, (b) any notable racial inequalities are the result of other oppressive variables or individual characteristics and not racism, and (c) those who create policy, White elites, do not see race when creating policy (Ostertag & Armaline, 2011). However, it is not always feasible to assume compliance from those in the workforce even if policy is in place. As Pierro, Cicero, and Raven (2008) noted, employees have different motivating factors that guide the willingness to comply with policy, either intrinsically or extrinsically. Intrinsically motivated compliance comes with recognition that job performance is somehow intrinsically beneficial to the worker whether it be through a sense of accomplishment or the mere fact that the worker is interested in their job (Pierro et al., 2008) On the other hand, extrinsic motivation is characterized by an outside influence such as the need to be recognized for their accomplishments or simply because they are told to do so (Pierro et al., 2008). Furthermore, Pierro et al. (2008) noted that the difference in personal motivations can influence compliance from subordinates.

In an attempt to explain police officer discretion, Smith, Novak, Frank, and Lowenkamp (2005) observed other predictors that influence the decision-making process. According to Smith et al., factors such as community-level predictors in addition to officer-level predictors are important in discretionary decision-making. Community-level

predictors such as crime rates, socio-economics, or even race may dictate what an officer decides to do (i.e. foot patrol, vehicle patrol, or even citizen engagement; Smith et al., 2005). Officer-level predictors include personal ideologies about the role of police in the community in addition to officer demographics (Smith et al., 2005).

Summary and Conclusion

There is an abundance of research in the area of racial profiling (e.g., Cochran & Warren, 2012; Johnson et al., 2011; Petrocelli, Piquero, & Smith, 2003; Phillips, 2009), so my search through the various online search engines and databases yielded an extremely large return. Adding in the topic of organizational management and officer behavior only increased the amount of research that was appropriate for this study, but analysis of the body of knowledge culminated in the identification of over 70 sources appropriate for this study. These sources that I identified contributed to the conceptual framework utilized in this study.

The formation of in-groups and out-groups, as noted by Allport (1958), is essential in understanding how stereotypes are formed. These in-groups and out-groups, for analysis of this conceptual framework, will be identified as police officers and racial and ethnic minorities, respectively. After all, as Kennedy (1997) suggested, it is the turbulent relationship between these two groups that has fueled many acts of civil unrest. In addition, this turbulent relationship is at the heart of the data collection policies that I intend to analyze in this study (Laney, 2004).

Police administrators implemented policies, either by legislation or by individual choice, to address the phenomenon of racial profiling (Laney, 2004). Ouchi and Johnson (1978) observed that the implementations of control mechanisms are an integral part of

organizational management, and when policies are not adhered to, those control mechanisms can be applied to ensure organizational compliance. However, as Rowe et al. (2012) noted, improper application of control mechanisms can result in negative employee behavior. At the heart of this study is the negative behavior known as depolicing.

Higgins et al. (2012) highlighted the notable disparity in the racial and ethnic composition of traffic stop data. It is important to note the influence of the many factors other than race that play a role in police officer decision-making. However, administrators who implement racial profiling policy rarely look at these other factors when identifying officers who contact an over-representative number of members of racial minorities. Data collection policies identify aggregate officer/minority contacts that are then compared with the community's minority population. Identification of an officer who has an over-representative number of minority contacts, per statutory law or department policy, may be subjected to disciplinary procedures. But the demographics of any given community, or surrounding communities, are in constant flux and discovery of a baseline for acceptable minority contacts can be a difficult task. While race may be at the forefront of other researchers' studies, I addressed the impact of other predictors that influence a police officer's decision to stop a motorist. In doing so, I utilized binary logistic regression to analyze the relationship between the predictor variables and the outcome.

In the following chapter, I address the methodology more specifically to include a rationale of design choice and a clear explanation of the variables involved. I address the research questions and the corresponding alternative and null hypotheses in logistic

regression format. In addition, I describe the sample and sampling procedure as well as the instrument utilized to collect the data. Lastly, data interpretation as well as threats to validity and any ethical issues in this study are addressed.

Chapter 3: Research Method

Introduction

The purpose of this exploratory, quantitative, cross-sectional study was to analyze the relationship between statutorily mandated racial profiling policy and a police officer's decision to stop or not stop a motorist when the race of the motorist is observed to be that of a visible minority. In this chapter, the chosen methodology for the study is addressed, including a description of the variables and an extensive rationale as to why the chosen design fits best with those variables, the chosen population and the corresponding sampling procedures (to include an explanation of effect size, alpha, and power levels chosen), and the procedures for data collection. In addition, an in-depth discussion on the instrument utilized to collect the data has been included along with a discussion on data analysis and interpretation. Lastly, any ethical issues that may have arisen in this study and the procedures that I followed to ensure the protection and anonymity of those involved in the study are presented.

Overview of the Research Design

In this section I explain the rationale behind the chosen research design. The research questions leading this study will be presented as well. Lastly, in this section the outcome, or dependent variable, and predictor variables used in this quantitative analysis are identified.

Design Rationale

This study was a quantitative analysis and utilized binary logistic regression to test the hypotheses presented later in this chapter. According to Creswell (2009), quantitative analysis involves the examination of variables and their relationships with

one another. In addition, quantitative analysis allows for the measurement of such a relationship using statistics. Field (2009) suggested that in order to predict the likelihood of outcomes relating to certain variables, specifically categorical variables, logistic regression is ideal. This study addressed discretionary decision-making by police officers that fell into two categories: (a) The decision to stop a motorist and (b) The decision to not stop a motorist. The presence of a dichotomous outcome variable such as the decision to stop, or not stop a motorist, and the fact that the study will predict outcomes involving four predictor variables, binary logistic regression was the logical choice for data analysis.

The use of binary logistic regression in the analysis of police officer behavior or decision-making appears on a variety of research projects aimed at police officer decision-making processes involving traffic stops (Barnum & Perfetti, 2010; Novak, 2004). Novak (2004) utilized logistic regression when researching a correlation between race and traffic stops while Barnum and Perfetti (2010) utilized logistic regression in predicting citation, arrests, and searches as they relate to race in a traffic stop encounter. More importantly, Phillips (2009), used ordinal regression, which he suggested is an offshoot of logistic regression, to measure an officer's decision to stop or not stop a motorist based on the presence of several variables. Much like these research examples, logistic regression was utilized in this study to predict whether any of the four predictor variables have a significant relationship with a police officer's decision to stop or not stop a motorist. Reflecting Phillips's research, this study also utilized vignettes to address variance issues in the decision to stop or not stop a motorist.

Variables

According to Field (2009), binary logistic regression analysis is best suited for quantitative research in which one dichotomous dependent variable, the criterion variable, is present along with several categorical or continuous independent variables, the predictor variables. This study fit these criteria. As stated at the beginning of this chapter, the purpose of this study was to analyze the relationship between racial profiling policy and a police officer's decision to stop or not stop a motorist for a traffic violation when the race of that motorist is observed to be a visible minority. This decision to stop or not stop is a dichotomous outcome variable.

Defining predictor variables for this study involved anecdotal understanding of police officer behavior combined with analysis of existing research resulting in the identification of four predictors. Although not a predictor variable used in this study, the perceived race of the driver must be addressed as it was analyzed as an influential variable in the decision to stop or not stop the motorist in the vignette. The Federal Bureau of Investigation's (FBI) Uniform Crime Report listed four classifications of race in their 2011 crime statistics, and they are as follows: (a) White, (b) Black, (c) American Indian or Alaskan Native, and (d) Asian or Pacific Islander (FBI, 2011). There are, however, noticeable missing race classifications missing from these four categories. Hispanics for example are not listed yet according to the 2010 United States Census, make up 16% of the U.S. population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011). This noticeable omission may be indicative of what Perea (1997) called a Black/White binary, in which races, such as Hispanics, are excluded from discussions of race, and apparently crime tracking. On the other hand, the U.S. Census Bureau (2011) noted that those claiming

"Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish lineage may be of any race" (para.2). However, data tracking instruments utilized in Missouri, anecdotally, delineate Hispanics from Whites as well as Blacks. As a result, this study will operationally define a minority to include any race, claimed national origin, or ethnicity other than White. In other words, and in accordance with the latest U.S. Census, the majority population will be that of White because 72.4% of the United States population claimed White alone (U.S. Census, 2011), and the minority population will include all other races. Visible racial or ethnic minority will include the remaining population that do not fall into the category of White.

The first predictor variable was defined by the statutory requirement calling for the collection of data identifying the race of those with who police contact either via traffic stop or voluntary contact. According to Laney (2004), several state governments passed legislation requiring police department's to track demographic information as well as contact disposition to identify if officers are utilizing race as a primary factor in decision making or are engaging in disparate treatment of minorities. Some states, such as Missouri and Kansas, allow for police to be disciplined if found to be engaged in racial profiling or disparate treatment of minorities (Kansas Statute 22-4611, 2013; RSMO 590.650, 2013). Other states, such as Iowa, have not passed any legislation forbidding the practice (Iowa Code, 2013).

The second predictor variable in this study was that of time in policing. The number of years as a sworn officer can be an important variable in an officer's behavior, and the use of race in discretionary decision-making may be no different. This study will analyze the correlation between how long an officer is employed in policing, by years, with his or her decision to stop or not stop a visible ethnic or racial minority.

The third predictor variable involved any prior discipline or consultation, one or more, for violating bias-based policing policies within the individual officer's police department. As noted by legislation in both Kansas and Missouri, officers can be subject to discipline if found to be engaging in racial profiling (Kansas Statute 22-4511. 2013; RSMO 590.650, 2013). Consequently, as noted by Rowe et al. (2012) applications of behavioral control mechanisms may be an important variable.

The fourth predictor variable identified for this study was the frequency of discussion relating to racial profiling statistics. In other words, any notification to the officer from their supervisor as to the current status of their racial profiling contact ratios was included as a predictor. These discussions may come in the form of formal or informal periodic evaluations or even as part of a disciplinary procedure.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

RQ1: What is the correlation between the presence of a State Statute Requiring Data Collection of Citizen Contacts and an officer's decision to stop or not stop a visible, racial or ethnic minority for any observed law violation?

$H_0$1: ßκ=0 In the population, the odds of the independent variable the presence of a state statute requiring data collection of citizen contacts as measured by a specific state statute increasing the likelihood of the dependent variable decision to stop or not stop as measured by an officers' self-report equals zero.

$H_1$1: ßκ≠0 In the population, the odds of the independent variable the presence of a state statute requiring data collection of citizen contacts as measured by a specific state statute increasing the likelihood of the dependent variable decision to stop or not stop as measured by an officers' self-report does not equal zero.

RQ2: What is the correlation between an officer's years as a sworn police officer and an officer's decision to stop a visible, racial or ethnic minority motorist for any observed law violation?

$H_0$2: ßκ=0 In the population, the odds of the independent variable officer's years as a sworn police officer as measured by an officers' self-report increasing the likelihood of the dependent variable decision to stop or not stop as measured by an officers' self-report equals zero.

$H_1$2: ßκ≠0 In the population, the odds of the independent variable officer's years as a sworn police officer measured by officers' self-report increasing the likelihood of the dependent variable decision to stop or not stop as measured by an officers' self-report does not equal zero.

RQ3: What is the correlation between the officer receiving any prior discipline or consultation for violating the department's racial profiling or bias-based policing policy and an officer's decision to stop a visible, racial or ethnic minority for any observed law violation?

$H_0$3: ßκ=0 In the population, the odds of the independent variable officer receiving any prior discipline or consultation for violating the department's racial profiling or bias-based policing policy as measured by an officers' self-report increasing the likelihood of the dependent variable decision to stop or not stop as measured by an officers' self-report equals zero.

$H_1$3: ßκ≠0 In the population, the odds of the independent variable officer receiving any prior discipline or consultation for violating the department's racial profiling or bias-based policing policy as measured by an officers' self-report increasing

the likelihood of the dependent variable decision to stop or not stop as measured by an officers' self-report does not equal zero.

RQ4: What is the correlation between the frequency of discussion of racial profiling or bias-based policing statistics and that officer's decision to stop or not stop a visible racial or ethnic minority for any law violation?

$H_0$4: ßκ=0 In the population, the odds of the independent variable frequency of discussion of racial profiling or bias-based policing statistics as measured by an officers' self-report increasing the likelihood of the dependent variable decision to stop or not stop as measured by an officers' self-report equals zero.

$H_1$4: ßκ≠0 In the population, the odds of the independent variable frequency of discussion of racial profiling or bias-based policing statistics as measured by an officers' self-report increasing the likelihood of the dependent variable decision to stop or not stop as measured by an officers' self-report does not equal zero.

Methodology

According to Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias (2008), data collection is a crucial component to hypothesis testing and the primary means for empirical support of predictions. Generalizations, as described by Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias, are an integral part of testing hypotheses, and generalizations come from making inferences drawn from a fraction of the population of interest; a fraction known as a sample. The population, on the other hand, is comprised of the entire group of units (Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias, 2008). For this study, I defined the population as all sworn police officers deployed in a patrol function. In other words, those officers who are tasked with the responsibilities of responding to calls for service, making traffic stops for observed

violations of law, and granted discretionary powers by their respective governmental authority. According to the FBI's Uniform Crime Report (2010), the total target population of police officers is 705,009 working in 448,905 cities. However, for this study, the sample size was approximately 412 sworn officers patrolling three cities.

Sampling

Sampling can be distinguished between probability and non-probability sampling (Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias, 2008). Probability sampling is characterized by the researcher's use of random selection; non-probability sampling does not use random selection (Trochim, 2006). As noted by Trochim (2006), non-probability sampling is not the best choice for generalization to an entire population, in this case all sworn police officers in the United States, but as noted it is not feasible to collect data from every officer either. Consequently, this study utilized non-probability sampling; namely purposive sampling.

Trochim (2006) noted that purposive sampling is self-explanatory; it is sampling with a purpose characterized by groups that have previously been identified as crucial to the research. This study was intended to show the effects of racial profiling policy on pro-active law enforcement, and the predefined groups to be studied are sworn police officers who routinely conduct traffic stops as part of their duties. Furthermore, the target sample was that of one agency from three states in the Midwest: Missouri, Kansas, and Iowa; each representing a different statutory requirement for racial profiling data tracking that shows an officer's statistical rate of minority contacts. This purposive sample represents sworn police officers who are the most likely to conduct discretionary stops for observed traffic violations. In contrast, it would not serve the study to survey units assigned to a

predominantly investigative or administrative function as, anecdotally, their assigned roles do not allow for routinely conducting traffic stops.

This sample was drawn from the respective department's statutory data tracking requirements. The State of Missouri has a racial profiling statute that requires police departments to track their officer's contacts with citizens and report their race as well as the reason for stop and disposition; departments are also required to implement policy that forbids bias-based policing (RSMO 590.650, 2013). The State of Kansas requires police departments to track their officer's contacts with citizens, just as Missouri requires, but adds a suggestive protocol to track voluntary citizen contacts; Kansas also requires police departments to implement policy forbidding bias-based policing (Kansas Statute 22-4511, 2013). Lastly, the State of Iowa has no data tracking statutory requirement. In other words, officers are not required by law to report citizen contacts, nor are departments required to have policy that bans the use of race as an indicator of criminal activity (Iowa Code, 2013). The rationale for choosing the three different sampling frames lies in the statutory requirements and their potential influence on individual officer discretion.

This study included an assumption that individual officers were aware of their respective department policy, and statutory law, which addresses the use of race in the decision-making process. As part of the survey instrument, officers were asked whether or not they have been trained in their racial profiling policy. The answers given by these officers are intended to address this assumption.

The current study employed binary logistic regression with demographic data collected from a self-administered survey that included a vignette. According to

Tabachnick and Fidell (2001), the proper "sample size depends on a number of issues, including the desired power, alpha level, number of predictors, and expected effect sizes" (p.117). Tabachnick and Fidell further added that a simple rule in computing sample size is $N \geq 104 + m$ with m being the number of predictor variables in the model. The current study employed a minimum sample size of $N \geq 104 + 4$ or $N \geq 108$.

When evaluating statistics it is important to promote confidence in the results and relay accurate results. Researchers take precautions to avoid two different types of error in research: (a) A Type I error in which the null hypothesis is erroneously rejected, or (b) A Type II error in which the alternative hypothesis is erroneously rejected (Field, 2009; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). According to Field (2009), increasing the value of one to lessen the chance of error creates a greater chance of error in the other. Since the two errors are characterized by different assumptions, as noted by Field, this study utilized and set an alpha level (α) of .05, meaning that there was a 5% chance a Type I error will occur.

Understanding the effects that occur in a researcher's sample population is a primary goal of statistical analysis (Field, 2009). The alpha level set at .05 as just described ensures that the researcher will observe an actual effect 95% of the time (Field, 2009; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001), but there is a caveat for interpreting confidence intervals. According to Field (2009), just because a researcher discovers a significant effect in the population, thereby providing evidence to reject the null hypotheses, does not mean that the null hypothesis is completely untrue; it is merely unlikely. To test or evaluate the importance of the observed effect or the strength of a relationship, as in the case of the current study, Field suggested the researcher measure the size of the effect.

According to Field, effect size is basically a measure of how one variable relates to another in terms of strength. For this study, I used an observed effect size of .50, which according to Field is a large effect size accounting for 25% of the variance.

Tabachnick and Fidell (2001) noted the importance of α, effect size, and power (1-β). Field (2009) described statistical power as the probability of detecting an observed effect noted by the effect size if such an effect even exists to begin with. Field suggested that a researcher should achieve a power of .80, which grants the researcher an 80% chance of detecting an effect in the sample population. For this study, I used a statistical power of .80, which decreased the chances of a Type II error (Field, 2009).

Using an α of .05, large effect size of .50, a power of .80, and 4 degrees of freedom, I conducted a GPower analysis to ensure sufficient sample size. The result of this power analysis suggested a minimum sample size of 52, which is far less than Tabachnick and Fidell's (2001) rule of $N \geq 104 + m$. Again, this study utilized the greater of the two with $N \geq 108$.

Participation and Data Collection

Recruiting participation in a study such as this involved professional introduction and a brief explanation. I identified three police agencies, one in Missouri, one in Kansas, and one in Iowa. I sought assistance from my employer, the Chief of Police in Lee's Summit, Missouri, and asked that he introduced me to the respective chiefs of each agency. Knowing the data collection may be of a sensitive nature, I hoped this professional introduction would validate the study and alleviate any suspicion from the respective chiefs of police. Each chief was contacted individually to both introduce myself and the study. Initial consent was granted to conduct research in the respective

agency. Each chief agreed through electronic communication and provided a copy of their racial profiling or bias-based policing policy upon request. Each were informed that the study sought to collect data pertaining to an individual officer's use of race in their discretionary decision making process.

Data collection was be conducted via a self-administered survey to include vignettes; the survey can be found in Appendices A and B. According to Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias (2008), asking questions of people concerning behavior that cannot be observed can often help to identify rationale and specifics relating to the experience in question. In addition, a vignette, according to Jenkins et al. (2010), can be used to collect data that represents collective group behavior. A survey with vignettes can be an excellent way to ask participants about their experience in a variety of roles, including police officers' experience with race and discretionary decision-making, as they pertain to fictional scenarios. Each participant was sent an email with a survey link. In the email I included an informed consent letter that explained the study as well as the rights of each participant. A range of dates was scheduled with each participating agency during which the officers could complete the survey at their own free will if they chose to do so. At the end of the time frame provided, I collected the data from Survey Monkey and exported it into SPSS. There was no debriefing of the participants nor was there any follow-up questionnaire or survey conducted. In addition, there was no payment for participation other than participants.

Instrumentation and Operationalization

The survey instrument utilized in this study was original, that is, I created the instrument and authored each question presented to the sample population. A thorough

review of the literature surrounding police officer behavior, organizational compliance, and racial profiling yielded no prior instrumentation to address a police officer's decision to not stop a motorist as it relates to the predictors chosen. As a police officer assigned to the patrol division, I have made thousands of traffic stops. I used this anecdotal knowledge of the factors that play a part in my personal decision making process when conducting a traffic stop. In addition, over the past 10 years, I have discussed what influences other police officer's decisions to make a traffic stop. Out of the many variables discovered, I chose four that I felt have the greatest impact on discretionary decision making as it pertains to racial profiling.

The research questions established for the current study address demographic information. The survey was designed to collect this information by asking straightforward questions to collect necessary data. Data was analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Science, version 21. As stated previously, binary logistic regression was utilized for this study.

Interpretation

Utilizing binary logistic regression involves a variety of assessments designed to evaluate how well the model fits the data and the extent of the contribution for each predictor (Field, 2009). Among these assessments are the Nagelkerke's R square, the Wald Statistic, and the odds ratio. According to Warmbrod (1999), the R-statistic characterizes the partial correlation of the predictor variable with the outcome; the values range between 1 and -1 with the positive value representing an increase in likelihood of a prediction as it corresponds with an increase in the predictor. The negative value, conversely, indicates that with an increase in any predictor variable, the likelihood of the

prediction occurring reduces (Warmbrod, 1999). However, Field (2009) stated that R is not necessarily an accurate measure alone as it is dependent upon the Wald Statistic. Squaring the R is also not a viable option as Field suggested doing so will result in an invalid value. One of the answers to this issue, as noted by Field is Nagelkerke's R square. This analysis utilized the value of Nagelkerke's R square to evaluate significance, which according to Field, can surpass issues noted with Cox and Snell's R square relating to the statistic reaching its maximum value.

The Wald Statistic, as described by Field (2009), best describes the contribution of the predictors as they fit the model. The Wald Statistic can help the researcher understand if an individual predictor is responsible for any significant change in the outcome (Field, 2009). In other words, the Wald statistic can signify whether or not an individual predictor is significantly related to the outcome, but the statistic must be evaluated with caution as the Wald statistic is susceptible to Type II errors. To address this susceptibility, log likelihood ratio tests were evaluated which addressed whether or not the predictors have a correlation with the outcome (Tabachnick & Fiddell, 2004).

Peng, Lee, and Ingersoll (2002) noted that logistic regression is centered around the logit, or "the natural logarithm of an odds ratio" (p.3). The odds ratio, simply put, is the odds of a predictor having the expected effect on the outcome or not having the expected effect (Field, 2009). Depending on the change in the odds ratio, the researcher is able to interpret the chances of an outcome occurring (Field, 2009). In other words, the odds ratio is the probability of the outcome occurring compared with the probability of the outcome not occurring (Warmbrod, 1999). This binary logistic regression study used the odds ratio to evaluate the categorization of each predictor variable as it related to a

unit change in the outcome (Tabachnick & Fiddell, 2004). In other words, in addition to the Wald Statistic, the odds ratio was used to classify the probability of the outcome occurring for each predictor. This classification was interpreted using the proportional reduction in error statistic calculated by SPSS, which according to Warmbrod (1999), reveals a percentage less error of classifying an outcome when using logistic regression than simply assigning classification without the equation. The proportional reduction in error statistic was used to analyze the associated classification table calculated by SPSS.

Validity and Reliability

Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias (2008) stated that validity of an instrument is important to ensure the instrument actually measures what the researcher intends to measure. If a researcher intends to draw valid conclusions based on the data collected, the instrument used to collect that data must be proven valid (Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias, 2008). The instrument I employed for this study is an original instrument and thus, has not been proven reliable. To address this issue, I selected academics and professionals in the criminal justice profession and asked their opinions on whether or not the questions posed address the variables I intended to measure. The academics chosen include three individuals with doctorate level degrees and the professionals chosen are all member of command staff at the Lee's Summit Police Department.

Reliability, on the other hand, is addressed to measure the amount of variable error of an instrument (Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias, 2008). Measuring the amount of variance in error is important to identify and in order to ensure reliability for this study. However, this survey asked participants factual information on how they would

behave in a particular situation in addition to demographic information. As such, reliability of the instrument was not an issue.

Threats to Validity

The collection of demographic variables in research may not be as sensitive to threats to validity and reliability as other variables in empirical research. Asking someone to list their age, race, or religious preference is a fairly straightforward, factual venture in which not much interpretation is needed. However, I also asked participants questions involving recollection of their behaviors and experiences pertaining to a somewhat sensitive subject. According to Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias (2008), response bias occurs when "respondents either deny the behavior in question or underreport it" (p.242). In response to questions about racial profiling, police officers might have had concerns about any reporting on such a sensitive topic because the phenomenon has caused violent civil unrest (Bah, 2006), and resulted in legislation banning its practice (Laney, 2004). However, to address the issue of response bias and lessen the chance urge to give the socially acceptable answers, I constructed the questionnaire to address an officer's willingness to ignore visible minorities in subjective compliance with either state law or department policy.

The next issue of concern was face validity. Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias (2008) stated that face validity "rests on the investigator's subjective evaluation of the appropriateness of the instrument for measuring the concept rather than whether the instrument measures what the researcher wishes to measure" (p.150). Furthermore, Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias advised that consultation with experts in the field might help to improve face validity. In this respect, I have discussed the variables that

influence discretionary decision-making in traffic stops with other police officers assigned to patrol. There is agreement on the predictor variables included that they are appropriate for this study.

Ethical Procedures

Three individual police departments were chosen for this study. I chose one department from Missouri, one department from Kansas, and one department from Iowa. Each department is approximately the same size (roughly between 150 and 200 officers). Each chief of police was contacted by email with a brief explanation of the study and an informal request to participate. Each department agreed and will be sent letters of cooperation to be included in the IRB application. Each chief of police was informed that their officers would be given a brief, on-site survey consisting of a short questionnaire in which demographic information will be collected. Prior to completing the questionnaire, the actual participants were provided informed consent forms and asked to complete the survey if they agreed to the conditions; completion of the survey served as a signature indicating a willingness to participate. There was no notable risk to participants who participated in this questionnaire and each participant was kept anonymous.

After collecting data from each department the results were entered into SPSS. All data was stored electronically on a flash drive and deleted from Survey Monkey, which was the site used to create the instrument and collect data. After 5 years, the data stored on the flash drive will be erased.

Summary

This study was a quantitative design with data analysis utilizing binary logistic regression to find a correlation between a dichotomous dependent variable (decision not

to stop) and four independent variables (the frequency of data discussion, the presence of a state statute requiring data collection of citizen contacts, an officer's years as a sworn police officer, and whether or not the officer had received any prior discipline or consultation for violating the department's racial profiling or bias-based policing policy). A questionnaire including vignettes was administered to the sample population consisting sworn police officer assigned to patrol in three states: Missouri, Kansas, and Iowa. The data collected was anonymous and every precaution was taken to ensure anonymity.

Any correlations discovered between the dependent variable and predictor variables are presented and discussed in Chapter 4 as well as any and all statistical conclusions. All appropriate tables generated in SPSS are included as well as discussion on both the alternative and null hypotheses related to each research question. Interpretation of the data is presented in Chapter 5

Chapter 4: Results

Introduction

The purpose of this quantitative, cross-sectional study was to analyze the relationship between having an existing racial profiling policy, at both the state and departmental level, and a police officer's decision to stop or not stop a motorist when the race of that motorist is observed to be that of a visible racial or ethnic minority. The dependent variable, or outcome variable, for this study was the decision to either stop or not stop a motorist, and there were four independent, or predictor variables: (a) The presence of a state law mandating the collection of racial profiling data, (b) Years in policing, (c) Prior discipline for violation the department's racial profiling policy, and (d) Frequency of supervisory discussion addressing collected racial profiling statistics. The research questions addressed, and the associated alternative and null hypotheses, are as follows:

RQ1: What is the correlation between the presence of a State Statute Requiring Data Collection of Citizen Contacts and an officer's decision to stop or not stop a visible, racial or ethnic minority for any observed law violation?

$H_0$1: ßκ=0 In the population, the odds of the independent variable the presence of a state statute requiring data collection of citizen contacts as measured by a specific state statute increasing the likelihood of the dependent variable decision to stop or not stop as measured by an officers' self-report equals zero.

$H_1$1: ßκ≠0 In the population, the odds of the independent variable the presence of a state statute requiring data collection of citizen contacts as measured by a

specific state statute increasing the likelihood of the dependent variable decision to stop or not stop as measured by an officers' self-report does not equal zero.

RQ2: What is the correlation between an officer's years as a sworn police officer and an officer's decision to stop a visible, racial or ethnic minority motorist for any observed law violation?

$H_0$2: ßκ=0 In the population, the odds of the independent variable officer's years as a sworn police officer as measured by an officers' self-report increasing the likelihood of the dependent variable decision to stop or not stop as measured by an officers' self-report equals zero.

$H_1$2: ßκ≠0 In the population, the odds of the independent variable officer's years as a sworn police officer measured by officers' self-report increasing the likelihood of the dependent variable decision to stop or not stop as measured by an officers' self-report does not equal zero.

RQ3: What is the correlation between the officer receiving any prior discipline or consultation for violating the department's racial profiling or bias-based policing policy and an officer's decision to stop a visible, racial or ethnic minority for any observed law violation?

$H_0$3: ßκ=0 In the population, the odds of the independent variable officer receiving any prior discipline or consultation for violating the department's racial profiling or bias-based policing policy as measured by an officers' self-report increasing the likelihood of the dependent variable decision to stop or not stop as measured by an officers' self-report equals zero.

$H_1$3: ßκ≠0 In the population, the odds of the independent variable officer receiving any prior discipline or consultation for violating the department's racial profiling or bias-based policing policy as measured by an officers' self-report increasing the likelihood of the dependent variable decision to stop or not stop as measured by an officers' self-report does not equal zero.

RQ4: What is the correlation between the frequency of discussion of racial profiling or bias-based policing statistics and that officer's decision to stop or not stop a visible racial or ethnic minority for any law violation?

$H_0$4: ßκ=0 In the population, the odds of the independent variable frequency of discussion of racial profiling or bias-based policing statistics as measured by an officers' self-report increasing the likelihood of the dependent variable decision to stop or not stop as measured by an officers' self-report equals zero.

$H_1$4: ßκ≠0 In the population, the odds of the independent variable frequency of discussion of racial profiling or bias-based policing statistics as measured by an officers' self-report increasing the likelihood of the dependent variable decision to stop or not stop as measured by an officers' self-report does not equal zero.

In this chapter, I present data collected during the initial pilot study, which showed no variance and was not analyzed with SPSS software, and discuss the changes made to the survey instrument administered for the main survey as well as some minor changes in data analysis. I discuss data collection as it applied to time frame for collection, descriptive statistics, sample representativeness, in addition to the logistic regression results, point biserial correlation, and frequencies and percentages of

associated variables. Furthermore, I will include all appropriate tables to illustrate the results of the study along with an evaluation of statistical assumptions.

In addition to the four research questions included in this study, I allowed respondents to explain the rationale for choosing to not stop the vehicle in the vignette. While not included in the logistic regression analysis, I analyzed descriptive statistics and frequencies for the following alternative research goals that may have influenced the officer's decision making process: (a) Describe the impact of an officer's understanding of a department policy on racial profiling or bias-based policing that cites discipline (consultation, sensitivity training, suspension, etc.) for violating the policy on an officer's decision to stop or not stop a visible, racial or ethnic minority motorist for any observed law violation; and (b) Describe the impact of the perceived race of a motorist on an individual officer's decision to stop or not stop that motorist for any observed law violation. Both of these alternative research goals were previous research questions that were changed or modified after the pilot study.

Pilot Study

After administering the original survey instrument for data collection, I noted problems with both the instrument itself and two research questions, which resulted in modifications to both as well as data analysis procedures. First and foremost, the initial question regarding stop or not stop based on the vignette yielded very little variation, suggesting very high reliability, but little validity; Trochim (2006) illustrated this very phenomenon by discussing consistent responses that did not actually measure the intended value. Frequencies and percentages for this study are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Frequencies and Percentages for Pilot Participant Survey Responses

Survey Question	*n*	%
Based on the scenario above, would you stop this vehicle?		
Yes	66	99
No	1	1

Analysis of the pilot study revealed another issue in addition to the validity concern. It was clear that the vignette needed adjustments that allowed for more variance in response. The questions asked relating to the vignette seemed too restrictive and allowed for limited responses. In addition, after discussing these pilot results with the same panel of experts used to analyze content validity, a few other changes were made regarding variables, research questions, and data analysis.

I initially planned on using officer race as a predictor variable, but through discussion with my expert panel, it was decided that officer race makes no difference in analyzing individual officer data as it does not negate claims of racial profiling if the officer is a racial or ethnic minority. Furthermore, Sklansky (2006) noted that policing involves more organizational culture than individual officer characteristics. As Sklansky cited Walker, Spohn, and DeLone (2000), "blue is blue," indicating that race does not trump organizational culture (p.1210). This variable was removed.

Further discussion with my expert panel prompted the addition of a new variable that may influence a police officer's decision to stop or not stop a motorist: the frequency of operational discussions of racial profiling data. Anecdotally, as an officer who routinely makes traffic stops as part of my daily duties, my personal profiling data are

discussed with me on a quarterly basis during evaluations with my sergeant. I am informed during each evaluation whether or not my minority contacts are within the expected range for my jurisdiction, and that information influences my discretionary decision making when it comes to making traffic stops. In addition, in speaking with the respective chiefs of police for the sample population comprising the main study, we determined that the frequency of evaluative discussion including collected racial profiling data may significantly influence a police officer's decision making process. This variable was added.

With the changes in variables came related changes in the research questions. I replaced the original research question addressing officer's race with a new research question, which addressed the frequency of collected data discussion with supervisors. I also made revisions to the research question addressing the influence departmental policy and the observation of race or ethnicity and a police officer's decision to stop or not stop a motorist. Upon making the above changes, I resubmitted my IRB application and received approval for the changes in data collection.

I asked the officers in question one whether or not they would stop the motorist based on the hypothetical vignette. If the officer chose to not stop, a follow-up question was asked as to what influenced that decision to not stop. With the fraction of respondents that would be responding to the follow up question, it was apparent that the population used in data analysis would more than likely be too small to reach statistical significance in the model. Furthermore, each department comprising the new sample population had a racial profiling or bias-based policing policy that cited discipline as a consequence for violation of that policy. I decided that the collection of this data was

imperative to this study, but the variable did not fit the requirements for logistic regression. Therefore, frequencies and percentages were chosen as the appropriate method for data analysis for this variable. The same data analysis was found to be appropriate for the open ended question on what influenced the decision to stop or not stop.

One final change was prompted by the pilot study, which was the sole use of CALEA accredited organizations. Roughly 1% of police agencies in the United States have achieved accreditation through CALEA standards. The rationale behind using only CALEA accredited agencies was to address any concerns that the officers did not know their department policy because CALEA is quite stringent on the understanding of department policy. As the survey instrument addressed training on department policy, I felt I could address this issue should it arise. In addition, with the small number of accredited agencies in the three states I surveyed, compiled with the fact that I already used one in each state for the pilot, devastated my pool of potential departments to use in the study. This requirement was dropped from the study in favor of any department.

Data Collection

Departments used in this study were individually selected. I looked for those roughly equivalent in size, between 150-200 officers each. I also looked for departments to be representative of different statutory reporting requirements in different states. I obtained cooperation letters from one department each in Kansas, Missouri, and Iowa, totaling approximately 500 potential participants. Of those 500 potential participants, 176 officers responded within the two-week time span. I conducted this data collection during the summer of 2013.

The survey link was distributed electronically to all agencies along with a Letter of Informed Consent. The survey and consent form were then distributed to the appropriate officers who routinely conduct traffic stops, via their respective administrative secretaries, or in one case, via their police officer's association representative. This differs only slightly from the original plan to send out electronic links to two agencies and personally delivering paper surveys to one department as was done during the pilot study.

Results

Following are the results of this quantitative analysis. Frequencies and percentages are reported as well as χ^2 statistics and correlation coefficients as appropriate. In addition, I reported the results of the forward stepwise binary logistic regression analysis and I evaluated any related statistical assumptions.

Descriptive Statistics

The demographic information I collected pertained only to an officer's years of sworn service. For the 176 officers who completed the survey, the range of experience was between 1 year and 34 years sworn service. Table 3 contains the mean (13.73) and standard deviation (7.28) for the officers' years of experience.

Table 3

Mean and Standard Deviation for Years of Service

Survey Question	*M*	*SD*
How long have you been a police officer?	13.73	7.28

I designed the survey to ask officers factual information on their decision making process as it relates to conducting traffic stop. Officers were asked to state whether or not they would conduct a traffic stop given a variety of specific circumstances. In particular, I asked officers whether or not they would stop an observed racial or ethnic minority for a minor traffic violation after being recently told by their supervisor during a routine evaluation review that their minority contact/stop ratio was slightly higher than acceptable by department standards. Furthermore, I asked them what influenced their decision if they chose to not stop the driver. Of the 176 respondents, 104 chose to go ahead and stop the vehicle (59%) and 72 chose to not stop the vehicle (41%). Sixty-seven of the officers who chose to not stop the vehicle (93%) reported either the observed race or a departmentally implemented policy prompted their decision. Frequencies and percentages of questions relating to the independent variables are included in Table 4. These frequencies and percentages account for the 176 officers surveyed (35%) of the total population for these jurisdictions.

Table 4

Frequencies and Percentages for Participant Survey Responses

Survey Question	*n*	%
Based on the scenario above, would you stop this vehicle?		
Yes	104	59
No	72	41
Was your decision to not stop this vehicle influenced by your understanding of any state law addressing racial profiling?		
Yes	23	14
No	53	32
Does not apply	88	54
Was your decision to not stop this vehicle influenced by your department's		

racial profiling policy?		
Yes	67	93
No	5	7
Have you received discipline for violating your department's racial profiling policy?		
Yes	14	8
No	159	90
Does not apply	2	1
Are your personal racial profiling stats discussed with you?		
Discussed	104	60
Not discussed	70	40

Note: Not all percentages may equal 100% due to rounding.

Statistical Assumptions

Logistic regression has three assumptions to be met: (a) Linearity, (b) Independence of errors, and (c) Absence of multicollinearity (Field, 2009). The second assumption is not of great concern for this study as none of the cases are related, nor are they tested more than once. However, I did test for linearity of the logit and absence of multicollinearity.

This study had only one continuous predictor, years of service. I transformed this variable to test it against its own natural log. The results of this test indicated that no significant relationship existed, $p > .05$. In addition, I assessed variance inflation factors (VIF) values prior to running the analysis to ensure absence of multicollinearity; no VIF were above 10, and no tolerance values were below .1.

Analysis

I conducted chi-square analyses to evaluate the relationships between the frequency of racial profiling data discussion, prior discipline for violating racial profiling policy, presence of a statute requiring data collection, and an officer's decision to stop or

not stop a motorist given the scenario. The results of those chi-square tests are presented in Table 5. To test the relationship between an officer's years of service and their decision to stop or not stop a motorist, I ran a point biserial correlation, and those results are presented in Table 6.

Table 5

Chi square analyses of categorical predictors and decision to stop or not stop

Predictor	Would you stop the vehicle? Yes	No	$\chi^2(1)$	*p*
Presence of Racial profiling law in state			10.90	< .001
No law	28 [20]	5 [13]		
Law present	76 [84]	66 [58]		
			1.73	.188
Prior discipline				
Yes	6 [8]	8 [6]		
No	98 [96]	63 [65]		
			1.72	.190
Racial statistics discussion				
Does not discuss	46 [42]	24 [28]		
Does discuss	58 [62]	46 [42]		

Note: Parenthetical values represent expected counts.

Evaluation of the chi square statistics revealed only one significant relationship between the predictors and an officer's decision to stop or not stop a vehicle, and that was the presence of a state law requiring the collection of racial profiling data, $\chi^2(1) = 10.92$, $p < .001$. An officer receiving prior discipline, $\chi^2(1) = 1.73$, $p = .188$, and frequency of discussion, $\chi^2(1) = 1.72$, $p = .190$, were not found to be statistically significant. Finally, an officer's years of service were not found to be statistically significant with their decision to stop or not stop a motorist $r_{pb}(170) < .01$, $p = .969$.

Table 6

Point Biserial Correlation between Years of Service and Decision to Stop or Not Stop

Predictor	Decision to stop or not stop
Years of service	-.003

I addressed research questions 1, 2, 3, and 4 using a forward stepwise binary logistic regression analysis. The presence of a state law mandating collection of racial profiling data, prior discipline for violating the department's racial profiling policy, the frequency of discussion of racial profiling data with supervisors, and an officer's years of service were used as predictors in the outcome officer's decision to stop or not stop a motorist based on the given scenario. Of these four predictors used in the logistic regression model, only one was found to be statistically significant, all others were discarded prior to begin entered into the model due to their statistical insignificance. The significant variable was identified as the presence of a state law mandating the collection of racial profiling data, $\chi^2(1) = 11.51$, $p = .001$, revealing that the presence of a state law mandating data collection accounted for between 6.5% (Cox and Snell R^2) and 8.8% (Nagelkerke R^2) of the variance in an officer's decision to stop or not stop a motorist given the scenario. Evaluation of the odds ratio shows that holding all other independent variables constant, respondents who are in a state that has a statutorily mandated racial profiling data collection policy are 4.70 times more likely to not stop a minority motorist if they are slightly exceeding their departments' expected minority contacts. The null hypothesis in research question one must be rejected in favor of the alternative hypothesis, the odds of the presence of a state statute requiring data collection of citizen

contacts increases the likelihood of the dependent variable decision to stop or not stop as measured by an officers' self-report does not equal zero. I reported the results of the forward stepwise logistic regression in Table 7.

Table 7

Logistic Regression for State Statute Predicting Stop or No Stop

Predictor	*B*	*SE*	95% CI	Wald	*p*	*Exp(B)*
State statute	1.55	.52	[1.72, 12.90]	9.05	.003	4.70

I identified one constant variable between each department surveyed, and that is the presence of a departmental policy that addresses racial profiling or bias-based policing that cites discipline for violating the policy. In order to evaluate the influence of having such a policy on the decision to not stop a minority motorist, I asked respondents who did not stop the vehicle based on the scenario if their knowledge of the policy had any influence on their decision, which addressed the first alternative research goal. Of the 72 officers who did not stop the vehicle based on the given scenario, 52 (72%) stated that their understanding of their department policy was influential in their decision making process to avoid the stop. Frequencies and percentages are presented in Table 8

Table 8

Frequencies and Percentages of Department Policy Influence on Stop or Not Stop

Did Policy Influence your Decision	*n*	%
Yes	52	72
No	20	18

Finally, to address the second alternative research goal, I allowed officers to fill in their own, open-ended response on what influenced their decision to not stop the motorist in the given scenario. Of the 72 officers who did not stop the vehicle based on the scenario, 67 (93%), cited either fear of violating the policy or race itself as the basis of the decision to avoid the stop. Frequencies and percentages are presented in Table 9.

Table 9

Frequencies and Percentages for Influence (Race or Policy vs. Other) on Stop or Not Stop

Influence	*n*	%
Other	5	7
Race or Policy	67	93

Summary

In research question one, I sought to identify a correlation between the presence of a state law requiring racial profiling data collection and an officer's decision to stop or not stop an observed racial or ethnic minority. Based on my findings, the mere presence of such a law is a statistically significant indicator that a police officer may choose to not stop a motorist given a similar situation. To be specific, the odds of an officer choosing to not stop a minority motorist in a similar situation increase by 4.70 times if that officer works in a state that mandates racial profiling data collection, holding all other variables constant.

The last three research questions, research questions two, three, and four, addressed an officer's years of service, previous discipline for violating the department's policy, and frequency of racial profiling statistics discussion, respectively, and any

correlation with that officer's decision to stop or not stop a visible ethnic or racial minority. Through forward stepwise binary logistic regression analysis, none of these three predictors were found to be statistically significant.

The first corresponding research goal was to illustrate the influence of a department's racial profiling policy on those officers who chose to not stop the vehicle in the given scenario. I asked each officer who did not choose to stop the vehicle if their department policy was influential in their decision. Of those officers reporting that they would not stop the vehicle, 72% stated that the policy was influential in their decision making.

The second corresponding research goal addressed whether or not the race of the driver was an influence in their decision to stop the motorist. Officers were asked to provide their own open ended response on what factor influenced their decision to stop or not stop the motorist, and of those officers responding 93% reported either race/racial profiling policy as influential in their decision.

Although department policies are intended to guide employee behavior, some may guide them in an unintended direction. In the three departments surveyed in this study, two had mandatory racial profiling policies and one had one that was voluntarily implemented. That one variable, the statutory requirement, was the only significant variable found in this study, and it was hypothesized as such. There was a large number of officers who chose to avoid stopping a racial or ethnic minority when presented with the scenario. This significant number of officers choosing to disengage at the sight of a racial or ethnic minority behind the wheel is cause for concern, and that concern will be

discussed in the following chapter. In addition, all recommendations and implications will be presented.

Chapter 5: Summary, Recommendations, and Conclusion

Introduction

The purpose of this quantitative, cross-sectional study was to analyze the relationship between racial profiling policy, at both the state and departmental level, and a police officer's decision to stop or not stop a motorist when the race of that motorist is observed to be that of a visible racial or ethnic minority. There were many reasons this study was conducted, but none more important than identifying statutorily required policy that may be an impediment to proactive policing. Of equal importance, however, is the potential for police officers to avoid policing minority populated neighborhoods in an attempt to skew their minority contact numbers.

The results of this study indicated that the presence of a state law requiring data collection policies implemented in every police department can significantly impact police officer decision making when it comes to conducting traffic stops on racial or ethnic minorities, which is a new contribution to the existing literature. Those officers who chose to avoid stopping a racial or ethnic minority stated they were influenced by the very department policy that was mandated by their state's legislators. Other potential predictors, such as years of service, prior discipline for violating the policy, and the frequency of statistic discussion were found to not be significant.

Respondents in this study were asked to respond to a scenario in which they were presented a hypothetical situation that would not be uncommon for many police officers. The vignette included a scenario in which the police officer had just been told by his or her supervisor that his or her racial profiling ratio was slightly higher than expected for his or her jurisdiction. This notification was part of a quarterly evaluation or performance

review and was not prompted by the statistics alone. After leaving the evaluation, the officer observed a vehicle speeding just above his or her personal allowance for speeders; they noticed the driver was a racial or ethnic minority at that time. They were asked if they would stop or not stop the vehicle based on the information given. Of the 176 sworn police officers responding to this survey, 72 stated they would let the driver go. Ninety-seven percent of these officers stated that would let the driver go because of skin color or because of the policy in place addressing minority contacts.

Interpretation

Mastrofski (2004) noted the importance of researching police officer discretion and the factors that influence it. This current study was geared toward identifying factors that influence a police officer's decision to stop, or not stop, a motorist when the race of that motorist was observed to be a racial or ethnic minority. The identification of a statute that requires data collection as a significant influence in a police officer's discretionary decision making process raises concern. The potential for police officers to choose to avoid heavily minority populated neighborhoods that may, in reality, need police patrol is notable.

In this study, 72 police officers out of the 176 surveyed stated they would not stop a visible racial or ethnic minority if their minority contacts were slightly above what was expected. There is no easier way to avoid disproportionate stop ratios than avoiding minority populated areas. Cooper (2003) noted that any potential antagonism from either the public or administrators may be perceived as avoidable if there is a withdrawal from policing. If an officer wants to avoid any associated labels with having a disproportionate number of minority stops, then action must be taken to rectify the numbers (Miller,

2007). There really is no other choice in the matter as if the numbers do not equal out, discipline is looming on the horizon.

Officers who chose to not stop the vehicle in the given scenario were allowed to explain why it was they chose to avoid the stop. Officers explained they were afraid of being "terminated" from their employment, afraid it would "skew my numbers the wrong way," or simply "the fact that the motorist is a minority." In fact, one officer reported the following: "We are routinely told to look at the race of the driver, and if they are a minority, let them go and stop a white driver." Miller (2007) noted that officers may tend to withdraw from their policing duties when there is a chance they may be viewed by administrators as participating in bias-based policing. The results of this study confirm this assertion. If there is a risk of discipline for violating an ambiguous policy then it might be best to avoid violating the policy by any means.

Vito and Walsh (2008) observed that traffic stops involve conscious decision making by the officer. Typically, an officer observes a violation and makes a choice to either take enforcement action based on his or her observation or ignore the violation; whether or not the officer is able to carry out such enforcement efforts is inconsequential as the decision was made and a valid attempt followed. The responses given by officers confirm that there is more involved in their decision making process than the mere observation of a violation. Officers are thinking about policy, what might be the repercussion of this stop, and whether or not they will be labeled erroneously based on their actions. All of these thoughts, in this study, impacted the decision to make a traffic stop on a visible racial or ethnic minority and, as such, were fresh on the minds of these officers.

The only significant variable identified in this study was that of a law being present that mandated racial profiling data collection. As officers worked in a state with a law mandating such practice, the odds of not stopping a visible or racial ethnic minority increased by 4.70 times holding all other independent variables constant. Stroshine et al. (2008) noted how an officer's individual interpretation of his or her surroundings can influence their decision making. Analysis of the data collected in this study reinforces this assertion. Even though the majority of officers did not specifically cite the state law as being significant in their decision making process, the fact that it was there proved to be statistically significant. One interpretation of this significance might be that an officer's knowledge of this statutory requirement is influencing his or her discretion whether he or she consciously knows it or not. Another interpretation could be that the officers were simply not willing to share this information in their responses for any number of reasons. Wilson (1968) theorized an identifiable connection between the political atmosphere in which a police department exists and the organizational influence the department has over its employees. In other words, do the officers act in a way that furthers the political ideology of the environment? According to Liederbach and Travis (2008), Wilson's theory cannot be proven. However, the influence of public policy in departmental organization is readily apparent in policing, and the impact may be seen in the identification of this variable.

As Warren and Farrell (2009) noted, politics can play a part in a police officer's individual decision making. It is apparent to me that the tone is set within each jurisdiction, perhaps each department, as to how a department will handle certain actions. Take for example, the handling of search incident to arrest after *Arizona v. Gant* (2009).

Some police officers began to tow every vehicle involved in a custodial arrest as it was a way around the warrantless search of the vehicle that had just been deemed in violation of the fourth amendment. When a vehicle is towed, an "inventory" must be completed of the vehicle to identify the suspect's belongings in the vehicle. Police administrators either supported this decision, making it common practice, or they did not and issued unwritten directives informing their officers that they will not be towing every vehicle based simply on an arrest. The same interpretation falls from department to department when it comes to racial profiling policies. Some departments are going to take into account the demographic makeup of the officer's district, or even surrounding districts, and hold him or her accountable accordingly, or they are going to take the total demographic makeup of the entire city and hold everyone to the same standard. Much like the search incident to arrest interpretation, neither one is technically wrong, but one is a perversion of the law's intent and, with scrutiny, may even be deemed as violating someone's rights.

Ouchi (1977) discussed organizational control and noted that supervisors watch their subordinates, compare their behaviors with some predesignated standard, then reward or punish based on their performance. The racial profiling policies implemented in these jurisdictions do just that. Supervisors identify disproportionate numbers and address the problem through discipline. The problem, as noted by Barnum and Perfetti (2010), is that disproportionate minority contacts do not equate to racial profiling. The officers responding to this survey were keenly aware of their policies forbidding the practice of racial profiling, but the majority of those who chose to not stop the motorist believed that higher numbers did equate to a policy violation, at least in the eyes of their

supervisors. The fear of discipline or termination was observed numerous times as a reason chose to disengage.

A large portion of the research surrounding racial profiling addressed how race influences the decision to stop (Higgins et al., 2011; Iomo et al., 2007; Miller, 2007). In fact, the focus tends to be on those variables that play into an officer's decision when making stops, race is just one of the many variables. However, the influence of policy had not been included in any previous studies that I could find. Of the officers participating in this study who chose to not stop the vehicle, 97% stated that their department policy was influential in their decision. This variable was analyzed for frequency and percentages only. Officers who responded to this question were only prompted to do so if they stated they were not going to stop the vehicle, and due to the follow-up nature of the question, the variable was not included in the logistic regression analysis. It is difficult to find a police agency of any size that does not have a policy banning the use of race as an indicator of criminal activity, and understandably so. This makes analysis of the policy's influence somewhat problematic, but we cannot ignore the large number of officers who are citing its influence in this study. Again, the influence of policy in a police organization is proven to be quite strong and reflective of the organizational goals of the department.

Insignificant Predictors

Three of the four predictors used in the logistic regression model were not found to be statistically significant in this study. Those variables are the frequency of stat discussion, years of service, and prior discipline for violating the racial profiling policy.

These three variables were not included in the forward stepwise regression analysis, but their inclusion in this study warrants discussion.

The frequency of stat discussion addressed how many times, if any, officers were informed of their racial profiling statistics. These answers ranged from quarterly to never, which were the two most common responses. Other responses included "only if there is a problem" or "during annual training." While this variables was not found to be statistically significant, discussion of racial profiling statistics occur to inform the individual officer where he or she stands as compared to his or her peers, either departmentally or at the state level. It was expected that there would be a significant relationship between the frequency of discussion and an officer's decision to not stop the vehicle in the vignette. It stands to reason that if the issue is never discussed, the issue will not be fresh on the officer's minds. However, discussion of the statistics need not unnecessarily influence an officer into intentionally avoid stopping anyone if a violation is observed. Again, as will be discussed in the suggestions for change section, there is more to be evaluated than the bare statistic.

Previous research addressed the relationship between time in policing and discretionary decision making (Paoline & Terrill, 2007). The current study addressed time in policing as a potential predictor of an officer's decision to stop or not stop a racial or ethnic minority in the scenario. However, logistic regression did not identify this variable as significant. A possible reason for this outcome is as follows: It is believed that varying degrees of experience in policing will result in varying degrees of responses in certain situations. Paoline and Terrill (2007) noted that force is less likely to be used the

longer an officer is on the job, save for an increase in the 3 to 5 year range. This tendency to just go with the flow may be visible in this study as well.

The last variable found to be insignificant through logistic regression was that of prior discipline for violation the department's racial profiling policy. Out of the 176 officers surveyed, 14 officers reported having been disciplined previously for violating their department's policy. I wholeheartedly expected this to be a significant predictor in the decision to stop or not stop a motorist. The few responding with the answer, however, may have played a part in its failure to reach a significant level. Not only have these officers been approached about their numbers, actual discipline, whether in the form of a consultation or suspension, had been handed down for violating the policy. It is difficult to make assumptions or interpretations from this data due to the small number of participants who fell into this category. In addition, more information is needed to address the impact of this variable. This is one to include in future research.

Limitations of the Study

As with any survey addressing sensitive topics, honesty of the respondents is a concern. While there were some officers who did not hold back, the data reveals some discrepancies in what the responses in the survey were and what the actual outcome of the analysis was. The presence of a state law mandating data collection policies was the only variable found to be statistically significant in the study. However, when asked directly about the influence of this state law, only 14% responded that they were influenced by the law. I am unsure as to why the discrepancy is identifiable. One interpretation could be that the officers were simply not willing to share this information. Alternatively, the officers may have not understood the question. At any rate, there is a

concern with response bias due to the nature of the question. Anonymity was promised and explained in the informed consent document, but that promise comes with no concrete guarantees. The officers would have to take that promise for what it is worth in their own minds.

Generalizability is an issue. For the current study, the results should only be generalized to the departments from which data was drawn. Simply put, the data collected from these departments reflect individual interpretation of their own racial profiling or bias-based policing policies as it might apply to the scenario given. As noted throughout this study, there is no agreement as to what constitutes racial profiling, so policies will vary from department to department. One department from Missouri, one from Kansas, and one from Iowa were used to collect data, and application of this data to outside agencies should be done with caution. These cities were predominantly urban with mixed races and cultures common in the Midwest. While I believe this data can be used to characterize the majority of police officers in the United States, there is no evidence to support such an assertion and the study was not constructed in such a way to be interpreted; as such, policies and laws were analyzed only to characterize the departments chosen.

Another limitation of this study was the pure quantitative nature characterizing it. While I have spent the majority of this chapter discussion how analyzing data alone is inappropriate for understanding police officer behavior, I built the study in that very fashion. There is a need for a qualitative aspect of this study to better understand what is behind a police officer's decision making process.

Lastly, I must address the issue of over-inflation and the increased chance of a Type I error in using stepwise logistic regression. Thompson (1995) noted that the problem with utilizing stepwise logistic regression is that there are incorrect computations of associated degrees of freedom in the study. The number of entered variables in the model determine the degrees of freedom in a stepwise logistic regression analysis (Thompson, 1995). However, Thompson (1995) noted that in studies with a small number of predictors in the model, stepwise logistic regression applications are "not equally evil" (p. 527). In other words, the over-inflation observed in stepwise logistic regression models with numerous predictors may not be observed in studies with a small number of predictors. This study utilized four predictors in the binary logistic regression model and as such, the model was not subject to the concerns noted by Thompson. However, for the sake of argument, I ran a forced entry analysis utilizing the same variables and found that the difference in significance was quite negligible. In addition, Field (2009) observed that the use of stepwise logistic regression can be quite useful when evaluating new data with no theoretical framework on which the study was based.

Recommendations

First and foremost, there needs to be widespread agreement on what constitutes racial profiling. The majority of racial profiling definitions I have found for this study address the use of race as an indicator in criminal activity or address race as the sole factor in deciding to initiate or further an investigation (Kennedy, 1997; Withrow, 2006). These operational definitions cannot be quantified with data alone. If an officer has over-representative minority contacts, that alone does not indicate that he or she is racial

profiling. It is quite possible, even probable, that each of those stops were prompted by observed violations that the officer would routinely stop a motorist for violating. As Barnum and Perfetti (2010) noted, over-representative numbers do not equate to racial profiling. It is not appropriate to implement some form of behavioral control when the officer is not violating the policy. Unless the policy has a specific number listed in the policy, a number that an officer should not surpass, then no behavioral controls should be implemented without defining the motivation behind each of his or her stops. Any deviation from this is essentially applying improper control mechanisms when the officer has potentially done nothing but his or her job. An agreed upon definition must be in place.

Another problem that needs to be addressed is that of a baseline for minority drivers. In many jurisdictions, officers are assigned a district or beat to patrol. While difficult to track, the demographic makeup of each district should be evaluated prior to holding an officer accountable for the number of minority contacts in his or her district. This baseline must include not only the demographic of the residents in the district but a baseline of those traveling in and out of the district, those in the surrounding district, and those who may be traveling in and out of the district. Neighboring municipalities should not be ignored. If departments are determined to collect data on the number of stops their officers are making, then those officers must be given a fair chance to explain their own data.

Furthermore, studies relating to officer discretion as it pertains to stopping or not stopping racial or ethnic minority motorists should continue. While quantitative analyses are great for analyzing frequencies, there is no better way to describe individual thought

patterns than qualitative analysis. Tracking how an officer processes information and decides to exercise discretion is not something that can be measured quantitatively. Consequently, interviews or observations should be employed to support quantitative data.

Implications

The greatest benefit for review of racial profiling policy might be found at the individual level. As Rowe et al. (2012) stated, "Behavior control is appropriate when trust is not expected as part of the relationship and when trust and respect are not embedded within the organizational infrastructure" (p.65). Police departments operate on the assumption that officers will make the appropriate and correct decisions. History has shown that this is not always the case, but those instances are most definitely the exception and not the rule. To take the approach that an officer is engaged in good, proactive police work before assuming disparate treatment can make a world of difference on not only performance but morale. There is no better way to destroy morale in an agency than to show your subordinates that there is no trust. After all, these men and women are trusted with firearms and expected to make appropriate discretionary decisions. The discretion applied in traffic stops is no different.

Socially, the willingness and ability for a police officer to enter and patrol minority populated neighborhoods without fear of taking enforcement efforts is at the heart of equality. The true injustice is found in an officer's unwillingness to patrol and execute the same enforcement efforts in a minority populated neighborhood that he or she is willing to execute in neighborhoods populated predominantly by Whites. Traffic stops and investigations should be based on probable cause and reasonable suspicion,

respectively. When that standard changes from environment to environment, disparate treatment is afoot. If equality if the goal, then equal enforcement must be practiced.

Roughly 40% of police officers surveyed for this study stated that they would not stop a minority motorist if presented with a similar situation as described in the scenario. The potential for these officers to be patrolling a minority populated neighborhood is great, and the result of inaction based on fear of repercussions could be devastating. Police officers must feel free to serve and protect all races and ethnicities if there is to ever be equality under the law. Unfortunately, there are laws and policies in place that only allow a limited number of enforcement efforts to take place in minority populated areas, which according to Capers (2009) tend to have the highest crime rates.

The methodological implications are clear. Quantitative analysis has many benefits in racial profiling research. Data collection is geared specifically towards statistics, but to better understand an officer's perspective, qualitative research is a necessity. I would strongly suggest a three part analysis in which quantitative data is collected with a qualitative portion to follow, leading back into a final qualitative analysis. This study has served well as a first step in understanding what influences a police officer's decision to stop or not stop a motorist. However, there is much to follow that this study did not address. Collection of qualitative data is a must.

In order for police administrators to better address the issue of racial profiling, there must be a strong focus on understanding the baselines as mentioned in the recommendations. In addition, there must be agreement, or at least specific operational definitions of what constitutes racial profiling at the departmental level. Until these issues

are rectified, police officers as well as the public will never have a true understanding of racial profiling.

Conclusion

I found it quite troublesome that a respondent reported that his or her supervisor ordered them to seek out White drivers and stop them. A suggestion like this does little to promote proactive policing, nor does it bode well for the police department when this sort of order becomes public knowledge. However, when an arbitrary number, one that is based on census data for the jurisdiction without any other variables, is put in place for a range of expected contacts, intentionally seeking out specific races or ethnicities may arise as an option. There is always the opportunity to stop nothing but the "soccer mom" speeding back and forth between their children's sporting events. This does little in the way of drug interdiction, but at least an officer would not have to worry about his or her racial profiling statistics. As Cooper (2003) put it, if the public criticizes the way the police conduct business, the public will get no policing.

Racial profiling laws are intended to eradicate the police use of race as the primary factor in stopping or investigating disproportionate members of any particular race, and that includes Whites whether they are at the heart of the policy or not. These policies are most certainly not intended to bring about what some call "reverse racial profiling," which is nothing more than racial profiling. There must be an understanding on what constitutes racial profiling and we must move away from strict data analysis to identify the phenomenon. Barnum and Perfetti (2010) were right by saying over-representative numbers are no proof of disparate treatment.

Racial profiling is a problem across the United States and legislators across the country have responded by passing laws calling for its end (Laney, 2004). However, with the lack of understanding and operationally defining the phenomenon, legislators are passing data collection requirements that do nothing more than look at numbers to determine disparate treatment (Barnum & Perfetti, 2010). With the lack of common agreement in defining racial profiling, policies implemented to combat its existence tend to be ambiguous. I use the term ambiguous because there is no agreement on what constitutes racial profiling amongst scholars (Laney, 2004), yet there are laws passed that are left open to interpretation and that interpretation typically falls into the category of numbers and only numbers. It typically makes no difference whether or not there was an actual violation that prompted the stop. All that matters is the race of the driver. Worden et al. (2012) noted that at least half of the time, race is not even noticeable to the officer due to the veil of darkness. Time of day, actual violation observed, and whether or not the race of the driver was even noticeable prior to the stop are amongst the many variables that should be taken into account when labeling behavior as problematic.

So much attention has been given to studying what factors go in to making a traffic stop that we have ignored the numerous reasons why an officer chooses to not make a stop. It is not feasible to stop every violation. Traffic may be too congested for the officer to turn around on a vehicle, it may be a relatively benign violation observed just before lunchtime, or it might have occurred while the officer is doing everything but running lights and sirens to get back to the station so he or she can go the restroom. Whatever the case may be, there are many factors influencing an officer's decision to stop, or not stop, a vehicle, and research must include the possibility that the officer is

allowing stops to pass as opposed to vilifying their actions as based on observed race or ethnicity.

References

Allport, G.W. (1958). *The nature of prejudice*. New York, NY: Doubleday Anchor Books.

Arizona v. Gant. 07-542 (2009).

Bah, A.B. (2006). Racial profiling and the war on terror: Changing trends and perspectives. *Ethnic Studies Review, 29*(1) 76-85.

Barnum, C. & Perfetti, R.L. (2010). Race-sensitive choices by police officers in traffic stop encounters. *Police Quarterly*, *13*(2), 180-208. doi: 10.1177/1098611110365690.

Batton, C., & Kadleck, C. (2004). Theoretical and methodological issues in racial profiling research. *Police Quarterly*, *7*(1), 30-64. doi: 10.1177/1098611103254102.

Bell, .D. (1995). Racial Realism. In K. Crenshaw, N. Gotanda, G. Peller, & K. Thomas (Eds.), *Critical race theory: The key writings that formed the movement* (pp. 5-19). New York, NY: The New Press.

Bobo, L.D. & Thompson, V. (2006). Unfair by design: The war on drugs, race and the legitimacy of the criminal justice system. *Social Research, 73*(2), 445-459. Retrieved from http://www.questia.com.

Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2013). *Local police*. Retrieved from http://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=tp&tid=71

Capers, B. (2009). Policing race and place. *Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review*, *44*, 43-78. Retrieved from http://www.law.harvard.edu.

Chappell, A.T., MacDonald, J.M., & Manz, P.W. (2006). The organizational determinants of police arrest decisions. *Crime & Delinquency*, *52*(2), 287-306. doi: 10.1177/0011128705278329.

Cochran, J.C., & Warren, P.Y. (2012). Racial, ethnic, and gender differences in perceptions of the police: The salience of officer race within the context of racial profiling. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, *28*(2), 206-227. doi: 10.1177/1043986211425726.

Colebatch, H.K. (2006). What work makes policy? *Policy Sci*, *39*, 309-321. doi: 10.1077/s11077-006-9025-4.

Cooper, F.R. (2003). Understanding depolicing: Symbiosis theory and critical cultural theory. *Villanova University Legal Working Paper Series. Villanova University School of Law Working Paper Series.* Working Paper 17.doi: 10.219/SSRN.380022.

Coover, G.E. (2001). Television and social identity: Race representation as "white"accomodation. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media, 45*(3), 413-420. Retrieved from http://www.questia.com.

Creswell, J. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Davenport, C., Soule, S.A., & Armstrong II, D.A. (2011). Protesting while black?: The differential policing of American activism, 1960 to 1990. *American Sociological Review*, *76*(1), 152-178. doi: 10.1177/0003122410395370.

Delgado, R. & Stefancic, J. (2007). Critical race theory and criminal justice. *Humanity & Society*, *31,* 133-145. doi: 10.1177/016059760703100201.

Fallik, S.W., & Novak, K.J. (2012). The decision to search: Is race or ethnicity important? *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, *28*(2), 146-165. doi: 10.1177/1043986211425734.

Federal Bureau of Investigation (2011a). *Crime in the United States* (Table 43). Retrieved from http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr.crime-in-the-u.s/2011/crime-in-the-u.s-2011/tables/table-43

Federal Bureau of Investigation (2011b). *Crime in the United States* (Table 74). Retrieved from http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr.crime-in-the-u.s/2010/crime-in-the-u.s-2011/tables/table-74.xls

Field, A. (2009). Discovering statistics: Using SPSS (3rd ed.). London: Sage.

Frankfort-Nachmais, C. & Nachmias, D. (2008). *Research methods in the social sciences* (7th ed). New York, NY. Worth Publishers.

Gabbidon, S.L., Higgins, G.E., & Wilder-Bonner, K.M. (2012). Black supporters of racial profiling: A demographic profile. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, *24*(4), 1-19. doi: 10.1177/0887403412442890.

Gabbidon, S.L., Marzette, L.N., & Peterson, S.A. (2007). Racial profiling and the courts: An empirical analysis of federal litigation, 1991 to 2006. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 23(3), 226-238. doi: 10.1177/1043986207306864.

Gilliard-Matthews, S., Kowalski, B.R., & Lundman, R.J. (2008). officer race and citizen-reported traffic ticket decisions by police in 1999 and 2002. *Police Quarterly*, *11*(2), 202-219. doi: 10.1177/1098611107309657.

Glover, K.S., (2007). Police discourse on racial profiling. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, *23*(3), 239-247. doi: 10.1177/1043986207306866.

Goar, C.D. (2007). Social identity theory and the reduction of inequality: Can cross-cutting categorization reduce inequality in mixed-race groups? *Social Behavior and Personality, 35*(4), 537-541. doi: 10.2224/sbp.2007.35.4.537.

Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life.* New York: Anchor Books.

Gumplowicz, L. (1899). *The outlines of sociology*. Nashville, TN: American Academy of Political and Social Science.

Heider, Fritz. (1958). *The psychology of inter-personal relations*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hickman, M.J. & Piquero, A.R. (2009). Organizational, administrative, and environmental correlates of complaints about police use of force: Does minority representation matter? *Crime & Delinquency*, *55*(1), 3-27. doi: 10.1177/0011128708316977.

Higgins, G.E., Gabbidon, S.L., and Jordan, K.L. (2008). Examining the generality of citizens'views on racial profiling in diverse situational contexts. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 35*(12), 1527-1541. doi: 10.1177/0093854808325214.

Higgins, G.E., Vito, G.F., & Grossi, E.L. (2012). The impact of race on the police decision to search during a traffic stop: A focal concerns theory perspective. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, *28*(2), 166-183. doi: 10.1177/1043986211425725.

Holmes, M.D., Smith, B.W., Freng, A.B., and Munoz, E.A. (2008). Minority threat, crime control, and police resource allocation in the southwestern United States. *Crime & Delinquency*, *54*(1). 128-152. doi: 10.1177/0011128707309718.

Horowitz, D. & Levin, M. (2001). The legal, political, and public war on racial profiling and its unlikely victims. *Texas Review of Law and Politics, 6*(1), 223-235.

Ingram, J.R. (2007). The effect of neighborhood characteristics on traffic citation practices of the police. *Police Quarterly*, *10*(4). 371-393. doi: 10.1177/1098611107306995.

Ioimo, R., Tears, R.S., Meadows, L.A., Becton, J.B., & Charles, M.T. (2007). The police view of bias-based policing. *Police Quarterly*, *10*(3), 270-287. doi: 10.1177/1098611106296479.

Iowa Code (2013). Retrieved from http://search.legis.state.ia.us/nxt/gateway.dll/ic?f=templates&fn=default.htm

Jenkins, N., Bloor, M., Fischer, J., Berney, L., & Neale, J. (2010). Putting it in context: The use of vignettes in qualitative interviewing. *Qualitative Research*, *10*(2), 175-198. doi: 10.1177/1468794109356737.

Johnson, D., Brazier, D., Forrest, K., Ketelhut, C., Mason, D., & Mitchell, M. (2011). Attitudes toward the use of racial/ethnic profiling to prevent crime and terrorism. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, *22*(4), 422-447. doi: 10.1177/0887403411381801.

Kansas Code of Criminal Procedure, Kan. Stat. Ann. 22-4601-4615 (2013).

Kennedy, R. (1997). *Race, crime, and the law.* New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Korematsu v. United States, 323 U.S. 214 (1944).

Laney, G.P. (2004). Racial profiling: Issues and federal legislative proposals and options. *CRS Report for Congress.* Retrieved from http://law.umaryland.edu.

Lever, A. (2005). Why racial profiling is hard to justify: A response to Risse and Zeckhauser. *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, *33*(1). 94-110. Retrieved from http://www.questia.com.

Lever, A. (2007). What's wrong with racial profiling? Another look at the problem. *Criminal Justice Ethics*, *26*(1), 20-30. Retrieved from http://www.questia.com.

Liederbach, J. & Travis III, L.F. (2008). Wilson redux: Another look at varieties of police behavior. *Police Quarterly*, *11*(4), 447-467. doi:10.1177/1098611108314567.

Lippert-Rasmussen, K. (2006). Racial profiling versus community. *Journal of Applied Science*, *23*(2), 191-205. Retrieved from http://www.questia.com.

Lundman, R.J. (2012). Race and ethnicity missingness in the traffic stop data reported by 308 Massachusetts police agencies. *Race and Justice*, *2*(1), 42-65. doi: 10.1177/2153368711431248.

Marx, K. (1983). Alienated Labour. In E. Kamenka (Ed.), *The portable Karl Marx* (pp. 131-145). London: Viking Penguin.

Matrofski, S.D. (2004). Controlling street-level police discretion. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *593*, 100-118. doi: 10.1177/0002716203262584.

Mendias, C., & Kehoe, E.J. (2006). Engagement of policing ideals and their relationship to the exercise of discretionary powers. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *33*(1), 70-92. doi: 10.1177/0093854805292509.

Miller, K. (2007). Racial profiling and postmodern society: Police responsiveness, image maintenance, and the left flank of police legitimacy. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, *23*(3) 248-262. doi: 10.1177/1043986207306868.

Novak, K.J. (2004). Disparity and racial profiling in traffic enforcement. *Police Quarterly*, *7*(1), 65-96. doi: 10.1177/1098611102250359.

Novak, K.J., & Chamlin, M.B. (2012). Racial threat, suspicion, and police behavior: The impact of race and place in traffic enforcement. *Crime & Delinquency*, *58*(2), 275-300. doi:10.1177/0011128708322943.

Ostertag, S.F. and Armaline, W.T. (2011). Image isn't everything: Contemporary systemic racism and antiracism is the age of Obama. *Humanity & Society*, *35*. 261-289. doi: 10.1177/016059761103500304.

Ouchi, W.G. (1977). The relationship between organizational structure and organizational control. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *22*, 95-113. doi: 10.2307/2391748.

Ouchi, W.G. & Johnson, J.B. (1978). Types of organizational control and their relationship to emotional well-being. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *23*, 293-317. doi: 10.2307/2392566.

Ouchi, W.G. & Maguire, M.A. (1975). Organizational control: Two functions. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *20*, 559-569. doi: 10.2307/2392023.

Paoline III, E.A. and Terrill, W. (2007). Police education, experience, and the use of force. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 34*, 179-196. doi:10.1177/0093854806290239.

Peng, C., Lee, K., & Ingersoll, G. (2002). An introduction to logistic regression analysis and reporting. *Journal of Educational Research*, *96*(1), 3-13. doi: 10.1080/00220670209598786.

Petrocelli, M. Piquero, A.R., Smith, M.R. (2003). Conflict theory and racial profiling: An empirical analysis of police traffic stop data. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *31*, 1-11. doi: 10.1016/S0047-2352(02)00195-2.

Phillips, S.W. (2009). Using a vignette research design to examine traffic stop decision making of police officers: A research note. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, *20*(4), 495-506. doi: 10.1177/0887403409333070.

Pierro, A., Cicero, L., & Raven, B.H. (2008). Motivated compliance with bases of social power. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *38*(7), 1921-1944. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2008.00374.x

Piquero, A. R. (2008). Disproportionate minority contact. *The Future of Children, 18*(2), 59-74. Retrieved from: http://www.questia.com.

Pollock, W., Oliver, W., & Menard, S. (2012). Measuring the problem: A national examination of disproportionate police contact. *Criminal Justice Review*, *37*(2), 153-173. doi: 10.1177/0734016811436335.

Ramirez, D.H., Hoopes, J., and Quinlan, T.L. (2003). Defining racial profiling in a post September 11 world. *American Criminal Law Review*, *40* (3), 1195-2008. Retrieved from http://www.questia.com.

Reddick, S.R. (2004). Point: The case for profiling. *International Social Science Review*, 79, 3-4. Retrieved from http:www.questia.com.

Reitzel, J. & Piquero, A.R. (2006). Does it exist? Studying citizens' attitudes of racial profiling. *Police Quarterly*, *9*(2), 161-183. doi: 10.1177/1098611104264743.

Risse, M. (2007). Racial profiling: A reply to two critics. *Criminal Justice Ethics*, *26*(1), 4-20. Retrieved from http://www.questia.com.

Risse, M., & Zeckhauser, R. (2004). Racial profiling. *Philosophy & Public Affairs, 32*(2), 131-170. Retrieved from http://www.questia.com.

Rocque, M. (2011). Racial disparities in the criminal justice system and perceptions of legitimacy: A theoretical linkage. *Race and Justice*, *1*(3), 292-315. doi: 10.1177/2153368711409758.

Roh, S. and Robinson, M. (2009). A geographic approach to racial profiling: The microanalysis and macroanalysis of racial disparity in traffic stops. *Police Quarterly*, *12*(2), 137-169. doi: 10.1177/1098611109332422.

Rowe, W.G., O'Brien, J., Rouse, M.J., & Nixon, R.D. (2012). Navy stories: Behavior versus professional control. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, *21*(1), 61-77. doi: 10.1177/1056492611400751.

RSMO ch. 590 § 590.650. Racial profiling – Minority group defined – Reporting requirements – Annual report – Review of findings – Failure to comply – Fund for audio-visual equipment – Sobriety check points exempt. Retrieved from http://www.moga.mo.gov/statutes.

Schafer, J.A., Carter, D.L., Katz-Bannister, A.J., & Wells, W.M. (2006). Decision making in traffic stop encounters: A multivariate analysis of police behavior. *Police Quarterly*, *9*(2), 184-209. doi:10.1177/1098611104264990.

Shane, J.M. (2012). Police employee disciplinary matrix: An emerging concept. *Police Quarterly*, *15*(1), 62-91. doi: 10.1177/1098611111433026.

Shultz, M., & Withrow, B.L. (2004). Racial profiling and organizational change. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, *15*(4), 462-485. doi: 10.1177/0887403403262127.

Sklansky, D.A. (2006). Not your father's police department: Making sense of the new demographics of law enforcement. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 96*(3), 1209-1228.

Smith, B.W., Novak, K.J., Frank, J., & Lowenkamp, C. (2005). Explaining police officer discretionary activity. *Criminal Justice Review*, *30*(3), 325-346. doi: 10.1177/0734016805285260.

Spencer, R. (2006). Why profiling is necessary. *Human Events*, *62*(28), 12. Retrieved from http:www.questia.com.

Stroshine, M., Alpert, G., & Dunham, R. (2008). The influence of "working rules" on police suspicion and discretionary decision making. *Police Quarterly*, *11*(3), 315-337. doi:10.1177/1098611107313029.

Tabachnick, B.G. & Fidell, L.S. (2001). Using multivariate statistics (4th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Pearson.

Theobald, N., & Haider-Markel, D.P. (2009). Race, bureaucracy, and symbolic representation: Interactions between citizens and police. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *19*(2), 409-423.

Thompson, B. (1995). Stepwise regression and stepwise discriminant analysis need not apply here: A guidelines editorial. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 55(4), 525-534. doi: 10.1177/0013164495055004001.

Trochim, W.M.K. (2006). Research methods knowledge base. Retrieved From http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/.

Tomaskovic-Devey, D. & Warren, P. (2009). Explaining and eliminating racial profiling. *Contexts*, *8*(2), 34-39. doi: 10.1525/ctx.2009.8.2.34.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2011). *The Hispanic Population*. Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-04.pdf.

Vito, G.F., & Walsh, W.F. (2008). Suspicion and traffic stops: crime control or racial profiling. *International Journal of Police Science and Management*, *10*(1), 89-100. doi: 10.1350/ijpsm.2008.10.1.67.

Warmbrod (1999). *Applied multivariate statistical analysis: The Ohio State University Coursepack.* Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University.

Warren, P.Y. & Farrell, A. (2009). The environmental context of racial profiling. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *623*(1), 52-63. doi: 10.1177/0002716208330485.

Weitzer, R., Tuch, S.A., & Skogan, W.G. (2008). Police-community relations in a majority-black city. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, *45*(4), 398-428. doi: 10.1177/0022427808322617.

Wilson, J.Q. (1968). *Varieties of Police Behavior: The Management of Law and Order in Eight Communities.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Withrow, B.L. (2007). When *Whren* won't work: The effects of a diminished capacity to initiate a pretextual stop on police officer behavior. *Police Quarterly*, *10*(4), 351-370. doi: 10.1177/1098611106293681.

Wolfe, S.E., & Piquero, A.R. (2011). Organizational justice and police misconduct. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *38*(4), 332-353. doi: 10.1177/0093854810397739.

Worden, R.E., McLean, S.J., & Wheeler, A.P. (2012). Testing for racial profiling with the veil-of-darkness method. *Police Quarterly*, *15*(1), 92-111. doi: 10.1177/1098611111433027.

Zhao, J., & Hassell, K.D. (2005). Policing styles and organizational priorities: Retesting Wilson's theory of local political culture. *Police Quarterly*, *8*(4), 411-430. doi: 10.1177/109861104269078.

Appendix A: Police Questionnaire Addressing Racial Profiling Law and Policy

Instructions: Please read the questions carefully and mark the appropriate response.

The following scenario depicts a police patrol officer's activity. Please read the scenario carefully and then answer the two questions that follow:

1. You are patrolling your district, and you pass a motorist that you observe to be speeding (either personal estimation, radar indication, or both) traveling just above your personal allowance for speeders; you see no other violations. As you prepare to turn around and stop the vehicle, you realize that the race of the driver is that of an ethnic or racial minority (Black, Hispanic, etc.).

Based on the scenario above, would you stop this vehicle?

___Yes

___No

Did the observed race or ethnicity of the driver influence your decision to stop or not stop this vehicle?

___Yes

___No

1. **What is your race?**

___White ___Black ___Hispanic ___American Indian ___Asian ___Other

2. **How long have you been a sworn police officer? (i.e. 3 years, 5 years, etc.)**

_____

3. **Have you received training in your department policy addressing racial profiling or bias-based policing?**

___Yes ___No

4. **If you made the decision to NOT stop a motorist in the previous scenario based on his or her race, was your knowledge of your department's racial profiling or bias-based policing policy influential in your decision?**

___Yes ___No ___Does not Apply

5. **Have you received any form of consultation or discipline (i.e. counseling, sensitivity training, write-ups, suspensions, etc.) for violating your department's racial profiling or bias-based policing policy?**

___Yes ___No

6. **If you made the decision to NOT stop a motorist in the previous scenario based on his or her race, was your understanding of any state law addressing racial profiling or bias-based policing influential in your decision?**

___Yes ___No ___Does not Apply (No state law)

7. **In what state are you employed as a police officer ?_____**

Appendix B: Police Questionnaire used in Final Data Collection

Police Questionnaire Addressing Racial Profiling Law and Policy

Instructions: Please read the questions carefully and mark the appropriate response/fill in the blank.

The following scenario depicts a police patrol officer's activity. Please read the scenario carefully and then answer the two questions that follow:

You are assigned to a district that is predominantly populated by a specific group of racial or ethnic minority (Black, Hispanic, etc.). You have a policy that says your traffic stops should be representative of the whole city's racial or ethnic minority population. You just left a regular performance review with your supervisor, and during that meeting you learned that your racial profiling stats were higher than the number selected as acceptable by your department.

You are patrolling your district, and you pass a motorist that you observe to be speeding (either personal estimation, radar indication, or both) traveling just above your personal allowance for speeders; you see no other violations. As you prepare to turn around and stop the vehicle, you realize that the race of the driver is that of an ethnic or racial minority (Black, Hispanic, etc.).

1. Based on the scenario above, would you stop this vehicle?

   __Yes (Go to Question 3)
   __No (Go to Question 2)

   _____
   _____

2. What influenced your decision to NOT stop this vehicle?

_____
_____

3. How long have you been a sworn police officer? (i.e. 3 years, 5 years, etc.) _____

4. Have you received training in your department policy addressing racial profiling or bias-based policing?

___Yes ___No ___Does not Apply

5. If you made the decision to NOT stop a motorist in the previous scenario based on his or her race, was your knowledge of your department's racial profiling or bias-based policing policy influential in your decision?

___Yes ___No ___Does not Apply

6. Have you received any form of consultation or discipline (i.e. counseling, sensitivity training, write-ups, suspensions, etc.) for violating your department's racial profiling or bias-based policing policy?

___Yes ___No ___Does not Apply

7. If you made the decision to NOT stop a motorist in the previous scenario based on his or her race, was your understanding of any state law addressing racial profiling or bias-based policing influential in your decision?

___Yes ___No ___Does not Apply

8. In what state are you employed as a police officer?_____

9. How often do your supervisors discuss your racial profiling statistics with you (i.e. monthly, quarterly, annually, never)?_____

Bradley R. Anders

Curriculum Vitae

Education:

2013 **Walden University**
Minneapolis, MN
PhD Candidate: Human Services: Criminal Justice

2007 **Boston University**,
Boston, MA Master's Degree Criminal Justice

2002 **University of Central Missouri**
Warrensburg, MO
Bachelor of Science Criminal Justice with a minor in Psychology

2000 **State Fair Community College**
Sedalia, MO
Associate's Degree

Professional Experience:

Aug 2011 to present **State Fair Community College**
Sedalia, MO
Adjunct Instructor

Responsible for the facilitation of a brick and mortar classroom to include lectures, quizzes, and testing. Specific duties include fostering a positive learning environment for criminal justice students and presenting quality information for future criminal justice professionals.

Jan 2011 to present **Everest Online College**
Phoenix, AZ
Adjunct Instructor

Justice Studies:
Responsible for the facilitation of online criminal justice courses based in the
eCollege format. Specific duties include fostering substantive discussion amongst students, grading discussion posts and individual/group assignments per APA formatting, and creating a student centered learning environment.

May 2009 **Lee's Summit Police Department** **Lee's Summit, MO**
to Police Officer
present

Crime Reduction Team (CRT):
Created and implemented a specialized unit that combines the concept of community policing with aggressive drug enforcement targeting a geographic area known for high crime resulting in increased case clearance rates and significant reduction in both violent and property crimes.

April 2003 **Sedalia Police Department** **Sedalia, MO**
to Police Officer
May 2009

Field Training Officer (FTO):
Responsible for training, preparation, and evaluation of all new police recruits.
Instruction, supervision, and testing of knowledge relating to police tactics and their respective application in the field.

K9 Handler:
Responsible for two police K9 units: one narcotics detecting dog, one narcotics with aggression dog. Responsible for daily care, maintenance, and continued training of these valuable pieces of equipment.

K9 Unit Supervisor:
Responsible for tracking all K9 uses and training logs.
Assure proper handling of K9 unit and distribution of all controlled substance training aids (Cocaine, Marijuana, Methamphetamine, and Crack)

First Line Supervisor of the Evidence Unit:
Duties included recording and maintaining every piece of evidence that was collected in the department, ensuring both a documented chain of custody and evidentiary integrity

Del Amici Inc.
Warrensburg/Sedalia MO

Feb. 1995 Owner/President: *February 1995 to May 2004*
to
June 2004

Warrensburg Restaurant 1995 to 2001

Responsible for ordering of supplies, payroll, hiring of all employees, firing of all employees, tax payments, scheduling, bookkeeping, cooking, serving tables, promotional sales, and bartending. Restaurant capacity was 89 people with 24 employees.

Sedalia Restaurant 1999 - 2004
Duties included: Responsible for ordering of supplies, payroll, hiring of all employees, firing of all employees, tax payments, bookkeeping, scheduling, cooking, serving tables, promotional sales, banquet planning and preparation, catering, and bartending. Restaurant capacity was 120 people with 36 employees.

Other Qualifications and Achievements:

- National Police Institute – Central Missouri State University, Warrensburg, MO. Graduated 1st in academy class in academics. July 2003.
- Nominated Officer of the Year for the Sedalia Police Department in February 2006.
- Credited and awarded medals for saving seven lives while on duty with the Sedalia Police Department, one of these a fellow police officer.
- Other awards received during work as a police officer include three community-policing awards, a safety award, numerous search and entry awards for serving over fifty successful search warrants on drug houses, four police commendations, and numerous certificates of merit for various duties performed.
- Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) Officer
- Certified Racial Profiling Instructor
- Vice-President of the Policeman's Retirement Board 2005
- President of the Policeman's Retirement Board 2006
- Member of the Sedalia Police Department's Grievance Board 2004 to 2007
- Member of the Sedalia Police Department Honor Guard 2004 to 2009